

Weekly Compilation of  
**Presidential  
Documents**



Monday, April 3, 1995  
Volume 31—Number 13  
Pages 477–520

## Contents

### Addresses and Remarks

- Florida
  - Community in Tallahassee—496
  - Florida State Legislature in Tallahassee—498
  - Hillsborough Community College in Tampa—507
- Georgia
  - Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games in Atlanta—485
  - Emory University students in Atlanta—491
  - Southern Regional Economic Conference in Atlanta—487
- Haiti
  - Arrival ceremony in Port-au-Prince—517
  - U.S. troops in Port-au-Prince—515
  - National Performance Review—481
  - Radio address—477

### Communications to Congress

- Angola, message reporting—483
- Native Hawaiian health care, message transmitting report—485
- Science and technology, message reporting—513

### Interviews With the News Media

- Interview with Tony Bruno and Chuck Wilson of ESPN Radio—478

### Meetings With Foreign Leaders

- Haiti, President Aristide—517

### Statements by the President

- Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman, Senate approval—513
- District of Columbia, legislation for financial oversight—496
- Major League Baseball strike—513
- Regulatory moratorium, Senate rejection—496
- Senator Howell T. Heflin's decision not to seek reelection—496

### Supplementary Materials

- Acts approved by the President—520
- Checklist of White House press releases—519
- Digest of other White House announcements—518
- Nominations submitted to the Senate—519

**Editor's Note:** The President was in Port-au-Prince, Haiti, on March 31, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

---

## WEEKLY COMPILATION OF PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

---

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

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

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

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

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

Week Ending Friday, March 31, 1995

**The President's Radio Address**

*March 25, 1995*

Good morning. This morning I want to talk about how much we can accomplish when we work in a spirit of cooperation. Once again this week demonstrated that Democrats and Republicans can come together to break gridlock when they put the American people first.

Our mission here is to keep the American dream alive for all our people; to grow the middle class and shrink the under class; to promote the mainstream values of work and family, community, and looking out for the future of our children; to reform Government to meet the challenges we face. There's a great debate here about how to change Government. On one side is the old view that big, one-size-fits-all Government can fix all our big problems. On the other is the view that Government is the source of all our problems. In the real world that's a false choice.

We must go beyond the old way of big Government and the new rage of no Government to the idea of Government as a partner, a partner that works to expand opportunity while shrinking bureaucracy, to empower people to make the most of their own lives through education and training, and to enhance our security on our streets and around the world. That's what I believe. And I believe most Americans feel that way, too.

In short, I believe that Federal Government must be a savior—or cannot be a savior, but must not sit on the sidelines. For our future we need a Government that helps us to create more opportunity but demands more responsibility from all our citizens. That's what I mean by the New Covenant: opportunity and responsibility.

Despite real differences between Republicans and Democrats, we see progress on three proposals I have supported for many years, proposals that I advocated when I ran

for President. All of them impose more responsibility on the Federal Government. And it's high time.

First, Congress passed a bill, which I was proud to sign, requiring Congress to live by the laws it imposes on the private sector. Second, last week in the Rose Garden right outside the Oval Office where I'm speaking now, I was pleased to sign another bill which for the first time limits the ability of Congress to pass laws which impose unfunded mandates on State and local Governments. As a former Governor, I know this bill will make a big difference in the ability of State and local governments to improve the lives of our people without having Washington tell them how to spend the tax dollars you send them. Third, last week the Senate passed a line-item veto. I have favored this power for Presidents, no matter what their party, for a long time. It will bring more discipline to our spending process by enabling Presidents to veto particular projects which are unjustified but which today can be hidden in comprehensive bills the President has to sign. Now that the line-item veto in some version has passed both Houses of Congress, I urge Members from both parties to resolve their differences, pass a unified bill, and send it to me. Then the line-item veto can put our people ahead of pork.

Last week, we saw some progress on another crucial issue, welfare reform. We saw that we can find common ground but we are not all the way there yet. In my radio address last week, I talked about the need to have tougher child support enforcement, to demand that parents take responsibility for their own children and not let parents off the hook or make the taxpayers pick up the tab for their neglect. If all the child support in America that is owed was paid, we could move 800,000 families off the welfare roll.

I'm pleased that Members of the House in both parties responded to my position on tougher child support enforcement. They

voted by 426 to 5 to adopt a provision from my welfare reform bill that calls upon States to deny driver's licenses and professional licenses to deadbeat parents, people who owe child support and can pay it but don't. The House has now adopted every major child support element in my welfare reform bill. If the Senate will follow suit, we'll mount the toughest crackdown on deadbeat parents ever and will help more children, too.

But we have to do more to promote responsible parenting. Other provisions of the House bill would actually make it harder for many people to get off and stay off welfare. And the bill doesn't really do anything to promote work; indeed, it removes any real responsibility for States to help people gain the training and skills they need to get and keep jobs. It even cuts child care for working people struggling to hold down jobs and stay off welfare.

I commend the Democrats in the House for voting unanimously for an alternative bill sponsored by Congressman Nathan Deal of Georgia because it was tougher on work requirements, better for children, and did more to promote responsible parenting. I'm looking forward to working with Republicans and Democrats to really end welfare as we know it; making sure people earn a paycheck, not a welfare check; that they move from dependence to independence.

I also want to caution the Members of the House to try to tone down the rhetoric. It got a little rough last week and a little too personal and partisan. After all, all Americans want to change the welfare system; no American wants to continue a system that doesn't promote work and responsible parenting.

In everything we do we must be working to expand the middle class, to shrink the under class, and to promote these values of family and work, community, and looking out for the future of our kids. I hope we'll be back in the Rose Garden while it's still spring to sign even more bills into law that help us to do those things. Guided by the values that have always kept us strong, we can work together to help all our people earn a fair shot at the American dream.

Thanks for listening.

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

### **Interview With Tony Bruno and Chuck Wilson of ESPN Radio**

*March 25, 1995*

**Tony Bruno.** As we continue on ESPN Radio, Tony Bruno and Chuck Wilson with you. And I've always wanted to do this, Chuck, when introducing a guest, but we've never had the opportunity so far.

Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States, Mr. Bill Clinton.

Mr. President, thanks for joining us on ESPN Radio. This is not a joke. People will think because I like to clown around that we're pulling a fast one on the American public, but we are not. And we appreciate you joining us.

**The President.** I'm glad to do it. And I'm glad to be in a conversation where the American people think someone else is pulling a fast one on them instead of the President. [Laughter]

### **NCAA Basketball Tournament**

**Chuck Wilson** Mr. President, we have had an opportunity to see an outstanding NCAA tournament. I know you're a big basketball fan, and your Arkansas Razorbacks, they're still alive.

**The President.** They're an amazing team. You know, everybody they've played this year it seems has played their very best game against them, and in every game it seems they have a few minutes of mental lapse where they let the other team get back in. But they've got enormous heart. I'm really proud of them, just to keep coming back. They never give up, and I respect that. I respect that in life, and I certainly respect it on the basketball court.

**Mr. Wilson** They've kept you on the edge of your chair, haven't they? The one-point game with Texas Southern, two overtime games, thirteen times this year they've had a game decided by 5 points or less, and they win 12 of the 13.

**The President.** It's amazing. They find a way to win. They keep getting themselves in trouble, but they find a way to win. Last night we had a watch party here at the White

House, and we had a lot of folks from home there. And we had a cardiologist there—we were all glad he was there. We thought he was going to have to jumpstart half the crowd to get us through the end of the game. [Laughter]

**Mr. Bruno.** They also keep you up very late also because of these overtime games. Can't you control CBS and have them put them on earlier? [Laughter]

**The President.** No, I don't have any—you know, that's the first amendment; the President, more than anybody else in the country, has no control over the media.

**Mr. Bruno.** President Bill Clinton is joining us from the Oval Office.

Let's talk about—now the Arkansas Razorbacks are one more step—actually, they're one step away from the Final Four. You've got the Sunday game. Is this team going to all the way? I want the Presidential prediction here now.

**The President.** Well, I think they have the ability to do it and they have the heart to do it. They've got to find the right combinations and maintain their concentration. I think they tend to up their play. You know, the two best basketball games I saw all year were the two games they played against Kentucky. And one they won, and one they lost. So it's obvious that they have the talent and the heart to do it, and I think if they can really get to the end of the games mentally, I think they've got a good chance to make it.

I was—I must say I was very impressed with the game Virginia played against Kansas last night. They were exhausted with 7 or 8 minutes left to go. I didn't know if they could get through the end of the game, but they somehow found the strength and the reserve to hang in there and win that game. So they've got a hard game to get by Virginia before they get to the Final Four. But I do think they have a chance to win.

### **The Presidency**

**Mr. Wilson.** President Clinton, frequently Presidents are accused of being out of touch with the people. They sit in the White House, they attend official functions, they don't get out with the regular people. You seemed to have really pushed very hard to be as normal

as you can in the White House. Do you find it beneficial, even beyond the family aspects, to get out and to go to basketball games or a football game, that kind of thing?

**The President.** Oh, I do. I think it's beneficial whenever the President can be in more normal circumstances for two reasons. First of all, it makes you remember that there's a real life beyond the White House and all the security apparatus that surrounds the President; it makes you feel better and kind of get back in touch with yourself. And secondly, it's important that the President see people in informal ways who are all kinds of citizens, that he relates to people without regard to their party or income or any other particular reason they might have to come to see the President in the White House. I think that's very important.

This is a wonderful opportunity, and it's important that the President be, to some extent, removed from the day-to-day things of life because you've got to keep looking for the long run. You've got to do a lot of things in this job that are unpopular because you believe them to be best for America in the long run. But still, the biggest danger is just being out of touch. So I try to fight it, and I enjoy trying to fight it.

**Mr. Wilson.** And it's tough to be normal in a sense because of all the security measures. You go to a game; it's not Bill Clinton going to the game, it's the President going to the game.

**The President.** Yes, and I—you know, I love to go to basketball games. I made one Georgetown game, my alma mater, and one George Washington game here in Washington this year. And I tried to do it in a way that would be as least disruptive as possible. I don't like to make other people wait on me to get out of a basketball arena. I don't like to make people wait in line while I'm getting in and getting seated. I really—I'm reluctant to go out to these events because I don't like to inconvenience other people. But it's certainly a great deal of fun when I get there.

### **Baseball Strike**

**Mr. Bruno.** President Bill Clinton joining us from the Oval Office here on ESPN Radio. Tony Bruno and Chuck Wilson.

One of the things that we—none of us will be able to go to unless we want to go to replacement games is major league baseball. Mr. President, we all know the situation is now at a turning point. We would have liked a line-item veto a couple of weeks ago to eliminate some parties from the bargaining mix. [Laughter] Unfortunately, you weren't able to do that for us either.

**The President.** We're about to pass the line-item veto. We're going to get that done. I don't know if I can apply it to baseball negotiations. I think it only applies to budgets, but it's not a bad idea. It's not too late.

**Mr. Bruno.** Well, the American fans, almost are apathetic about this. We're a week away from opening day. The real games, obviously, aren't going to start, barring some miraculous development this coming week. What do you think is going to happen? Do you think that this thing will eventually be solved before the season is totally shot?

**The President.** Well, I still think there's a chance. Mr. Usery, the person I appointed to mediate this, is still working. And of course, there are some developments involving—in the courts—involving the NLRB decisions that could have an impact on this. But I have to say, I will say again, I think both the players and the owners have to be aware that ultimately this game depends upon the fans. And if the fans finally get sick of it and decide they'd rather do something else, that's not good for baseball. And in the end, that is the ultimate hazard, that if it becomes so painfully clear that it's no longer a sport and it's just a business, then the customers may decide to take their business elsewhere. And that's what I think they all have to be sensitive to. They're about to run out this string. They need to resolve this.

**Mr. Wilson.** The thing that is so frustrating is that this game is predicated so much on the history of the sport. And if we start the season with replacement ballplayers, it really puts a stain on the history of the game, doesn't it?

**The President.** Well, sure, it does. Just like the strike last year. We had a chance to break records that had stood for decades, both because we had some great hitters having great seasons and, of course, because the expansion maybe spread the pitching a little

thinner than the hitting. But for whatever reason, we were on the verge of having a shattering season in the best sense. And the American people were excited about it; they were into it. We had all kinds of people my age who hadn't thought about baseball in years that were back into it. And then, boom, all of a sudden there was the strike, and it was over.

So I think if you put that with a season of replacement players, I think there's going to be a lot of diminished enthusiasm. I think people will be more interested in their minor league teams, the teams in their own little leagues in their communities, than they are in major league baseball. It could become a community support again—sport again—almost the way soccer is, if they don't fix it.

#### **Michael Jordan**

**Mr. Bruno.** Mr. President, sooner or later baseball will be back; we all know that somehow, someday, will happen. Michael Jordan, though, returned recently now to the NBA, and Mike Tyson was just released from prison. So things aren't really all bad. We're seeing some of the big names in sports come back. Your thoughts on the return of Michael Jordan and Mike Tyson now back into the mainstream society.

**The President.** Well, I think Jordan has played very well, considering the pressure that's been on him and how long he's been out of basketball. You know, he doesn't quite have his shot back yet. But he's played very well, and I'm amazed that—I know he was training for baseball, but it's still—it's a different sport that requires different skills. I'm amazed at how well he's gotten back into the flow of the game. And he makes the Bulls a different team because he in effect makes all those other guys more potent weapons as well. So I think—I don't know how quickly they'll get it all worked out, but when they do they'll be humming again.

#### **NCAA Basketball Tournament**

**Mr. Bruno.** All right, Mr. President, before we let you go—and we appreciate your time this morning—we've got to get—we know you like Arkansas. We need the Final Four prediction from President Bill Clinton.

**The President.** I don't want to get into that. I'm devoted to Arkansas, and of course, the Oklahoma State coach, Eddie Sutton, is a very close friend of mine. He coached at Arkansas for many years. And he has done a brilliant job, I think, in getting that team as far as it's gone. So I think—you know, I thought when we started the tournament that there were eight or nine teams that could win. Last year, when Arkansas won, I think, realistically, there were only about four teams that had a good chance to win. This year there really are eight or nine teams. And of course, now we're down to eight and I think every one of them—I can see a scenario where they could come out on top.

UConn and UMass are both playing much better than they were along toward the end of the season. And UCLA has been stunning, and Kentucky, I don't think they've missed a shot since they beat Arkansas in overtime. So I wouldn't hazard a prediction. I think any of these teams that are left can win.

**Mr. Bruno.** President Bill Clinton, taking the safe political route here on ESPN. Mr. President, we—

**The President.** As long as you know who I'm for I don't have to predict who's going to win. [Laughter] I'm unambiguously for—[laughter].

**Mr. Bruno.** Mr. President, thank you so much for joining us here on ESPN Radio. We appreciate it.

**The President.** Thanks, Tony. Thanks, Chuck. Bye-bye.

NOTE: The interview began at 10:57 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House and was embargoed for release until 6 p.m.

## Remarks on the National Performance Review

March 27, 1995

Thank you very much. Mr. Vice President, Chairman Hundt, Secretary Babbitt, to Phil Lader and Dan Goldin and James Lee Witt, ladies and gentlemen: I'm glad to be here. I'd go nearly anywhere to get a check that size. [Laughter]

And I have now—and with all of you as my witnesses—the Vice President publicly thanking me for asking him to take over this

reinventing Government effort. [Laughter] That is enough to wipe away all the private reservations that we have had to go through over the last year and a half. I want to thank him and Elaine Kamarck and all the staff of the reinventing Government effort, because they have worked so very hard to give our country the Government that it deserves, the Government for the future, one that costs less and works better and reflects the real values of our people.

You know, in Washington, we're engaged today in a great debate over what the role of the Government here ought to be. Just about everybody has rejected the past view that there is a big one-size-fits-all Government that can solve all the big problems of America. Now the rage in Washington is to argue that the Government is the source of all of our problems and if just there simply weren't one, we'd have no problems. Sooner or later, the American people will come to agree, and I think they are quickly coming to agree, that the old one-size-fits-all view was wrong but the new rage of no Government is wrong as well, that we need a Government that can be a partner to our people, to help them to compete and prosper in a global economy which is changing very rapidly and which presents great opportunity but also real challenges as well.

I believe we need a Government that shrinks bureaucracy and increases opportunity, one that empowers people to make the most of their own lives instead of pretending that they can solve people's problems for them, and a Government that enhances security around the world, but here on our streets as well. The key to our future is to, therefore, create more opportunity but also to have all of us, each in our own ways, assume more responsibility. That's what I have called the New Covenant. It's basically an old-fashioned social compact about citizenship, citizenship for the 21st century, that requires us to get rid of yesterday's Government and replace it with a new Government.

A lot of the things that we have to do don't have a necessary partisan tinge to them, and I hope that we can keep this reinventing Government effort a broad-based bipartisan one. In that regard, I thank Congressman Boehlert for coming today, in spite of the results

of the NCAA basketball tournament. I thank you, sir. We had a bet on the Syracuse-Arkansas game, and he paid his 5 dollars. And I told him that since God determined the outcome, he should give it to a church instead. [Laughter] But I thank you, sir.

Since we have been here, we have worked very, very hard to try to show discipline and order and direction. We've got the deficit down by \$600 billion. We've reduced the size of the Government. It's on its way to being fewer than 2 million, for the first time since President Kennedy was here.

But we know we have to go beyond cutting, and even beyond restructuring, to literally reevaluate what we're doing. Are we doing it well? Should we be doing it at all? Should somebody else be doing it? Are we being as innovative and flexible as the most creative private organizations in this country? We should never—we should never be less creative or less entrepreneurial simply because we have a public, as opposed to a private, mission.

Today we see again the good that can come when we discard the old ways. The FCC didn't used to have auctions. In the past, a company that wanted the right to broadcast on certain frequencies filled out a stack of Government forms, then hired lawyers and lobbyists to shepherd the case through the process year after year. When all was said and done, the company had in fact paid a lot for the privilege of broadcasting, but only the lawyers and the lobbyists had collected, and the Government simply gave away the goods. More recently, the FCC did auction off the broadcast rights, but they did it for free. And the winners held auctions and profited—pocketed the profits.

When I say we want Government that works like the best private business, the first rule is, taxpayers don't want the Government to give any of their property away for free when it ought to be paid for. And last year the reinvented FCC started holding auctions of its own. We had hoped they'd be a success, but frankly, this \$7.7 billion check for the American taxpayers by selling off parts of the wireless spectrum exceeds every expectation which was put out there, including our optimistic projections.

When we said this is what we're going to do, and this is how we're going to help get the deficit down, a lot of my colleagues on Capitol Hill sort of rolled their eyes and said, "Yeah, sure." Well, they were wrong. We didn't raise just a few billion dollars. We raised a few billion dollars and then a few billion dollars more from this. And I want to compliment all those who had anything to do with organizing and carrying out these auctions. I'd also like to thank those who won the bids—[laughter]—and those who bid them up. This money goes straight to reducing the deficit, and there will be more such auctions in the future. So Chairman Hundt, on behalf of the American taxpayers, I thank you for that \$7.7 billion. The dividend will go a good ways toward paying down our Government's deficit.

We have other things that we're working on as well. And again, I would say it's important not just to cut, not just to generate income for the American people but to do it in the right way. Yes, the United States Department of Agriculture must be shrunk. We think the right way to do it is to close agricultural field offices and to reduce subsidies after worldwide negotiations, not to cut school lunches. We don't need to take summer jobs away from young people who will be idle in some of the most difficult areas of our country if we take more full-time jobs away from Federal employees which we don't need anymore. We don't have to shut down national service or stop training our teachers if we trim the Government's overhead. We don't have to give up on making our children's schools safe and drug free if we simply stop giving away commercial treasures, like these broadcast bands.

We have to do a lot more. We have to do a lot more. We still have to continue to get the deficit down and to free up the money we need to invest in our people and their future. So today we're announcing further changes in four agencies that are here with me today that will save over \$13 billion and enable us to reduce the number of Federal bureaucrats by over 5,000 more.

At NASA, we have streamlined operations to take account of what the needs of today's space program are. It used to be that 42 senior managers supervised the space station

program; NASA has reduced that number to 4. Now, we're going to build on this momentum by making the management of our most forward-looking agency our most modern as well.

At the Small Business Administration they're closing offices all around the country, even as they open partnerships with banks and retired business people to work to help small businesses. Once, when the SBA made a loan, a public employee did all the paperwork. Now they're working with 7,000 banks so that they bear the overhead cost of making the loans. That's more money for private investment and fewer taxpayer costs.

At the Department of the Interior, they're reducing the work force by 2,000 people and making this far-flung department work more like a business. We're allowing companies who have, for example, offshore oil leases to prepay the taxpayers. Believe it or not, a lot of them really want to do it. That brings in billions of dollars and means we don't need battalions of auditors to make sure we're getting our money's worth.

As I said on many occasions, under the leadership of James Lee Witt, we have transformed FEMA from being a disaster into being a model disaster relief agency. Now, we're going to build new partnerships with our States to reduce the Federal micromanagement and help them prepare for emergencies at the local level.

All of these changes, indeed, the entire reinvention effort, has one overall goal: a Government that does only what it needs to do but everything it must do, it does it well, efficiently, and at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayers.

Just consider this fact. Today we talked about the SBA. The entire budget of the SBA is less than the taxes paid last year by three companies that got their starts with SBA loans. Listen to the three: Apple, Intel, and Federal Express. I think an SBA that stays in business and helps more people get started is in the interest of the United States of America.

I should also say, as Chairman Hundt never tires of telling us, that there's a chart in the other room which documents the fact that these auctions generated more than 3 times the total budget of the Federal Com-

munications Commission from its inception during the Great Depression to last year, which I also think is a pretty good bargain for the American taxpayers.

What this should remind us of is that you can reinvent Government, cut costs to the taxpayers without a mean spirit or a meat ax. We can do this in a way that brings the American people together instead of divides them. We can do this in a way that lifts the incomes and the job prospects of the American people instead of diminishes them. We can do it in a way that is humane and decent to our Federal employees, too.

And I thank the Vice President and the REGO team for their work on the buyout package because it was the right and fair and decent thing to do. We can do this, but it takes hard work. It takes a good, open mind. It takes consistent determination. And I hope we will continue to have broad, bipartisan support for the kind of thing we're celebrating today. If we do we're going to get rid of the deficit and build America for the 21st century.

Thank you very much, and bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:40 p.m. at the Old Post Office. In his remarks, he referred to Reed E. Hundt, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; Philip Lader, Administrator, Small Business Administration; Daniel S. Goldin, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and Elaine C. Kamarck, Senior Policy Adviser to the Vice President.

### **Message to the Congress on Angola March 27, 1995**

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since September 26, 1994, concerning the national emergency with respect to Angola that was declared in Executive Order No. 12865 of September 26, 1993. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

On September 26, 1993, I declared a national emergency with respect to Angola, invoking the authority, *inter alia*, of the Inter-

national Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) and the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c). Consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution 864, dated September 15, 1993, the order prohibited the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to the territory of Angola other than through designated points of entry. The order also prohibited such sale or supply to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola ("UNITA"). United States persons are prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies, or from attempted violations, or from evasion or avoidance or transactions that have the purpose of evasion or avoidance, of the stated prohibitions. The order authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, as might be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order.

1. On December 10, 1993, the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") issued the UNITA (Angola) Sanctions Regulations (the "Regulations") (58 *Fed. Reg.* 64904) to implement the President's declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against Angola (UNITA). There have been no amendments to the Regulations since my report of September 20, 1994.

The Regulations prohibit the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to UNITA or to the territory of Angola other than through designated points. United States persons are also prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies to UNITA or Angola, or from any transaction by any United States persons that evades or avoids, or has

the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions set forth in the Executive order. Also prohibited are transactions by United States persons, or involving the use of U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, relating to transportation to Angola or UNITA of goods the exportation of which is prohibited.

The Government of Angola has designated the following points of entry as points in Angola to which the articles otherwise prohibited by the Regulations may be shipped: *Airports*: Luanda and Katumbela, Benguela Province; *Ports*: Luanda and Lobito, Benguela Province; and Namibe, Namibe Province; and *Entry Points*: Malongo, Cabinda Province. Although no specific license is required by the Department of the Treasury for shipments to these designated points of entry (unless the item is destined for UNITA), any such exports remain subject to the licensing requirements of the Departments of State and/or Commerce.

2. FAC has worked closely with the U.S. financial community to assure a heightened awareness of the sanctions against UNITA—through the dissemination of publications, seminars, and notices to electronic bulletin boards. This educational effort has resulted in frequent calls from banks to assure that they are not routing funds in violation of these prohibitions. United States exporters have also been notified of the sanctions through a variety of media, including special fliers and computer bulletin board information initiated by FAC and posted through the Department of Commerce and the Government Printing Office. There have been no license applications under the program.

3. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from September 26, 1994, through March 25, 1995, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Angola (UNITA) are reported at about \$50,000, most of which represents wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Customs Service, the Office of the Under Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office

of the General Counsel) and the Department of State (particularly the Office of Southern African Affairs).

I will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
March 27, 1995.

**Message to the Congress  
Transmitting a Report on the Health  
Care for Native Hawaiians Program**

*March 27, 1995*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith the Report on the Health Care for Native Hawaiians Program, as required by section 11 of the Native Hawaiians Health Care Act of 1988, as amended (Public Law 102-396; 42 U.S.C. 11701 *et seq.*).

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
March 27, 1995.

**Remarks to the Atlanta Committee  
for the Olympic Games in Atlanta,  
Georgia**

*March 28, 1995*

**The President.** Thank you. This is a pretty lively crowd. Mayor Campbell, thank you for welcoming me back to Atlanta. I'm glad to be back. I'm glad to be here with Billy Payne and Andrew Fleming and all the leaders of the Olympics, LeRoy Walker and others.

You know, I was listening to Billy Payne talk, and I was thinking it really would have been a shame if the world had been deprived of all that energy and the Olympics had gone someplace else. [Laughter] My granddaddy used to say that people like Billy Payne are the kind of folks who sell hospitalization to shut-ins. [Laughter] I believe he could talk an owl out of a tree. [Laughter] The more you think about that the funnier it will get. [Laughter]

I'm glad to see my good friend, Andrew Young, here. He was a great Ambassador for

you, recently, when he spoke at the annual President's Prayer Breakfast, the congressional prayer breakfast in Washington, DC. And I thank him for all he has done over the years, especially on the Olympics.

This is a great endeavor. I can't imagine that Herbert Hoover refused to open the Olympics. That's probably why he was a one-termer. [Laughter] All this time we've been reading in our history books it was because of the Depression; turned out it was the Olympics. [Laughter]

I don't think—Herbert Hoover didn't like athletics very much because he was the first President who got a lower salary than a baseball player. [Laughter] Now the lowest paid baseball players make five times what the President makes—[laughter]—but back then the priorities were different. Babe Ruth was the first baseball player who ever made more than the President. And they asked him—they said, "It's the middle of the Depression. You're making more than the President of the United States. What do you have to say about that?" He said, "I ought to be. I'm having a better year." [Laughter]

You know, a lot of things happen here in Atlanta. I saw the other night on television Michael Jordan had his first buzzer beater since coming back, you know, in Atlanta. You didn't like that, but it was nice for the rest of us. [Laughter] Georgia is going to the Final Four of the Women's NCAA. Playing Tennessee. [Laughter] We have a ticket here—don't you think one of us ought to be for Georgia? [Laughter]

I am delighted to be here. I came here mostly to say a simple thank-you to all of you. You have no idea, I think, what you are doing for the United States. This is a great endeavor, and it is an endeavor that is just as much about cooperation as it is about competition. It's about cooperation because of the teamwork required to put this endeavor together. It's about cooperation because a lot of these sports are team sports. It's about cooperation because the competition, even in the individual sports, requires a rigorous adherence to certain ethical rules of conduct which make the competition honorable and honored when over. That is true for the Olympics, it is true for the Paralympics, and

therefore, in what you are doing, you are upholding the very best in this country.

The facilities are great. The technology is great. Don't you like hearing the Vice President talk about technology? *[Laughter]* You know, I thought I was a policy wonk until I had Al Gore as Vice President and Newt Gingrich as Speaker. It's amazing. *[Laughter]* Now I feel like the linesman at the tennis match. I just—out, in, let. *[Laughter]*

I told them the other day—you know, we're up there, fighting about the school lunch program and the food stamp program, and I found a technological fix for them. We should scrap the school lunch program and substitute E-mail stamps that would give you virtual food that everybody could download on the Internet. *[Laughter]* They're going to explain to me next week why that won't work, when I get back. *[Laughter]*

I want to say, too, that I appreciate the Olympic force. You're going to have 50,000 volunteers working on this, and then you're going to have—you've got 770,000 people in this Olympic force working in community service projects. That's an amazing thing. Nothing like that has ever been done, take my word for it, around anything like this before. And it probably would only happen in the United States. But again, it reinforces the fact that if you have enough spirit and enough vision and you're willing to cooperate, you can get just about anything done you want to do.

And if you ask me what I hope would come out of this, it would be that. This is a remarkable endeavor. There will be some winners and some losers. There will be some things that don't go right. There will be occasional accidents. As the Vice President said, we offer our deepest condolences to the family and friends of Jack Falls, who was killed in the accident, working on the Olympic stadium, and to those who were injured, David Oakes and Bruce Griffin. But we know that in the course of human endeavor, if people work together and they try to bring out the best in each other, and they play by rules that are honorable and clear and widely respected, that there is nearly nothing that cannot be done.

I'll bet you anything when all this is said and done, people look back and they cele-

brate the Olympics, and then they'll celebrate the incredible physical facilities you'll leave behind, which will be used by generations of people after most of us are even gone here. But one of the most enduring legacies will be the idea that over three-quarters of a million people actually got together to try to use the Olympics as a way of organizing around how to lift people up who live here.

This spirit of partnership is, frankly, one of the reasons that our administration awarded one of only six highly coveted empowerment zones to the City of Atlanta, because of what you represented here.

I remember when I was a kid, I really admired Jesse Owens, and I watched those old films of Jesse Owens running in Berlin after Hitler promulgated all of his theories of racial superiority. And at the time, there was some question about whether Jesse Owens would be able to go and run; the Nazis were going crazy in Germany. And Jesse Owens ran his way into the hearts of the world and the history books of the Olympics and the United States.

He said something that has stayed with me. He said, "A lifetime of training for just 10 seconds." But the truth is that it's not that. You may feel that. You may feel like you're spending three lifetimes in the next 479 days just for 17 days. *[Laughter]* But it isn't that. It will endure.

This is an interesting time for the United States, and it could not be a better time in our history for us to have the Olympics. And I'll tell you why. Our economic system has produced, and just in the last 2 years, over 6 million new jobs. Other countries all around the world are asking us to come and help them set up the mechanisms of a market economy in former Communist countries: How do you regulate the banks; how do you set up a stock market; how do you get things so that they will work honestly and fairly and well, and free people can earn their way?

We find people all over the world asking us to send the FBI in to help them deal with the problems of crime once they stop being dictatorships and they open up freedom, because we know that freedom can always be abused—always asking for America to do that. And when I go to these meetings, they say, "Well, gosh, you guys seem to be doing

well. You've got your economy going and your deficit's down and things seem to be headed in the right direction." And yet, here at home, because there's so many changes going on, a lot of Americans still don't feel secure about their future.

In a global economy, the things that lift a lot of people in Atlanta up—make for the record number of new business starts we had in 1993 and the record number of people, hardworking Americans becoming very wealthy—those same forces scare other people, with companies being downsized and all these changes happening.

And we need the Olympics in the United States, not just in Atlanta, not just in Georgia, not just in the New South that you are leading into the future. The United States needs the Olympics to remind us that every time we work together, we keep our eye on the future, we have a set of honorable rules by which we play, and we try to lift each other up, we do quite well. You will stun the world by your performance here. You will do that.

In doing that, and in working with all the people who are going to be doing all these volunteer projects, you have the capacity to remind America that just because the future is uncertain and rapidly changing, we do not need to be insecure. All we need to do is to do what we have always done when the chips were down and the stakes were high.

We are doing, as a country, better than virtually any other place in dealing with the challenges of the modern world, but we are not immune to those challenges, those problems, those anxieties. Now we're either going to hunker down or take a deep breath, throw our shoulders back, and walk right through them into the future. That is what you must do here. And when you do it, I'll make you a prediction: It will have an enormous positive impact on what Americans all over this country, from Alaska to southern Florida, from Maine to southern California, will believe we can do. And goodness knows we need it. And we're all going to do our best to make the most of it.

So thank you. Good luck, and Godspeed.

[At this point, an ACOG representative and Mayor Bill Campbell of Atlanta presented commemorative bricks to the President and the Vice President.]

**The President.** You have no idea how much this means to us—[laughter]—especially the way they were presented. We spend most of our time in Washington dodging these. [Laughter]

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 5:40 p.m. in the Inforum Building. In his remarks, he referred to William Porter "Billy" Payne, chief executive officer, and Andrew Young, co-chair, Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games; G. Andrew Fleming, chief executive officer, Atlanta Paralympic Organizing Committee; and LeRoy T. Walker, president, United States Olympic Committee.

### Remarks at Session I of the Southern Regional Economic Conference in Atlanta

March 29, 1995

Thank you very much. Thank you, Secretary Brown, for that introduction, and thank you for the magnificent job you have done as Secretary of Commerce, promoting the interest of American businesses and American workers throughout the United States and all across the world. As far as I know, there is no precedent for the efforts that you have made or the results you have achieved. President Chace, thank you for your remarks this morning, and thank you for hosting us. Governor Miller, as always, thank you for bringing us back to Atlanta and to Georgia. Thank you for giving me such a nice place to sleep last night.

You heard Secretary Brown talk about this economic conference in the context of the one we did 2 years ago in Little Rock. Let me say that that conference, I believe, was very successful and did play a major role in helping us to finalize the economic strategy that we have pursued for the last 2 years.

We wanted to come back now to the country and do some regional economic conferences for some reasons I will explain in a moment. We thought we should begin in the South and we should begin here in Atlanta. This city and this university are remarkable examples of where we ought to be going as a people. This is a place of opportunity and responsibility where people are

working together. And I can say, I think, for all Americans, we can hardly wait for another 479 days to pass so the Olympics will begin here.

As the industrial age gives way to the information age and all of our economies are linked as never before, the South has really done a remarkable job of tapping in to all the opportunities that are presented. Atlanta has become a magnet for worldwide corporate headquarters. Miami has become a financial center for all of the Caribbean and Latin America. South Carolina and Tennessee have become new homes for manufacturing operations from all around the world. Charlotte has become a new national home for banking. And obviously, three letters, CNN, prove that this part of our country is the center of a global information network.

This conference, as I said, is designed to be the first of several regional conferences to follow up on what has happened in the last 2 years. The remarkable group of people that came to Little Rock in 1992, some of whom are here today and are participating in this second round of conferences, really gave us a lot of ideas to take to Washington that were consistent with the things I had advocated in my campaign but in some ways went beyond them.

The strategy that we brought to Washington was fairly straightforward. We wanted to reverse the trickle-down economics and reverse the idea that the Government had no affirmative responsibility to be a partner in growing the economy, increasing the number of entrepreneurs, expanding the middle class, and shrinking the under class.

We did that with a strategy that was designed to reduce the deficit, expand trade, increase our investment in the education and training of our people in the technologies of the future, to help the areas that were left behind or that were subject to sweeping changes because of defense downsizing, for example, and to reform the Government, to make it cost less and do better.

The results, I think, are clear: We've had \$600 billion in deficit reduction. We have already cut or eliminated 300 programs with 400 more on the way for our new budget. The Federal Government is at its smallest size in a long time. We have already reduced

it by 100,000. And for the budget already adopted, over a 6-year period it will go down by 272,000, which will make it the smallest it's been since President Kennedy was in office.

Our economic plan changed the tax structure in ways that made it, I think, more fair and more conducive for economic growth, while income taxes were raised on corporations with incomes of over \$10 million in 1½ percent of our people. Working families with modest incomes received a significant tax cut. This year the average family of four with an income of \$25,000 a year or less will pay about \$1,000 less in income taxes. That's 6 million families in the Southern States alone.

Ninety percent of the small businesses, the engine of economic growth, were made eligible for tax cuts by increasing the expensing provisions by 70 percent. We created empowerment zones and enterprise communities to give incentives for people to invest in areas that had been left behind. Four of the nine major empowerment zones, which got big tax incentives for private enterprise to invest in them, are located in the southern region, including Atlanta, the Kentucky Highlands, the Mississippi Delta, and the Rio Grande Valley of Texas.

Last year, there were twice as many loans to small businesses in the SBA under the then-leadership of Erskine Bowles from North Carolina and now under the leadership of Phil Lader from South Carolina. There were twice as many loans in the South from the SBA than in any succeeding year ever, including the year before I took office. That includes over 11,000 businesses in loans worth over \$2 billion.

So that strategy was our economic strategy. It went with our strategy to expand trade: NAFTA, GATT, the Asian-Pacific region, the Summit of the Americas in Miami, the national export strategy that Secretary Brown has worked so hard on to sell more of our products and services around the world.

We increased investment in education from Head Start to making more college loans available to people. And we certainly began not only to shrink the size of Government but to change the nature of Government, to let States have more say over welfare reform and health care reform, to move

toward what we have now done in this year, reducing the unfunded mandates on State and local governments, and to change the nature of regulation under the Vice President's reinventing Government effort.

We have, for example, just announced that small businesses will be allowed, when they're first fined, not to pay the fine but instead to put the fine into correcting whatever the problem is with a Government agency; that Government agencies will be given the authority not even to impose a fine in the first instance, to waive it, on small businesses. The Environmental Protection Agency is reducing the paperwork burden by 25 percent. It will save 20 million hours of work for American citizens in the private sector this year.

So these are the things that we have worked so hard to do. What have been the results? Well, you heard them already, but I'd like to say again. We've had over 6 million new jobs in this economy, and 1993 was the best year in American history for small businesses and start-ups. The combined rate of unemployment and inflation is at a 25-year low. We have the African-American unemployment rate in the United States below 10 percent for the first time in 20 years. Unemployment in the South has dropped even more than in the country as a whole. The South has 30 percent of the population but has generated 40 percent of the new jobs that have come into this economy in the last 2 years.

Now, that is the good news. Why are we having this economic conference? Because the news is not all good and because we are under a great responsibility to try to keep this economic recovery going of high growth and low inflation.

Let me talk first about the news that's not all good. You may wonder with these numbers, which are better than we've had in decades, why poll after poll after poll says that people think the country is not going in the right direction. One reason is that over half the American people in spite of this recovery, are working longer workweeks for the same or lower wages than they were making 15 years ago. This is a new phenomenon in the global economy, that wages are stagnant.

The other thing is that nearly everybody knows someone who's been part of a restructuring, a downsizing, some market change in a larger economic unit, which means that even when times are good, people think things are changing so fast that their level of security, their sense of stability, of rootedness, of reward for work is more fragile than it has been in the past.

It's funny, you know, this economic strategy that I've tried to pursue basically grew out of my experience as a southern Governor, when the real southern strategy of the seventies and eighties in the South was better education, more jobs, and a closer partnership between the public and private sectors and between people of all races and backgrounds. That's the strategy, the real southern strategy that lifted the South from the sixties forward. And it's ironic that in the country now with this problem of wage stagnation and the splitting apart of the middle class, the challenge we have, in a funny way, is a lot like the challenge that I faced when I first became a Governor.

You know, most of us who were born in the South remember when nearly everybody was poor. Zell Miller gave that magnificent speech at the Democratic Convention about living in the house his mother built herself. When I was born in Arkansas, the per capita income of my State was 56 percent of the national average. And most of us who are natives to this region thought that a major part of our life's mission would be getting the American dream to all the people who lived in our region, without regard to their race or condition of birth.

Now, the challenge for America is whether or not, even in the midst of all our economic triumphs and when we are the world's only military superpower, we can preserve the American dream for all of our people. Can we avoid this wage stagnation? Can we avoid this increasing inequality in the United States that is gripping every advanced economy in the world as we become more globalized, as we become more dependent on technologies, as things change faster and education determines income more than ever before? That is the great challenge.

And that's why we are working now in Washington to continue what we've been

doing for the last 2 years but also to focus on things like the middle class bill of rights, the education tax deduction, more training for workers who are unemployed or underemployed, raising the minimum wage, working on welfare reform, things we think will raise incomes and bring people together again.

So let me close with this. I hope that all of you think that this will be a day well spent. From my point of view, I think we should be focused intensely on three questions. One is: Even though all 50 States are growing now—it's the first time in a long time that's happened—what are the differences in the economies of the various States in this region, in this region, and the rest of the country? Are there specific things that ought to be done in the southern region or within the Southern States that are different from what we might be doing as a whole? Question one.

Question two: What is the proper role of the National Government in working with you to build this economy and to make it better? That's the great debate in Washington we're having today. It used to be the prevailing theory was there was a big-Government solution for every big problem. Now, the prevailing theory is the Government would mess up a one-car parade, and if it didn't exist, America wouldn't have any problems. Both theories are wrong and are contradicted by all experience everywhere in the world. Not Japan, not Germany, or any country ever became a great industrial power without trying to develop the capacities of the people and having a coordinated economic strategy and having a framework within which markets could succeed.

So, what should we be doing? What should we be doing? What have we done that's right? What have we done that's wrong? What should we stop doing? What should we start doing? That's the second question.

The third great question is the one that I mentioned earlier, and it's the national question. And it is at the core of what we will have to be concerned about, I predict to you, for decades: How do you preserve the American idea that if you work hard and play by the rules, you can do better; that we will always be able to grow the middle class and shrink the under class and spark an un-

precedented number of entrepreneurs? How do you preserve that American idea in the global economy? That is the great challenge of this era.

When this day is over, if we honestly address those three questions: Are there still differences about the South or within the South that we need to be sensitive to; what's the role of the Federal Government; what can we do to raise incomes and increase stability for people who are working hard and playing by the rules, then I think you will believe your day was well spent.

In 1986, I was the chairman of the Southern Growth Policies Board, and I asked the former Governor of Mississippi, Bill Winter, to be the chairman of our project on the future of the South. Every 6 years, there's a report on the future of the South. The Secretary of Education, Dick Riley, issued one in 1980. We've been at this a long time. We called our report in 1986, "Halfway Home and A Long Way To Go," which captured the fact that the South was moving rapidly compared to the rest of the country but wasn't there yet. Now we're in one of the two Southern States that has a per capita income above the national average. We know the South is growing more rapidly than the rest of the country and moving quickly. But there are still differences, and there are profound challenges facing the United States.

So I would say to you, we're more than halfway home. The southern strategy has found its finest expression, perhaps, here in Georgia and with the administration of this Governor. I noticed—one thing I have to brag on him for—these HOPE scholarships so that any young person in Georgia who has a certain grade-point average gets a full tuition scholarship for 4 years to any institution in the State, public institution in the State—anybody. That's the kind of strategy and the kind of programs that we ought to be supporting everywhere in the United States.

So we've done very well, but these three great questions still have to be asked and answered. We're going to ask these questions all across the country, but I think we did the right thing to start here.

Let me close with this. In 2 weeks, on April 12th, we will honor the 50th anniversary of President Roosevelt's death in Warm

Springs, Georgia, about 60 miles from here. On the day he died, Roosevelt was drafting a speech for Thomas Jefferson's birthday, a speech he obviously never got to deliver. The last words written in his own hands were these: "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active purpose."

One final problem we have are the doubts the American people have about today. If you look at what has been achieved in this State, in this region in the last 10 years, there is a lot more room for hope than for doubt.

Thank you very much.

Now, to provide an economic overview, I would like to call on the Secretary of the Treasury, Bob Rubin. As most of you know, he was, until he became the Secretary of the Treasury, succeeding Lloyd Bentsen, he was the President's National Economic Adviser and the head of the National Economic Council, a position now occupied by Laura Tyson, who was the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

One of the important things we did in our economic strategy, which has received virtually no attention but which I predict historians will credit for a long time to come, was to establish a National Economic Council, like the National Security Council, that met on a regular basis, included all the various actors in the Federal Government, and forced us to coordinate our economic policy in ways that had never been done before. It is obvious that a big part of our national security in a global economy depends upon our national economic strength.

I am convinced that that institution now will endure through future Presidencies of both parties and unforeseen developments. And I think one of the reasons it will endure is because Bob Rubin, as the first person to head the Economic Council, did such a good job in bringing people together and making it work. So I'd like to call on Secretary Rubin for a brief overview of the economy as we see it today.

Mr. Secretary.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 9 a.m. in the Cannon Chapel Building at Emory University. In his remarks, he referred to William

M. Chace, president, Emory University, and Gov. Zell Miller of Georgia.

## Remarks to Students at Emory University in Atlanta

March 29, 1995

**The President.** Thank you very much. Thank you, Laura Sawyer, for your warm and generous introduction. Thank you, President Chace, for what you said in reminding me of our generation's obligations to the students here present by recalling that day now almost 32 years ago when I met President Kennedy.

I have very much enjoyed this day at Emory. I thank the university and all responsible for making it possible for us to hold here the first of our conferences on the state of the American economy and where we go from here. I wish all of you could have been there today to hear the people who came to tell their stories, stories of struggle and triumph, stories, many of them against all the odds, what they had done to make their way in the economy of the 1990's and how they were looking forward to the next century.

I just have one question about this before I get too serious. Where is Dooley? I was told if he showed up, you all would get up and leave. [*Laughter*] I hope he waits until the end if that's true.

Let me say that I ran for the office of President because I was concerned about the direction of our country and the future of our children, basically because I believe the obligation of every generation of Americans is to preserve and nourish and deepen the American idea, the idea that if you work hard and play by the rules, you can make the most of your God-given potential and live the life of your dreams and that you can do it without holding anyone else down and, indeed, the more people from all walks of life and all races and regions who are lifted up, the better off we'll all be. That is the American idea.

When I met John Kennedy and when I went off to college—I was the first in my generation to go to college—I was the son of fairly poor people in the South when I was born in Arkansas right at the end of World War II; the per capita income of our

entire State was only 56 percent of the national average.

And for young people who were growing up in the South when I was about your age, the great question was whether we could become part of the great American mainstream, whether we could overcome our legacy of abject poverty and our legacy of racial discrimination to come together and learn and grow. That is not at issue anymore. Now, two Southern States, Georgia and Virginia, have surpassed the national average in per capita income. Atlanta is the home to more international companies than any other city in the United States. You're doing a lot of things in the southern region that are the envy of the rest of the world. Thirty percent of America's people live in the South, but 40 percent of the new jobs created just since I've been President have been created in this region.

So the issue is not what it was a generation ago. There is a different issue today, which is whether we can keep the American dream alive for all our people in a global economy in the information age, which splits people apart based on their level of education and their skills, and at a time when the differences in our country and the differences throughout the world in race, religion, and other areas both serve as ways to unite us and to divide us. That is the great question of this time.

Now, when I became President, I wanted first to get the economy moving again, to give people some economic hope. And we had a distinct strategy: reduce the deficit, expand trade, increase investment in education and technology, reform Government, give lower income families a tax break so nobody would ever be punished for work instead of welfare, encourage small businesses and new businesses, reduce regulation and give the States more authority to experiment in tough areas like welfare reform and health care reform. That was our agenda.

After 2 years, we have a reduction in the deficit of \$600 billion. This is the first time—[applause]—this is the first time since the mid-1960's when your Government is running at least an operating surplus: that is, if it were not for interest on the debt accumulated before we came here, we would have

a budget surplus today. So at least our operations do not exceed our revenues.

We have expanded trade by more than at any time in a generation. We have dramatically reformed the Government, already 100,000 fewer people working for the Federal Government if no new changes are made by the new Congress, which is unlikely. But if there were no changes made, the Government would be reduced in size over a 5½-year period by 270,000 people, to its smallest size since I went to Washington when John Kennedy was President.

And we have given vast new authority to the States to experiment in important areas. We have reduced regulation. We are trying to move forward. And perhaps most important of all, we have cut spending while increasing our investment in education, from expanding Head Start to apprenticeships for young people who don't go to college, to the Goals 2000 program to help our schools meet tough national standards with grassroots reforms, to expansion of the student loan program in ways that make our student loans now less costly with better repayment terms.

Now, these are important changes. The results are pretty clear. In the last 2 years, we've had 6.1 million new jobs; we have the lowest combined rate of unemployment and inflation this country has had in 25 years. We had, in 1993, the largest number of new business incorporations in the history of the United States. In 1994, the unemployment rate in America for African-Americans dropped below 10 percent for the first time in 20 years. The results speak for themselves.

I must say, since I'm trying to spark an honest and civil bipartisan discussion of this, I was honored to see on the front page of your newspaper today one of your most distinguished alumnuses, the Speaker of the House, acknowledges that the economic program has brought some good results to the United States of America, because it has. It was the right thing to do, and it is moving the country forward.

Now, so I ask you, if that's true and all that has happened, well, why isn't everybody happy? And why do they keep voting to change the way the Government's going if the policies are working? Well, I think there are a number of reasons, but let me offer

a few, because they will affect your lives as Americans.

In the first place, the global economy and all the pressures of the global economy and the information revolution and all the dramatic changes it brings, means that for the first time, even though we are having more jobs coming into this economy, wages are stagnant for most Americans. Half of the American people are working longer work weeks for the same or lower wages than they were making 15 years ago. And that is unheard of in our history.

In addition to that, there's more inequality among the middle class. That's why I say over and over again, my mission is to expand the middle class and to shrink the under class, to give poor people a chance to work their way into a good life. But today, the American middle class is splitting apart based on whether people have the education and training and skills necessary to compete in the global economy for a good job that pays a good wage with a good future.

The third thing that's happened is that—and a lot of your parents have probably been affected by this or at least work in companies that are affected by it—there is more instability in the work force today even when there is more prosperity, downsizing in government, downsizing in big companies, reorganizations that are constant, so that people are worried about whether they're going to have their job even when we have more jobs. And when people do lose their jobs, they tend to be unemployed for longer periods of times, and they tend to get a new job, not their old job back. All this is new in your lifetime.

This will be the pattern you will face, but if you described all this to somebody 10 years ago, they'd say it couldn't happen; there's no way, you cannot create 6 million jobs, drive down the unemployment rate, explode the economy, and not have wages go up. You can't do it. It's impossible. Well, it happened.

So what is our job economically? Our job is to lift the incomes and the sights and the aspirations of the American people. How are we going to do it? You have to get more high-wage jobs into this country, more trade, more focus on technology. You have to make sure our people can fill high-wage jobs. We have

to educate everyone better, everyone, not just the college students, everyone.

And thirdly, we have to have the right kind of Government. The great debate going on in Washington today is about what the proper role of our National Government is. The old view was that there was a big Government solution to every big problem and that people who were in need should be helped.

The new rage in Washington is that the Government is the source of all the problems, and we would have no social problems, no economic problems, no problems at all if we had no Government. If the Government went away, except for national defense, everything would be peachy keen. *[Laughter]* Now, the whole theory is that every problem—all the social problems we've got, from teen pregnancy to welfare dependency, to the breakdown of life in our cities was all because we had too much Government trying to help people.

Now, I have a different view from both those views. I don't think either one of those views is right. My experience as a Governor, my observation of other countries that are doing well, plain common sense, and the stories we heard today indicate that we need a limited but effective Government that costs less but does what it's supposed to do, and here's what I think it's supposed to do.

I believe the National Government is still essential in creating opportunity even while we're shrinking bureaucracy, creating opportunity by making sure we've got a level playing field, and creating opportunity by making sure that people can make the most of their own lives. We've got to empower people. You can't really help people past a certain point except to put food on their table and to get them through the tough times. But you can empower people, through education and technology, to make more of their own lives. That's what we have to do.

And the third thing we can do is, even in a very dynamic economy, in a dynamic society, we can enhance security in a legitimate way, without in any way undermining opportunity. We enhance security abroad when we make an agreement with the Russians so that, for the first time since nuclear weapons were invented, there are no nuclear weapons

pointed at the people of the United States. That enhances our security.

But if we make progress toward peace in the Middle East, we are enhancing our own security because of the volatile impact of that area on the whole rest of the world. But there are things we can do here at home that enhance our security as well. The family and medical leave law, which allows people to take a little time off when a baby is born or a parent is sick without losing their job, that enhances our security because it makes our families stronger while we keep our jobs. The crime bill, which puts more police officers on our street and gives our local communities the flexibility in choosing prevention programs that keep young people out of crime and off drugs, those things enhance our security. If we didn't have 2 million highly dysfunctional drug abusers in this country, the crime rate for violent crime would be about half what it is today. So it enhances our security when we have a safer society with lower crime rates. And that's—part of that role is a national responsibility. That's what I have tried to do.

Now, that leads us—and I want you to watch this debate unfold in Washington, and you've got to decide where you fit. And your old party label may not give you an answer to the present problems that we face, because Government can't fix it all, and Government cannot walk away from it all. And there are a lot of hard questions that have to be resolved.

But for example, my view is, there's a right and a wrong way to cut spending. I do think that the Agriculture Department had to be cut, but my view was not to reduce the school lunch program, but close 1,200 offices, because we didn't need that many when we had fewer farmers and fewer problems.

I agree that we should have reduced expenditures in the Housing and Urban Development Department, but what we did was to get rid of a whole layer of regional offices and to consolidate a lot of those various programs that had been kind of encrusted with bureaucracy over the years. We didn't want to cut a program for homeless veterans or make it more difficult for poor elderly people to have a roof over their head. There is a

difference in how you cut spending. And these are distinctions that have to be made.

Or in the area of education. We offered a way to cut the deficit and increase educational opportunities. I had student loans when I went to school, and I'm not ashamed of it. I'm proud of it. I'm grateful that I was able to get it from the previous generation. And when I got out of college, I paid them off. And I think when you get out of college, if you've got one, you ought to pay it off—*[laughter]*—because that's the way we're going to preserve it for the next generation.

So we have reduced student loan defaults. They no longer cost the taxpayers \$2.8 billion a year. The cost is down to \$1 billion a year. We've reduced defaults by nearly two-thirds. We're doing a better job of collecting. Now that's a lot better than getting rid of the interest subsidy and raising the cost of student loans. That is better. That is a better way to do that.

We found there were so many incentives in the old student loan program toward bureaucracy and paperwork and wasting money because basically you'd go to a bank and get the student loan. It was a 90-percent guarantee. So if you default on the loan, does the bank have an incentive to sue? No, because the Government will give you 90 percent and 10 percent will be at least what the lawyers would cost.

So we went into this direct loan program and we said, "You can have these loans at a lower interest rate with better repayment terms when you get out of college. If you've got a big loan burden, you can pay it off as a percentage of your income." And now about, oh, 40 percent of our universities have already enrolled. We just had people there from the University of Florida today, a man and his wife in medical school saying they would owe \$140,000 between them. And when they go into residency, if they had to start paying off their student loan under the old system, it would take one-half of their disposable incomes. But because of the new program; we cut the cost, improved the repayment terms, and guess what? It saves the taxpayers \$10 billion over 6 years. So if we can give people more loans at less hassle and save \$10 billion, why would we instead say, no, let's keep the old system and save the

\$10 billion by adding to the cost of going to college? Our way is better, because it's pro-education, and it makes sense, and it will take us into the future.

I wish I had longer to listen to you and we could ask questions. I'd like to stay here 3 or 4 hours, but I've got to go to Florida. But I want you to think about this. Think about this debate. Every time you see an issue being debated in Washington, ask yourselves two questions. How can I cut through all the political rhetoric to figure out how this is going to affect me and my friends and my generation and the future of this country and the children I hope to have? Don't think about it in political terms. Think about it in terms of how it's going to affect your life and the future you want for yourselves and your children.

And the second thing you ought to say is, now, what do I believe my country should be doing about this. Because we are going through this huge period of—

*[At this point, there was a disturbance in the audience.]*

What did they say? Prisons are not shelters? I agree with that. Why are you shouting at me? Sit down. I heard you. We heard you. We heard you. We heard you. Sit down. We heard you. *[Laughter]*

I like those guys. They believed in their free speech and mine as well. I appreciate that. Thank you very much.

**Audience member.** Why 100,000 more cops instead of more shelters?

**The President.** I'll tell you why we need 100,000 more police.

Now, wait a minute, let's don't start a flood here. Free speech—we'll listen. *[Laughter]* I'll tell you why. I'll tell you why we need 100,000 more police. Because the violent crime rate in America has tripled. And this is a big fight I'm in with the Congress. They just want a block-grant. They want to cut the amount of money to the crime bill, block-grant it to the cities and States and say, basically, spend it however you please. I say, no, we've got to have 100,000 more police. Here's why; you're entitled to an answer to that.

The violent crime rate has tripled in the last 30 years. The number of police officers

has increased by 10 percent. In every major city where more police officers have been trained not simply to catch criminals but to prevent crime, to work with friends and neighbors and help kids on the street, the crime rate has gone down. One of the little-known good things that is happening in America today is that in many, many, many places, the crime rate is going down because of community policing.

So I say we ought to have a 20 percent increase in the number of police forces, not only to catch criminals but to prevent crime from occurring. And a 30 percent overall increase in police is still not as much as a 300 percent increase in violent crime. I think we made the right decision on that. That's exactly the kind of debate that we ought to be having.

But I also believe—I also believe we have to do more for shelter. I also believe we have to do more for shelter. Our administration—you look at the record of Secretary Cisneros and HUD. We have tried our best to increase that. But none of this is answering the big questions. And you have to answer that. I want you, every one of you, without regard to where you're from, what your family's income is, what your race is, I want every one of you to believe that your tomorrows will be whatever you want them to be and whatever you're willing to work hard to make them to be.

I want you to be positively ecstatic at the prospect of bringing your own children into the world and this country and thinking about the 21st century being the most peaceful and prosperous and exciting time the world has ever known. That's what I want. And that is all that matters, in the end, is whether we do our part.

When I was your age, I had a professor of Western civilization who told me that the United States represented the finest expression of our civilization because it had embodied the two most important ideas: first, that the future can be better than the present, and second, that every single one of us has a personal, moral obligation to make it so. That is what I am trying to do in Washington. We're having a big debate about what the role of the National Government is. I want you to answer the debate by determin-

ing what is best for you and your future and the other people in this country.

This country's in better shape than it was 2 years ago. It's going to be in better shape 2 years from now if I have anything to say about it, but you will have more to say about it than anybody else. Stand up for education, and stand up for the future.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:34 p.m. in the Woodruff Physical Education Center. In his remarks, he referred to Laura Sawyer, student council president.

### **Statement on Legislation for Financial Oversight of the District of Columbia**

*March 29, 1995*

I am pleased that Congressman Davis introduced legislation today to establish a financial oversight authority for the District of Columbia. My administration worked closely with the Congress in drafting the bill, and I hope we can continue the bipartisanship already at work to help the District return to fiscal health.

The financial crisis in the District is serious and demands immediate attention. Although other cities have suffered similar problems, Washington, DC, plays a uniquely important role in the Nation's life. It is the Nation's Capital and is important not just to the people who live there but to all citizens of the United States.

I care deeply about the District and its residents. They deserve a government that delivers municipal services efficiently and effectively.

My administration stands ready to work with Congress to determine what help is appropriate. At my direction, my Budget Director, Alice Rivlin, a DC resident for 38 years, is heading a senior level, interagency working group to monitor the District's problems and assist DC in meeting its responsibilities.

### **Statement on Senator Howell T. Heflin's Decision Not To Seek Reelection**

*March 29, 1995*

I was sorry to learn of Senator Heflin's decision not to run for reelection. His strong voice, his solid belief in right and wrong and his sense of humor have helped the Nation confront some of our toughest issues head on, while his efforts in areas of education and race relations have changed the course of the country. Although we will miss his leadership here in Washington, I wish him all the best in Tuscumbia.

### **Statement on Senate Action To Reject a Regulatory Moratorium**

*March 29, 1995*

I am deeply committed to regulatory reform that cuts redtape without undercutting the health and safety of the American people. Giving the Congress 45 days to consider regulations before they take effect would let lawmakers focus on the specifics of these issues and address real problems as they come up, without delaying necessary public protections. This approach, not the blunt instrument of a moratorium, is the right way to reform regulation. It's common sense.

### **Remarks to the Community in Tallahassee, Florida**

*March 29, 1995*

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. It's about to rain on us, but I won't melt, and I'm glad to be back in Florida and glad to be in Tallahassee, and I thank you.

I want to thank Governor Chiles and Lieutenant Governor McKay and your County Commissioner Malloy, and of course, your fine mayor, all of them for meeting me; and along with my EPA Director, Florida's own, Carol Browner. I'm glad to have her back here.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to be back in Florida, a State that embodies what

I am trying to get done all across the country, a State that is committed to opportunity, committed to building strength out of diversity, and committed to our future. That's what America needs everywhere.

I wish you could have been with me in Atlanta today. We had the first of a number of regional economic conferences. I had all kinds of people talking about what's going on in the South and how we're going to get this country into the next century with the American dream alive, with opportunity and education and hope for every single citizen of this country. That's what I believe in.

I'm sure it has not escaped you that we're having a mild debate in Washington, DC, these days about what our Government ought to be doing. Now, on the one side there's people who believe that everything that's been done in the last 25 years is fine, and that there's a big Government solution for every big problem. I disagree with that.

But now all the rage in Washington is that everything the Government did was wrong, and Government is the source of all of our problems, and if Government would go away, everything would be like flowers blooming in the desert. I disagree with that, too.

What I believe, like Lawton Chiles believes, that we need a Government that is limited but effective, that is smaller, that regulates less, but that is committed to the following things: creating opportunity; empowering people through education to make the most of their own lives; and finally, enhancing the security of the American people, not only abroad as we have but also at home in our streets and in our schools and in our families. That is what we need a Government for.

And we have made a good beginning. We have reduced the deficit. We have expanded trade. We have 6 million more jobs in this country. We had the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 25 years.

And I know that you know that Florida has grown more rapidly than the rest of the country. Since I became President, the unemployment rate in this State has dropped almost 3 percent. Governor Chiles whispered in my ear, said it's the lowest in 13 years. And I appreciate that.

Almost a million families in this State got an income tax cut because they're working hard for modest wages. And we don't believe anybody who works full-time with a child in the house should be in poverty. We want people to leave welfare and go to work. And they shouldn't be taxed if they're working.

We have worked hard to deal with the problems of this State up and down to maintain a strong military and a military presence in northern Florida and throughout the State. We have worked hard to make Florida a showcase of the future with the Summit of the Americas conference we had down in Miami in December.

And I know that apparently a few hours ago it leaked out that the Defense Department has just decided to move the command of the Southern Command for Central and South America away from Panama, as we're required to do under the Panama Canal Treaty, to Florida, to Dade County.

I want you to know that the Central Command, which as I said, covers all of Central and South America, I want you to know how important this is. They are working to promote democracy throughout our hemisphere, to promote cooperation with these countries, to help to defend the Panama Canal, and most important of all now, to help to protect the American people and the people of those countries from the scourge of drugs and the illegal thugs that purvey them all across our part of the world. And now the center of that effort will be in your State.

Sometimes I ask myself, well, if things are going this well, why aren't we all happy? And there's good reason. There is a good reason, because for the first time in our history, the global economy with all of its competition and the rise in technology with all of its ability to have fewer people do more work, means that we have created 6 million jobs, but our incomes aren't going up yet. This has never happened before where half the American people are working longer without a raise, where there is more inequality in the middle class, with incomes splitting apart and uncertainty.

So I say to you, we've had 2 years to generate more jobs and get the economy going again. Now, we've got to concentrate on growing the middle class and shrinking the

under class and getting the incomes of the American people up again so they can look forward with confidence to the future. [*Applause*] Now—thank you. [*Inaudible*]

Let me ask you this, we all know that we need a smaller and less bureaucratic Government. Lawton Chiles has got pictures in the paper all over America, being hoisted up to get rid of all those regulations. But there is a right way and a wrong way to do it.

I am proud of the fact that Carol Browner is getting rid of 25 percent of the paperwork of the EPA to save 20 million hours for the American people every year. I'm proud of that. I'm proud of the fact that a small business person in Florida can go to the SBA for a loan; instead of having to fill out a form an inch thick, it's just a page long, because we got rid of bureaucracy. I'm proud of the fact that we threw 10,000 regulations away in the Federal personnel manual. But I think you still want us to have clean water, clean air, a safe workplace, and a safe country.

If we're going to raise incomes, folks, we need a commitment to do things that will raise incomes, more good jobs. If we're going to give tax breaks, which I favor, let's give them to middle class people to educate their children so that that will lift incomes. Let's raise the minimum wage. It hadn't been raised in years, and it will help people's incomes. Let's reform welfare so that people go to work and raise their children and people who owe child support have to pay that child support to take care of their children.

And let's get rid of wasteful Government, but let's don't cut off our nose to spite our face. When we wanted to cut money out of the Department of Agriculture, we closed 1,200 offices; we did not cut the school lunch program. When we wanted to cut money out of our efforts on housing, we got rid of all the regional HUD offices and consolidated these old bureaucratic programs. We didn't try to cut a program for homeless veterans. There's a right way and a wrong way to do this.

And here, with all this fine music that's been provided to us by the band and the choir from—what? From Florida A&M and Florida State, right? [*Applause*] The last thing we need to do is to cut the college

loan program and make it more expensive to go to college.

So I say to you, you stay with us. You engage in this great debate. Yes, we'll bring the size of the Government down. Yes, we'll reduce the burden of regulation. But let's remember, we've got to keep our people first. We've got to keep our eye on the future. We've got to invest in education. We've got to grow the economy. We've got to keep the American dream alive.

I want every young person, every young person here tonight, to be able to look to a future where you can do anything that your dreams and your efforts will permit you to do. I want every one of you young people to look forward with the same anticipation that all of us up here had in having your own children and raising your own families. I want you to believe in the promise of America. Let us commit to that and make sure it's real and alive here in Florida.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:30 p.m. at Tallahassee Regional Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Florida Gov. Lawton Chiles and Lt. Gov. Buddy McKay; Leon County Commissioner Rudy Malloy; and Mayor Scott Maddox of Tallahassee. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

### **Remarks to the Florida State Legislature in Tallahassee**

*March 30, 1995*

Thank you very much. [*Applause*] I may stay all day, but not here behind the podium. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Speaker, thank you. And, Mr. President, thank you. Mr. Speaker Pro Tem, Governor Chiles, Lieutenant Governor McKay, distinguished State officials and members of the Cabinet, members of the Supreme Court, members of the Florida Legislature, ladies and gentlemen: I am very pleased to be here. I've had a wonderful, brief stay in Tallahassee already—ran around Lake Ella this morning and the local park and met a lot of your fellow citizens and enjoyed that very much.

I have enjoyed nothing so much in a long time as listening to Elizabet Martinez play the

National Anthem. I was watching on the Speaker's closed-circuit television. It was very moving. I was moved by the letters I received from friends and supporters of hers when she was playing the National Anthem in Guantanamo, and I just told her that, under the program which the Attorney General has supervised so ably, all the children from Guantanamo should be resettled in the very near future. And we thank you, young lady, for what you have done.

Elizbet gave me a beautiful little angel, and I told her I was going to put it on my table in the Oval Office and I wanted her to come see it. I think she ought to play that in the White House. And I hope she will.

I'm delighted to be here, along with Attorney General Reno and EPA Administrator Carol Browner, here in the Florida Legislature on the 150th anniversary of your statehood. This is the first State legislature I've had the privilege of addressing since I have actually been in office. And as a former Governor and as a Governor who had the privilege of being Governor during the 150th anniversary of our State's statehood, I am especially happy to be here today.

When I ran for President, I was determined to make a new partnership with the States and to be a good partner. We have worked hard on those things with Florida. And goodness knows we've had lots of opportunities, some of them positive and some of them just the problems that life brings. We've worked hard to turn FEMA around and to help you with the last of the hurricane relief, which occurred, of course, before I was elected, but a lot of the work remained to be done when I took office. And we worked hard in the aftermath of the recent flooding. And I was pleased when I arrived at the Tallahassee Airport last night: Three different people told me they thought FEMA had done a good job handling the floods, which made me feel very good about that.

Attorney General Reno and the INS have worked hard to improve immigration laws, and the Customs Service has worked hard at the Port of Miami to clear the ships faster and step up our antidrug efforts at the same time. We've gone for more public-private partnerships, like the National Magnetic Lab here in Florida, and Carol Browner has

worked very hard with many of you here in this room and people throughout the State on a responsible plan to save the Everglades.

The Summit of the Americas was hosted in Florida, and it was a triumph, and we are still feeling the vibrations of it throughout the hemisphere. And I thank all of you who had something to do with that.

Many of you worked hard with us to help to save the space station project. And I think now we have firmly anchored it as a part of America's future. And it's very important, and I can tell you that—I see Bill Nelson nodding his head—he's ready to go. [*Laughter*] I cannot tell you what an important part of our foreign policy it has become. It's given us a way of cooperating with the Russians in ways that cut through political differences and other problems and involve all of our other partners in the space station.

And of course, yesterday I had the privilege of announcing that the Department of Defense had selected Florida as the new headquarters for our Southern Command when it moves out of Panama to the State of Florida. [*Applause*] Thank you. [*Applause*] Thank you.

One thing I tried hard on that I wasn't so successful on to be a good partner with you was to get baseball started up again in time for a full spring training. But I can say that, as you know, there's a case in the courts now, and if the judge does uphold the injunction and the players do manifest their willingness to return to work as they have said they will, then I certainly hope there will not be a lockout. I hope we can have baseball this year, and I think all of you hope that as well.

Let me say to you that the experience that I had as a Governor in the seventies, the eighties, and the nineties—I served for 12 years in all three decades—directly affected the decision I made to seek the Presidency and to do the things I have tried to do. I ran for President largely because I thought our country at the dawn of this new century was facing a whole set of challenges which did not fall easily into the political patterns into which Washington seemed to be frozen, the constant partisan battles, the constant attempt to divide every issue between whether it was liberal or conservative or left or right

instead of determining whether it would move our country forward.

Most of the Southern States, and Florida most especially, did pretty well in the 1980's by following a different sort of southern strategy: focusing on educating all of our children and more and more of our adults, focusing on getting more jobs and economic opportunity into our States, focusing on getting people together across racial and other lines, and focusing on real partnerships between the public and private sector. That's what works in real life. It seemed to be a very small part of the political life of our Nation's Capital. And I ran because I wanted to change that. I wanted to try to break out of all the false choices that cloud the rhetoric we hear for years and years and years out of Washington, to try to move this country forward.

I really believe the great question facing our country on the eve of a new century, which will be characterized by breathtaking change brought on by the information revolution, the globalization of the economy in all of its manifestations, the end of cold war and, therefore, the end of the need for people to sort of hunker down behind their barriers into two world camps, the great question is whether we can seize the opportunities this new time presents us without being undone by the problems that we confront; whether we can literally preserve the American idea that if you work hard and play by the rules, you can live up to your God-given abilities; that you can provide for your children and know they'll have a limitless future; that you can rely on your country being the strongest force in the world for peace and freedom and democracy in ways that help you at home. That is the great question.

And the answer to the question, indeed, the many answers to the question, in my judgment, do not fall easily within the sharp ideological partisan battles that have dominated our Nation's Capital for too long. Governors and legislators tend to be more practical people. Not that we don't have passion, not that we don't have principles, not that we don't have convictions but we know what works in the end is people working together, not finding ways to drive us apart.

And so I ask you today to spend a few minutes with me thinking about where we are, what we're going to do, what you expect your National Government to do, and how you expect it to relate to you as a citizen, as well as a member of the State government of Florida.

I believe that the role of the National Government in 1995 should be not to be a savior, not to be a Government-knows-best, a one-size-fits-all Government. Nobody believes that anymore. But I also don't believe in the new rage that Government is the source of all of our problems, and if we didn't have it, we wouldn't have any problems. That is contradicted by the experience of every country in the world today and every country the world has known since the beginning of the industrial revolution.

I believe the role of Government is to do the following things: Number one, to create opportunity with a minimum of bureaucracy; number two, to empower people to make the most of their own lives, not to solve their problems for them but to give them the tools to take care of themselves; number three, to enhance our security not just abroad but at home on our streets and in our schools, in our families, as well; and number four, to wage a relentless assault to change the Government that was appropriate for the industrial age but is too bureaucratic, too big, and too cumbersome for the information age and the 21st century.

Now we've worked hard on that for 2 years. We had an economic strategy to create opportunity, reduce the deficit, and we did, by \$600 billion. Indeed, the Government budget today, for the first time in 30 years, is actually in surplus in its operating costs, that is, except for interest on the debt, we have a surplus today, except for interest on the debt.

Now, of course, the bad news is that 28 percent of personal income tax receipts are required to pay the interest on the debt accumulated between 1981 and 1993. So that doesn't mean we can stop working on it. We have to do more, but we have done a very great deal, indeed.

We have expanded trade in ways that have clearly benefited Florida: NAFTA, GATT, the Summit of the Americas, reaching out

to the Asian-Pacific region. We have increased our investment in infrastructure and technology. And we have done right well. We have sought to empower people from everything from expanding Head Start to providing more help to States to help them with people who don't go to college but do need some training after high school and apprenticeship programs, to providing more affordable college loans to millions and millions of students in every State in this country.

We have sought to enhance our security by doing a better job of protecting our borders, by fighting against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, by reaching agreements with the Russians and other states of the former Soviet Union to dismantle nuclear weapons. And for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no nuclear missiles pointed at the children of the United States today. That is a good thing.

But we have also sought to enhance our security through the crime bill's attempt to put 100,000 more police on our streets through the Safe and Drug Free Schools Act, through the Family and Medical Leave Act, through giving tax relief to low-income working families so no one who works full-time with children in the home will still live in poverty. Those things relate to our security, as well.

And finally, we have sought to change the Government, to make it smaller, less bureaucratic, less of a problem, and more of a partner in the American adventure. The Government is now over 100,000 people smaller than it was when I became President. We are on our way to reducing it by 270,000 over 6 years. If no new actions are taken, that will give us the smallest Federal Establishment since John Kennedy was President.

We are cutting programs. We have already eliminated or reduced 300 programs. And in my new budget, I've asked Congress to eliminate or consolidate 400 more. We are deregulating important segments of our economy and trying to reduce the burden of regulation. I'll say more about that in a moment. And we are committed to giving more responsibility to the States—in very important ways that we've also been a good partner with Florida, that I didn't mention earlier—the

waiver you got from restricted Federal rules to pursue health care reform, which has enabled small businesses in Florida that could not afford health insurance before finally to voluntarily insure their own employees.

And I'll say a little about this in a moment, but Florida was also one of now 25 States to receive a waiver from the cumbersome Federal rules governing the welfare system to try to help you move people from welfare to work. We've given more of these waivers in 2 years than the previous administrations, combined, in 12. I believe in shifting power back to the States to make their decisions to build the future of the people of the States, where you can do a better job.

Now, the preliminary results are hopeful. In the last 2 years, we've had sustained economic growth, over 6 million new jobs, a big drop in the unemployment rate, about a 3-percent drop in the unemployment rate here in Florida; the job growth rate here in the private sector about 4 times what it was in the previous 4 years. We are moving forward as a country. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment inflation in 25 years. That is the good news. But there are still many challenges, challenges that you confront every day, challenges in economics, challenges in the fabric of our social life, challenges in the way Government works.

We know, still, that in spite of this big recovery, most wage-earners are working harder for the same or lower wages than they were making 10 or 15 years ago. We know that within the great American middle class the great challenge of our time is that we have more inequality, people splitting apart by income, mostly related to their own educational levels, something that we never faced before.

From the end of World War II until the end of the 1970's, this country rose together. Almost every income group rose about 100 percent, just about double their income. The bottom 20 percent actually increased their income from the end of World War II until 1978 by about 140 percent. We were going up, and we were going together.

Now, since 1979, we have the bottom 60 percent of our country actually losing ground economically in real terms. The next 20 percent having a modest 5 percent gain, and only

those of us in the upper 20 percent of the income brackets actually doing quite well. This is something you see in a lot of other countries, but it presents a special threat to the American idea that anybody—anybody who will work hard and play by the rules can live up to the fullest of their ability. And it is a challenge we must face together. It is a new challenge. It has no simple partisan ideological solution.

We know, still, we have too many social problems. We are divided with too much crime and violence and drug abuse, too many of our children born out of wedlock, still too many things that are taking apart the fabric of our society. And we know that for all the changes we've made in Government, we sure have a long way to go there.

I know that Governor Chiles sent all of you a copy of the book, "The Death of Common Sense." What you may not know is that he sent me one, too. [*Laughter*] In fact, he put it in my hot hand, and I read it within 48 hours. And we called Philip Howard, and we got him to come to Washington, and we asked him to work with us as he has worked with you.

So when we talk about cutting Government, I guess I'm singing to the choir and looking at the lead singer over here on my left. But I'd like to give you a report about what we are doing and what we propose to do. And I need your help and your involvement, without regard to your party, from your perspective at the State level about what the next steps are going to be. And so does the Congress.

Let me just tell you some of the things we've done already. We announced the other day that we're going to cut reports we require from the American people in half, unless there's some compelling public interest reason not to, so that people who have to file reports four times a year will go to twice a year; twice a year, once a year and so on.

We took the small business loan form from being an inch thick to a page long. Last year, we gave twice as many loans at lower cost to taxpayers than the year before I took office. We gave in Florida 1,200 loans, worth over \$250 million, and under the leadership of our Vice President and the new head of SBA, we are now going to cut the SBA budg-

et by 32 percent and increase the number of loans by 12,000 next year. That's what we ought to be doing for this Government, more performance, lower cost.

Under the able leadership of your former staffer, Carol Browner, the Environmental Protection Agency is working through complicated problems from Florida to California that were mired in the courts for years. But she is doing it and, at the same time, cutting paperwork from the EPA by 25 percent. That will save 20 million hours of work for the American people every single year.

The Environmental Protection Agency is also opening compliance centers and telling people, if you wonder whether you're in or out of compliance, come to our center, and if you're out of compliance and you show up voluntarily, we will waive the fine for 6 months while you get in compliance. No more punishment for people who are trying to do the right thing.

We have changes in the Food and Drug Administration, where we've heard a lot of complaints about things taking too long. We've reduced the time lag and the cost for permitting drugs that have absolutely no possible danger to health or to the environment, for moving antibiotics on line, for moving medical devices on line that plainly present no problem. It will put another half a billion dollars a year into the American economy, just speeding up the 140 medical devices and getting rid of 600 pages of regulation. And I'll bet you right now \$100 that a year from now, there will not be a single American who will come up to the President and say, "What did you do with those 600 pages of regulation. I miss them so much. I can't stand it." [*Laughter*] We are moving in the right direction.

We have changed our approach to small businesses. If a small business violates a Federal rule for the first time now, every regulator is going to be given the authority to waive the fine altogether. And if any business violates a rule but does not do so flagrantly, instead of taking a fine away from the business, the business will be given the option of taking the fine and keeping it and spending it on correcting whatever the problem was instead of giving the money to the Gov-

ernment. This is the kind of common-sense direction I think we ought to follow.

We've changed rules for procurement in the Defense Department. It's going to save you billions of dollars a year as taxpayers. There's going to be no more \$500 hammers and \$50 ashtrays, and there won't be \$50 on every transaction. The rules and regulations on procurement added \$50 to the cost of everything the Defense Department bought that cost under \$2,500.

We had Defense Department rules that required people in our military to buy computers at twice the cost with half the capacity that you could buy them off the shelf in a store in Tallahassee. All that's been scrapped. We're moving in the right direction.

The new Congress and I have worked together on three things that I campaigned for President on that I think probably has wide support among members of both parties here that I'm very encouraged about. They passed a law that I was proud to sign that applies to Congress all the laws they impose on the private sector. High time. They passed a law that I signed last week that reduces the ability of Congress to impose upon States and local governments unfunded mandates to require you to raise taxes and change your priorities.

And both Houses of Congress have passed different versions now of the line-item veto, which I strongly support, and I believe we will reconcile them and come out with something that works, and I assure you I will do my dead level best to use that line-item veto in a way that restrains unnecessary Government spending.

Now, here's where you come in, because we need to move to the next area where we're still having a big debate, because I think there is a right way and a wrong way to cut Government spending, a right way and a wrong way to relax regulation. And I want you to be a part of this process.

For example, we wanted to cut spending in the Agriculture Department. We closed 1,200 offices we didn't need. We think that's a better approach than reducing the school lunch program. We realized we had to cut some spending in the housing area. We got rid of the regional offices of HUD, and we consolidated a lot of old bureaucratic pro-

grams. We think that's a better approach than ending efforts to help homeless veterans, many of whom are still deeply troubled because of the experiences that they've had to come to grips with in their lives. We had the EPA cut regulation by 25 percent. We think that's a better approach than this "takings bill" before Congress, which 20 States in referendums have rejected because it undermines the ability of governments even to do basic zoning and could bankrupt the budget of any government that tried to implement it. So there are ways to do this that I think are right and wrong.

And let me just say one thing about the block grant proposal. When I was a Governor, I loved block grants, and I still think they're a pretty good idea in many areas. I haven't changed just because I've become President. I like the community development block grant, and I used it effectively. But I want to remind you it's worth about half, or maybe less than half of what it was when it was given in the early eighties in the Reagan administration.

The Congress gives block grants primarily to save money. And now we're talking about block grants in areas that could be really painful to the high-growth States. So I ask you, think about what's attractive about it, but look at the details. Don't get caught in the rhetoric; look at the reality. It is not fair for the Federal Government to adopt a block-grant system which flat-funds big things that are very important to the quality of life, indeed, the ability to live a decent life for millions of our people. That may be just wonderful for States with no growth or declining population. They might even make money out of the deal. But for the growth States of the country, it can be a trap. So watch it, read it, look at the fine print, and stick up for your interests. [*Applause.*] Thank you.

Now, I'd like to give you three examples of where I think we have done the right thing to reduce spending and help you and help your people. And again, let me say that we need to move beyond the labels of the past. We need to put the people of this country first, and we need to keep our eye on the future. And I'd like to give you three examples with three groups of people from Florida

who are up there—and I'll recognize them each in turn—that, to me, symbolize the right way to cut Government, to make college loans more affordable, to end welfare as we know it, and to make our streets safer.

One of the most important things that our administration has accomplished is to make college loans more affordable for millions of Americans by eliminating the middle man in the old college loan system, lowering the cost, and offering better repayment terms. Believe it or not, we've actually reduced the deficit, made loans more affordable to young people all across the country, and cut the hassle to the colleges and universities involved.

We've also been very strict in enforcement. No opportunity without responsibility. It was costing you in 1991 \$2.8 billion a year as taxpayers in delinquent loans, people who borrowed the money and wouldn't pay it back. We have cut that rate from \$2.8 billion a year down to \$1 billion a year by cracking down on people who won't pay their loans. People who borrow the money ought to pay it back.

But let me say again, we have found a way to lower the cost of the college loan program to the taxpayers, give out more loans at lower cost to the students, and cut the hassle to the colleges and universities in between.

I want to introduce some of the people that are up there. Michelle Bellamy, of Orlando, is a senior criminal justice major at Florida A&M here in Tallahassee. And Rebecca and Craig Cummins, husband and wife, are 4th-year medical students at the University of Florida. I'd like to ask them to stand up there. Now, yesterday, I held a regional economic conference in Atlanta, and Rebecca and Craig came and testified. Rebecca said that when they got out of medical school they'd have combined debts of \$140,000, that under the old student loan program it would have taken half of their income to pay their loan obligations when they went into residency at very low pay. Under the new student loan program, they can have their choice of ways to repay the loan. And one of their choices is to pay the loan off over a longer period of time as a percentage of their income.

This means that young people will never be discouraged from borrowing money to go

to college because they know they'll never be bankrupted by paying it back, even though we're going to be tougher on requiring it to be paid back.

Their loan administrator said that she thought she had died and gone to heaven when she got into this program—literally, that's what she said—because there was no hassle. They didn't have to wait weeks and weeks and weeks to get the money. There was less paperwork. And I will say again, because we took out the middle man, it lowers costs to the taxpayer.

There are 502,000 Florida students and former students who now can take advantage of this direct college loan program. They and others are using this program today. There are some other students up there with them, and I'd like to ask them to stand. All the students that are up there, would you all stand together and be recognized.

So here's decision number one for you. I made a proposal to reduce the cost of education in the Federal budget, and there's another proposal in the Congress to reduce the cost of education in the budget. You decide which one you think is best. Right now we can make only 40 percent of our schools eligible to participate in this program. My proposal is, over the next 5 years let 100 percent of America's schools decide if they want to participate in the program. It will cut the deficit by \$12 billion over 6 years and get a lot more people into college loans, get a lot more people into college, and people will be able to pay them back.

The other proposal is to cap the program right where it is, which will add \$6 billion to the deficit over the next 5 years—by taking that money and giving it to the middle men who are making the loans now and making a much bigger bureaucratic hassle—and to save that money, that \$6 billion, by making the loans that young people get now more expensive, by charging them interest on the loans while they're already in college and adding \$2 billion a year to the cost of the loans.

Now, I think common sense says that my way of saving money, which gets you more students at lower cost and better repayment terms, is better than the alternative proposal, which gives more money to the banks in the

middle, runs the deficit up, gives you fewer students, and gives them more headaches at the colleges administering the program, and far more heartache to the students in repaying it. I think it's a clear choice.

But you need to be heard on it. It's not a partisan issue. It's a special interest against a public interest issue. It's an old Washington way of doing things against a new way of doing things issue. This is a big deal, and it's a clear choice. Both parties propose to reduce the deficit from education costs, but the choices are different.

Let me give you another example. Everybody in America wants to reform the welfare system. And good for them—because we know that some people on welfare, a significant percentage, are there because they're young, they have young children, they have no education, they don't have a particularly bright future if all they do is get a check from the Government to stay in the fix they're in, that the system for too many people does not promote responsible parenting, good work, or independence.

Most people also know that the system we have today is worse than it would be because we don't enforce our child support enforcement the way we ought to and that it's complicated for you because more than a third of the child support cases in America today cross State lines, so your ability to do it is limited.

Now, last year I worked with Members of the Congress in both parties and sent a sweeping welfare reform proposal to the Congress. It was not passed. They didn't get to it, and I wish they had. This year we're going to get a welfare reform bill, and it's a good thing. It will give the States far more flexibility, no matter which system is passed.

One of the things that I think is that since we've now given 25 States, including Florida, waivers from all these Federal rules, I think every State in America ought to do anything that any State's already got the right to do. Why should you have to keep coming back to the Federal Government asking for permission to try innovative ways to change your welfare system? I don't think you should.

But I think what you've done here shows what works. And again, it's a choice we have to make. And this one is a little harder for

you than the last one. But I want you to make a choice, and I want you to be heard.

In January of 1994, Florida received one of our first waivers to implement a family transition program, to accelerate the pace of moving people from welfare to work in Alachua County and Escambia County. The program reflects what we're trying to do, and I thought it was a good proposal. And apparently, it's working. It requires people to move from work to independence within 2 years, and it creates additional opportunities for people to do that by investing in education and training and child care.

And I might say, every time you interview a bunch of people on welfare, they'll always tell you, "If we had health care for our kids and child care and some way to go to work, we'll go to work." And the Florida program does that.

Now, what we want to do in the Congress is to pass a bill that will promote work, responsible parenting, and tough child support. The bill that passed the House of Representatives—I want to compliment it—does promote tough child support. We know today if we were collecting all the child support that is owed and could be paid, we could move 800,000 families off welfare today—if we were just collecting child support. And I compliment the House on passing that bill.

But the rest of the program, in my opinion, is deficient. I think it's weak on work and tough on kids. I don't think it does as much as—it certainly doesn't do as much as the Florida project does to move people from welfare to work. The attractiveness of it is it gives you a block grant. It says, "You do what you want, and what do you care what they do in Utah or Idaho or Maine." The problem is the block grant also has some strings attached and requires, for example, States to deny benefits to teenagers who have babies and to their babies until they reach the age of their majority—the mothers—and gives people the option to deny it altogether.

Now, it just seems to me that the better course is to give the States a great deal of flexibility, but to say, number one, if you have a growing caseload we shouldn't block-grant you. You can't help it if Florida is growing faster than some other States. And number two, we shouldn't punish children for the

mistakes of their parents. And number three, what we really want is for people to go to work and be good parents, and we ought to have certain baseline requirements to do that.

Now, that's what I believe. And I'll tell you why I believe that. There are reasons up there, again, in the audience. Irene Marry is ending welfare as we know it. She is the mother of six from Escambia County. She participated in your program. Since joining the family transition program a year ago, she received her GED, she enrolled in training for a high-wage job as a heating and air-condition technician. She will earn a paycheck, not a welfare check. And I met some other ladies who are with her who are doing the same thing. This is your program. I think this is what America ought to do. I'd like to ask them to stand up. Please stand up, all three of you.

Last example: the choice you have to make. No State in the country knows any more about crime and violence than Florida. We know that there are many reasons for crime. There are many causes of crime, and there are many proposed solutions to crime. After 6 years of partisan gridlock, last year we broke gridlock and passed the crime bill.

The crime bill had three major components: A lot of money for prisons for States that had tough sentencing provisions—you had to have certain tough sentencing provisions to get the Federal money to help build the prisons—a substantial but smaller amount of money for prevention programs—there were certain categories specified, but essentially States and local communities got to decide what worked best in prevention—and a substantial amount of money to help local communities and county jurisdictions and, to some extent, States, hire law enforcement officials.

There was a total flexibility on the part of the States, virtually, in the prevention money, nearly none in the prison money, and some in the police money, but basically the money had to be used to hire police on the street and not behind desks.

Now, this bill was put together in complete cooperation with the law enforcement community. There were 11 major law enforcement groups that worked on this, along with

the State attorneys general—General Butterworth knows, he was very active in this—the Prosecutors Association, all the law enforcement folks around the country. They told us, among other things, “You’ve got to have some prevention money in here. We can’t jail our way out of this problem.” People in law enforcement said that.

And it was interesting. I mean, a lot of these folks were Republicans, and some were Democrats. But they said, “This is not a partisan deal. We live on the streets. Our badges are on every day. We cannot jail our way out of this. We have got to have some prevention money, as well.”

The argument for the police was plain: Violent crime has tripled in the last 30 years in America. The number of police on the street has increased by only 10 percent. This is not high math. So we proposed to, in effect, increase by another 20 percent the number of police officers on the street.

Why? Because one of the little known success stories in America in the last several years is that in community after community after community that has adopted an aggressive—an aggressive community policing system—the crime rate has gone down, not just because more criminals are being caught but because more crime is being prevented. There is evidence here. This is not some theory. There is evidence, city after city after city with crime rates declining where they have been able to implement aggressive community policing programs.

In Florida—and the Attorney General—I want to compliment the Attorney General on this. She set up—it used to be that law enforcement groups hated dealing with the Federal Government because they had to hire a consultant to figure out how to get through the web of the Justice Department. Janet Reno instituted for smaller communities a one-page, eight-question form to get a police officer, one page, eight questions.

And since October—you know, the people who are attacking this approach say, “Communities don’t really want this. They can’t afford to match it. They don’t like it.” All I know is, since October, over half of the communities in America have asked for police grants from the Justice Department, on their one-page, eight-question form. And

since October, we have already awarded over 16,000 new police officers to over half of the police departments in America. Almost 1,000 new officers in Florida. The Escambia Sheriff's Office is putting 20 new officers on the street, and 14 of them are with us today. I'd like to ask them to stand because that's what you got for your money.

Again, you have a choice to make. There they are. My proposal is—and let me say what the—the crime bill was paid for by a trust fund, no tax increases, no money from anything else. The 272,000 people we're going to take out of the Federal bureaucracy, all of those savings go into a trust fund to pay for this crime bill. That's how it's paid for.

Now, the House bill says that, "No, no, we don't like this. We want to spend more money on prisons but only if you comply with our sentencing requirements." No State flexibility there. "We know how you should sentence people, and if you do it our way, you can have this money. And we want to spend less money on police and prevention, but—here's the deal—we'll put it in a block grant for you and you can do what you want to with it. You won't get as much, but you can do what you want to."

It's very seductive and very attractive. You have to ask yourselves from your perspective: Should there be less on prevention? Should there be less on police? Should we really walk away from this commitment to 100,000 police officers when violent crime has tripled, only a 10-percent increase in police, and every law enforcement group in America tells us we ought to do it?

I think the answer is clear. You may disagree, but you should know—again, on the block grants, you're a growth State and your opportunities are exploding. But your problems will grow, too. So I ask you to think about it and to make your voice heard. And for goodness sakes, do your best to talk about it in terms of what puts your people first, what gets us into the future. No partisan political rhetoric. Let's look at what is right for the country. And what is right for our State.

I think this is a very exciting time to be alive and to be in public service. This debate we are having about the role of Government is a good thing to have. But in the end, our

mission has got to be to keep the American dream alive. The idea that this is a special country, where little girls who can play the violin can come and breathe the air of freedom and fight for it for all of those who are like her who don't enjoy it.

This is a special country. And there is never going to be a time—I thought about this when the minister was praying at the beginning of the session here—the Scriptures tell us there will never be a time when human existence is free of difficulties. They are endemic to our nature and to the condition of things on this Earth.

So we have vast new opportunities and profound new challenges. And the real question is, how are we going to meet them. With all my heart, I believe that the best days of this country lie ahead of us if we make the right decisions. In a new time, the right decisions cannot be made with old rhetoric that divides us when we need to be united.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:45 a.m. in the House Chamber at the State Capitol. In his remarks, he referred to James A. Scott, president, Peter R. Wallace, speaker, Jack Ascherk, speaker pro-tem, Florida Legislature; violinist Elizbet Lorenzo Martinez; Bill Nelson, Florida treasurer and insurance commissioner; and Bob Butterworth, Florida attorney general.

### **Remarks to Students at Hillsborough Community College in Tampa, Florida**

*March 30, 1995*

**The President.** Thank you very much, Bill Lanthripp, for that introduction. Thank you, President Paloumpis and thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for making me feel so very, very welcome here today. I also want to thank those of you who brought the little children here; it's wonderful to see them—that little girl back there in her green dress and that little girl there, this young man there; you look great. Thank you.

I want to thank some of my partners in trying to make your future better who are here with me: your Governor and Lieutenant Governor, Lawton Chiles and Buddy McKay. I thank my friend, Congressman Gibbons, for

being here, the Speaker of the House, Peter Wallace, and your representative, the Majority Leader of the House, Jim Davis. I thank them all for being here.

I also want to say that I almost got here in time. I got here a day ahead of the new mayor's inauguration, so I want to thank on the next to the last day of her tenure, my longtime friend, your Mayor, Sandy Freedman, for doing such a good job for Tampa. And I want to wish your new Mayor, Dick Greco, all the best, and I look forward to working with you.

Ladies and gentlemen, if I could start on a more serious note, I just had the opportunity to meet at the airport with the families of the two Tampa police officers, Mike Vigil and Kevin Howell, who were shot and wounded last week. I also had the opportunity to meet an HCC student, Mike Meyers, who saved one of those officer's lives, because he's a certified emergency medical technician. He told the police he was a paramedic, and they brought him there. He grabbed his bag and rushed to the fallen officers, and he did a very fine job. And I had a chance to thank him for that, and it's an encouragement to all of us to learn some of the skills that he knows. You never can tell when you will need them. I understand that Officer Vigil remains in critical but stable condition, but I was just informed by his family that the doctors say his chances are now better than 50-50 that he's going to make a good recovery.

I am delighted to be back in Florida. I had the opportunity to spend the night at the Governor's mansion last night and to address the Florida Legislature today about the challenges facing our country and what we're going to do about it. Today, I want to talk to you about your future. I spend a lot of time in community colleges like this one, because I think in many ways, this is the most important institution in American society as we move toward the next century.

With all of the challenges we face, we basically know what works. What works is, educating all of our people; what works is doing what it takes to generate more jobs; what works is bringing people together across racial and income and other lines; what works

is a commitment to give more people a shot at the American dream, to grow the middle class and to shrink the under class, and to prepare for the future. And that's what community colleges do.

In a very real sense, what I have been trying to do as President is to bring that spirit and those ideas into the National Government. I've worked for a dozen years as a Governor, in which time I had the honor and privilege to spend countless hours in educational institutions, from elementary schools to community colleges, to vocational training schools, to our 4-year universities. And I found when I went to Washington that every reason that I worried about the country when I ran for President turned out to be true.

I ran because I thought this country was on the verge of a new century, dominated by the end of the cold war, the emergence of the global economy, wealth tied more to knowledge than ever before, when we had new opportunities but new challenges, and that Washington was in the grip of old-fashioned partisan political rhetoric, dividing us when we needed to be united, holding us back when we needed to go forward.

Now, we are all engaged in a great debate which you hear every day on the news as you watch events unfold about what your Government should be doing in this moment. The old view was that there was a Government solution in Washington for every big problem in the country and that Government could actually help people with big problems. Well, we know that that's not exactly right; they're not one-size-fits-all, Government knows best, out of Washington. And we know that there are great limits on how much Government can help people to fulfill their abilities.

The new rage is to say that the Government is the cause of all of our problems, and if only we had no Government, we'd have no problems. I can tell you, that contradicts evidence, history, and common sense. Now, the truth is—so the question is, what are we going to do? I can tell you what my view is, and it is different from either extreme. I believe we need a Government that doesn't pretend to be a savior but that doesn't sit on the sidelines. I believe in a partnership.

I believe that the National Government's mission at the end of this century is as follows: Number one, we ought to be creating opportunity and demanding responsibility. Number two, I think we ought to be doing everything we can to empower the American people through education for a lifetime to make the most of their own lives. Number three, I believe we ought to be enhancing the security of the American people, not only by making the world a safer place but by making our streets and our schools and our homes and our workplaces safer places. And number four, I think we have got to dramatically change the National Government to make it smaller, less bureaucratic, less meddlesome, but still helpful to move this country forward. Now, if you look at the record in creating opportunity, we have brought down the deficit, we have expanded trade, we have increased our investments in new technology, and in the last 2 years our Nation has produced over 6 million new jobs, the unemployment rate in Florida has dropped 3 percent from 7.4 to 4.3 percent. We are clearly moving forward and creating more opportunity.

If you look at the empowerment issue, we have increased investments in education, everything from expanding Head Start to expanding the efforts of States to make apprenticeships for people that don't go to college to dramatically—and I mean dramatically—increasing the availability of scholarship for middle class people to get a higher education.

If you ask: Well, what have we done on security? Well, look around the world. We are making progress in troublesome areas of the world, like the Middle East, in bringing peace, and Northern Ireland. We have made agreements with Russia and with other countries in the former Soviet Union to drastically reduce the number of nuclear weapons. And for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no nuclear missiles pointed at the children of the United States of America.

Now, if you ask what have we done to reduce the size of Government—and I want to compliment Governor Chiles for his leadership in this—Florida is one of the—really, the groundbreaking State in America, I think,

in slashing unnecessary regulation. And I congratulate him on that.

What are we doing in Washington? Well, we've reduced the size of the Federal bureaucracy by 100,000. We're going to reduce it by 270,000 over 5 years. It'll be the smallest Federal Government since John Kennedy was President of the United States.

We have reduced the Government deficit so much that if it weren't for interest on the debt, incurred in the 12 years before I showed up, we'd have a surplus today, not a deficit in the Government account. We're paying our operating bills. We're now giving Government regulators the authority not to fine people the first time they make a mistake.

And Carol Browner, from Florida, who's the head of the EPA, has opened up an office in which people, good, honest business people can go and say, "Look, I'm afraid I'm in violation of some environmental law." And instead of getting a fine, they'll get 6 months to fix it.

We have changed the rules so that now if somebody makes a mistake in good faith, our Federal agencies have the right not to fine people but to say, "You keep the fine if you'll spend it in fixing the problem, making the work place safer, making the environment cleaner."

So we are moving forward. With this new Congress, we are finding some areas of agreement that are quite important. I signed a law that I campaigned for President to support that applies to Congress all the laws they put on the private sector. I think it's high time.

I signed a law the other day which limits the ability of the Congress to impose upon State governments and local governments, so-called "unfunded mandates," requiring them to raise your taxes because of some people in Washington want, instead of what you decided the mayor should do, or the Governor and the State legislature should do. And it's high time.

And we're about to get agreement—we passed a line-item veto, which most Governors have, which allows a President to go into a big bill where a lot of pork barrel spending might be hidden with a lot of good things, so you can't afford to veto the bill

and find the pork. And we're going to get that passed soon. And that's a good thing.

But there still are some disagreements. And the American people, without regard to their party, will have to be heard on these disagreements, because you have to decide what you think the main mission of our country is. Is the main mission to make sure there is no Federal Government, or is the main mission to grow the middle class, shrink the under class, and support family and community and the future of this country? I think that is what the main mission of this country is.

And let me give you some ideas. With all the cutting of the budget we have done—and last year, I gave the Congress the first budget in 25 years that cut defense and domestic spending together. Only medical costs went up because of inflation. Everything else was cut. But I did not cut within that education. We increased our investment in education. Why? Because—look around you. It is the future of America.

So are we going to grow the middle class, shrink the under class and be a safer country if more poor little kids go through Head Start? I think we are. Are we going to grow the middle class if more kids who get out of high school but don't want to go to college, at least get 2 years of some kind of training afterward in a community college—that type of thing? I think we are. Will we be growing the middle class and shrinking the under class if every person who wants to go to college can get a college loan at a lower cost and a better repayment schedule? I think we are.

So this is a big decision we have to make in Washington. Let me give you a clear, explicit example. I recommended that we could save some money and do a better job by our young people if we changed the college loan program because it was a big bureaucracy. You know it was a guarantee, so the Government would guarantee a loan a bank would give you. The bank charges a fee; then if somebody doesn't pay it back, the bank gets 90 percent of the money from the Government. So they never sue, because the lawyer fee would cost more than 10 percent. Right? We were spending, when I became President, \$1.8—\$2.8 billion a year of your money

for delinquent loans, because people weren't paying their student loans.

Colleges and universities were complaining all over America that the paperwork was driving them bananas to process the student loans. The students were complaining that they couldn't get the loans in a hurry. And then when they had to repay them on a 10-year schedule, if you borrowed a whole bunch of money, you couldn't take a job that you might want if it has a salary so low you could never make your loan repayment. And it didn't just apply to people in what you call public service jobs.

Yesterday in Atlanta, I had an economic forum, and I had two married medical students, a husband and wife from the University of Florida, come and testify. They are 4th-year medical students. They will owe \$140,000 when they get out of medical school. You say, "Well, doctors make a lot of money." They do, but not when they're residents. Right? They were going to literally have to spend one-half of their income, combined, paying off their students loans, while they're residents working 60–70–80 hours a week. Under our plan, they can pay it off as a percentage of their income. So when they start making money, they pay more. But now they get to make a living and work and become doctors. It's a better system.

So how does this affect you? today, 40 percent of American institutions are eligible to participate in that. What I said is, let's let everybody participate. We'll cut the fraud rate. We've already taken it from \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion a year. We've cut the fraud by nearly two-thirds. We'll cut the cost of the program. We'll loan more money to more students. We'll be less trouble to the institutions of higher education, and the deficit will go down because we'll save \$6 billion. That was my proposal.

Now, here is the other proposal in the Congress. The other proposal is: Leave the banks with the money; cap the number of colleges that can participate at 40 percent; and instead, make students start paying interest on their loans while they're in college—add \$2 billion a year to the cost of college.

**Audience members.** No-o-o!

**The President.** To me, I don't think you have to be Einstein to conclude that does

not make sense. Let's stay with our program. Let's save money and educate people and not go back to charging people more for student loans.

Let me tell you something else. There's a lot of talk about tax cuts in Washington today. There is a limit to how much we can cut taxes because the deficit's big. We need to keep bringing the deficit down. But I believe we should have a modest tax cut for middle class people targeted to raising incomes and increasing the wealth of the country over the long run. Don't just write people a check. Give people who are playing by the rules some incentives to do more. That's why my bill says let's give people a tax deduction for the cost of education after high school. Get more people to get educated and do that. Why? Why? Because it's just like the GI bill after World War II: Everybody who goes to school is going to make a higher income and pay more taxes and run the deficit down and run the wealth of the country up. And if we keep it disciplined and small, we can afford it.

But we can't afford just to go out here with these huge tax cuts with a deficit of the country as big as it is. The reason the Florida economy dropped in unemployment by 3 percent is that we brought the deficit down and increased our investment and expanded trade. So we got interest rates down and business opportunities up and generated more jobs. The most important thing is to keep the American people working and get their incomes up. And that's what we have to do.

Now, you will see these debates over and over and over again. I want to mention two more, because they affect you. We're having a big argument about what to do about crime. Well, we finally passed a tough crime bill last year. Your Mayor helped us pass it. Your Governor, your Attorney General, your law enforcement official helped us pass it.

And what that crime bill does is it says—first of all, it was virtually written by law enforcement officials—it says that we should have the National Government do three things to help bring the crime rate down: Help the States build more prisons so we don't let dangerous criminals out too soon; help local communities give kids something to say yes to and not just something to say

no to, so we prevent crime and keep people out of trouble; and have a 20 percent increase in the police forces of the country so we can catch criminals and prevent crime. Those are the three things we did.

Now, the Congress has proposed to reduce the amount of money we're spending on the crime bill but require the States to spend more on prisons and spend less on police and prevention, and tell the communities do whatever you want to with the money. And I'm opposed to that, and I want you to know why. Violent crime has tripled in the last 30 years, and we have to do something about it—all kinds of violent crime. I just announced last week that the former attorney general of Iowa, Bonnie Campbell, is going to head the first-ever division of the Justice Department on domestic violence, violence against parents and children. We have to do something about this.

Now, in 30 years, violent crime triples, but the police forces of the country increase by only 10 percent. You don't have to be a genius to figure out that there's some connection between a huge increase in crime and nearly no increase in the police force. How are they supposed to do what they're doing? Not to mention how much better armed the criminals have become—right?—which is part of the problem with these fine police officers.

Now, we know, also, that one of the good news stories that often does not get told in this country is—I have seen this with my own eyes—there's city after city after city where the crime rate has gone down because of strategies that have been adopted like some of the strategies adopted right here in Tampa. When you put people out and you deploy police in the proper way and they work with people in the community, they not only catch criminals quicker but they also deter crime. I have seen it all across America. This is a good deal. Florida has already been awarded funds for more than 960 police officers, 18 of them right here in Tampa. We don't need to tamper with the crime bill. We ought to stay with it and implement it.

I'm just going to give you one last example, because we have to decide what kind of country we're going to be and what we're going to do together. These young people

that were introduced over here, the AmeriCorps volunteers—and they clapped and I was glad to see them—they're part of our national service program. It's a program basically to bring the idea of the Peace Corps to the streets of America. It's a program designed to say, "If you will work, essentially, for minimum wage for a year, we'll give you about the equivalent college education benefit of the GI bill, if you'll help us to deal with our security problems here at home, help to volunteer and to rebuild America here at home."

Now, there are those who say, "Well, we can't afford this. It's too expensive." We have 20,000 young Americans in AmeriCorps today, thousands of more who want to get in, who want to work for minimum wage and earn this education credit and build up our country. There are more people in AmeriCorps today than ever served in the Peace Corps in any single year in its history since President Kennedy started it, because the American people are dying to get out there and do something to lift this country up.

Let me just give you a couple of examples. Two years ago, just 89 of our volunteers immunized 104,000 infants in poor areas in Texas. Believe me, they paid for the whole program in that one year. Here in Florida after the hurricane, our volunteers, working with Habitat for Humanity, built 75 homes, and they built them quicker and better because of that.

These AmeriCorps volunteers are from Pinellas County. They're members of three local law enforcement agencies involved in community police departments, the Clearwater department, the St. Petersburg department and the county sheriff's office. They're working together to make what I just talked to you about, community policing, a reality, to make the streets safer. They're out there doing things that uniformed officers don't have to do that lower the crime rate and make people safer. That is what we ought to be doing. I think it is worth the investment.

I'm cutting spending as quick as I can. We've cut more spending in the last 2 years than had been cut in a month of Sundays, and I will cut more, and I will work with

the Congress to cut more. But it is not right to cut out AmeriCorps. We should be lifting up young people like this and giving them a chance to serve.

So I want you to be a part of this. America needs to work like the community colleges work. People get in, and they're just judged based on their merit, and everybody gets a fair shot. And you know if you conclude the course, you've got a good chance to get a job and a better chance to live out your dreams. That's the way this country ought to work. It ought to be flexible, unbureaucratic, changing to meet the needs of a changing society, but it requires a partnership between the public sector and the private sector. Your Government in Washington, I am doing my best to change it to make it more like this. But we are creating opportunity. We are empowering people. We are enhancing our security. And we are downsizing this Government. We are making America a better place together, and I urge you to enter this debate and tell everybody that you can, "We do not need more of the old-fashioned, hot air, partisan political rhetoric. We need a strategy to move this country forward."

And let me say this in closing. I got a letter the other day from a guy I went to grade school with. And he said, "You know, Bill, one of the problems that you're having as President is that you're living out your dream. But too many people our age are living with broken dreams." I ran for this job because I wanted all the people my age to be able to live their dreams, and because I want you younger people here to be able to look forward to a life that is full and rich as the one I've enjoyed. And those of you that are young and don't have any children yet, I want you to think about having children with an atmosphere of excitement and hope and conviction that your kids will see America's best days. And I'm telling you, if we will keep our heads on straight and think about how we can pull together instead of how we can be driven apart, we will do that.

God bless you, and thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:34 p.m. in the gymnasium at the Dale Mabry Campus. In his remarks, he referred to William Lanthripp, president, Dale Mabry Campus Student Government

Association, and Andreas A. Paloumpis, president, Hillsborough Community College.

**Statement on Senate Approval of Dan Glickman as Secretary of Agriculture**

*March 30, 1995*

I am pleased the Senate today overwhelmingly voted in support of Dan Glickman as the new Secretary to the Department of Agriculture.

Dan Glickman will be a strong voice and advocate for farmers, working families, and American agriculture.

During the past 2 years, the Agriculture Department has broken new ground on expanding trade opportunities, developing empowerment zones for distressed rural areas, and streamlining a major Federal agency that now runs more efficiently. However, our work is not done, and we must still tackle other important issues facing rural communities, farmers, and ranchers.

Next month will be especially important as we convene in Ames, Iowa, for the National Rural Conference to discuss the development of our Nation's economy, jobs, trade, and preservation of the family farm. It is important to hear firsthand from ordinary Americans, and I am pleased Dan is starting the job with his sleeves rolled up.

**Statement on the Major League Baseball Strike**

*March 30, 1995*

For the first time in months there is reason for some optimism for those of us who are hoping for a 1995 baseball season with real major league players.

The players have agreed to return to work if the district court judge issues an injunction. If the judge does grant the injunction, I hope the owners decide to let the players play ball.

In October, in an attempt to assist the parties, we appointed Bill Usery as special mediator with the hope that he could bring the owners and players together at the bargaining table, where ultimately this dispute must be resolved. He has done his best to get that job done and will continue to do so.

As the owners and players meet in these last few days before the scheduled start of the season, I hope they will give it their best shot, that they will bargain in good faith and be flexible and willing to compromise so that America's baseball fans again have a sport they can be proud of.

Like millions of other fans across the country, I want to see the Ripkens, Gwynns, Bonds, Mattinglys, and Cones in uniform on the playing field. We're getting down to the wire. Let's hope the owners and players see the light for the sake of the fans and bring back Major League Baseball.

**Message to the Congress on Science and Technology**

*March 29, 1995*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

This Nation's future depends on strong public and private support for science and technology. My Administration's decision to make sound investments in science and technology even as the Federal Government cuts other spending is premised on three basic assumptions:

- Technology is the engine of economic growth.
- Scientific knowledge is the key to the future.
- Responsible government advances science and technology.

The Congress and the American people can find evidence of the Administration's dedication to responsible government support for science and technology in our defense and economic policies as well as our management of the science and technology enterprise. We have decreased the Federal deficit, helped to create millions of new jobs, and improved the tax treatment of small businesses and of investments in research and development. Hemispheric and global trade agreements as well as relaxation of outdated export controls have opened huge export markets to America's high-tech industries. *My National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement* (February 1995) depends on farsighted and efficient science and technology investments. Our foreign policy and security interests are also supported by

mutually beneficial international cooperation in science and technology.

We have consistently endorsed technology policies to increase prosperity and enhance environmental quality. In *Technology for America's Economic Growth* (February 1993) and *Technology for a Sustainable Future* (July 1994) this Administration conveyed to the American people our plans for public/private partnerships to improve the business environment, enhance access to quality education and training, support development of information infrastructure, ensure continued excellence in health care, and strengthen America's global competitiveness.

Streamlined government based on strong partnerships—within the government, with the private sector, and among nations—is a hallmark of the Clinton/Gore Administration. The “virtual department” I created by establishing the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) has cut bureaucratic red tape and produced a historic first: an integrated research and development budget that focuses on national goals. The NSTC has also produced large savings by enabling agencies to coordinate their efforts, divide tasks, and share resources.

My Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) provides critical links to industry and academia. Their oversight of NSTC activities, such as development of strategies for the management and disposition of fissile materials, promises to improve the Federal effort. So, too, do the forums and workshops that have drawn in thousands of experts and stakeholders to help develop priorities in areas as diverse as fundamental science; environmental technology; and health; safety; and food research.

I am also very proud of the steps we have taken to improve international cooperation in science and technology. Through the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission we have used science and technology cooperation to ease the Russians' transition to democracy and a market economy. We have received valuable new technology and cultivated a crucial partner in global affairs through Russian participation in the international space station. We have used the Megasciences Forum of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and other international forums

to explore ways to share the increasing costs of cutting-edge research while maintaining our position of world leadership. Bilateral science and technology cooperation with other nations, including advanced industrial economies such as Japan, and big, emerging markets such as the People's Republic of China, serve us well in the global economy—giving us access to new ideas and new technologies while creating new opportunities for business.

Economists have estimated that the social rate of return on investments in research and development averages about 50 percent, or about double the average private rate of return. Clearly a solid Federal investment program is justified even in the leanest times. It is especially important for the Federal Government to maintain its investments in science and technology when the pressures of international competition are leading businesses to focus on shorter term payoffs at the expense of more basic, longer term, and riskier research and development.

In *Science in the National Interest* (August 1994), the Vice President and I reaffirmed our longstanding commitment to world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering. Scientific discoveries inspire and enrich us. Equally important, science and mathematics education provides all Americans with the knowledge and skills they need to prepare for and adapt to the high-technology jobs of the future and to exercise the responsibilities of citizenship.

This Administration has articulated clear goals and established priorities for Federal spending, and our economic policies have improved the climate for private investment as well. We intend to work closely with the Congress to ensure the well-being of our children and grandchildren. These investments will prepare us for the challenges of the 21st century.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
March 29, 1995.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 31.

**Remarks to United States Troops in Port-au-Prince, Haiti**

March 31, 1995

**The President.** Thank you.

**Audience member.** Go, Razorbacks!

**The President.** Who said, “Go, Razorbacks?” We should have had a longer promotion ceremony up here. [Laughter]

General Fisher asked me to take roll call. Are the 2d Brigade Warriors here? [Applause] The 65th Engineer Staffers? [Applause] The 1st of the 21st Gimlet? [Applause] The DISCOM Lightning Supporters? [Applause] The 1st of the 25th Aviation Bandits? [Applause] Special Forces Green Berets? Per person, they deserve applause. What about the 3d Squadron 2d ACR Wolfpack? [Applause] Are all the Light Fighters present and accounted for? [Applause]

I’ve been told that your lungs are as strong as your hearts and your hands.

Did I leave out anybody? Would you like to be heard? [Applause]

**Audience members.** Semper Fi!

**The President.** Good for you. [Laughter]

Every one of you who has taken part in Operation Uphold Democracy. On behalf of the American people, I am here to say, thank you. Thank you for serving your Nation. Thank you for being democracy’s warriors. Thank you for helping to bring back the promise of liberty to this long troubled land. You should be very proud of what you have done.

We gave you a tough and demanding mission which some said could not be done, and you proved them wrong. Look what you have accomplished. Seven months ago, a brutal military regime ruled Haiti, beating and torturing and murdering its citizens. Now the Haitian people are moving from a dark night of fear to a new day of freedom. You and all those who have served since last September helped to make that happen.

Seven months ago, thousands of migrants were streaming out of Haiti. Now tens of thousands of Haitians have come home, home to start to build a better life for themselves and their fellow country men and women. You helped to make that happen.

Seven months ago, the world wondered whether the United States could summon the

will to protect democracy in this hemisphere. Now the world knows once again that the United States will honor its commitment and stand up for freedom. And you helped to make that happen. For all this, you should be very, very proud.

We gave our word, and the men and women of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marines, and the Coast Guard, you’ve kept our word. You have succeeded because you’re the best trained, best prepared, best equipped fighting force in the world. Your reputation landed in Haiti before you did. And I am convinced that is one of the reasons that so much was done with so little bloodshed. The moment the military rulers learned that you were on the way, they got out of the way.

Since you’ve been here, you’ve been asked to do it all, and you have. You’ve taken thousands of guns off the street. You’ve helped to train a new Haitian police force. You’ve repaired roads and bridges. You’ve brought food and medicine to the farthest reaches of our country—to this country. And of course, you have literally turned the lights back on in dozens of towns.

You not only answered the call of duty, time and again you have gone beyond it. And that is what heroism is all about. Each of you in your own way has become a hero in Haiti. I’d like to mention a few of you whose stories I have learned about.

Sergeant 1st Class Steven Lamb, whose platoon conducted over 140 patrols, often under hazardous conditions: On one mission the platoon came across a mob using steel pipes to beat a man whose hands were tied behind his back. They dispersed the crowd, freed the man, treated his injuries. By stopping violence, confiscating weapons, and diffusing problems before they got out of control, the platoon helped to give hundreds of Haitians a new sense of confidence and security. Thank you, Sgt. Lamb.

I met Sergeant 1st Class Michelle Howard of the Army: Many men and women under her command were overseas for the first time. Their morale was a little low without any mail from home, so she wrote the families of every single soldier in her platoon and told them to sound off in writing more often. Then the letters, postcards and packages

came in by the dozens. And now Sgt. Howard is called by the troops, "Mother Teresa With a 9-Millimeter." Well, thank you Mother Teresa, and thank you, Sergeant Howard.

I met First Sergeant Jose Garcia Apponte, and he and dozens of volunteers from all the service branches, on their free time and with no pay, started the School of Hope to teach Haitians English. Already the school has graduated more than 300 students. And now they'll return to their communities to share what they have learned. Thank you, Sergeant Garcia Apponte.

I met Private 1st Class John Firreno, a medic from the 32 ACR: He was on patrol about midnight last month when he came upon a young Haitian woman about to give birth. Now that requires courage. *[Laughter]* As his comrades clustered around him with flashlights, he helped to deliver an eight-pound baby boy. Well, he didn't get a medical degree, but the boy now bears his name. Thank you, Private Firreno.

I want to thank the special forces who fanned out across the country and helped our local leaders learn the basics of government of, by, and for the people, good things like keeping the streets safe and holding town meetings and even some of the not so good things like collecting taxes.

Through these and dozens of other acts, big and small, you have defended democracy and made it stronger here. You have shown the Haitians what it means to be a soldier in a free society, working for the people, not against them. And when you go home, you must know that you have inspired a new generation of Haitians, supported by the United Nations mission, to carry on the never-ending struggle for freedom.

I know that for those of you who are preparing to leave, your loved ones are ready to welcome you home. General Sullivan, the Army Chief of Staff, recently visited in Hawaii with the families of the 25th Infantry Division soldiers. On my behalf, he thanked them for their sacrifice and the extraordinary support they have given to you. They and all of our military families have been heroes, too. And our country is in their debt, as well.

I'd also like to thank the soldiers from other countries who have been our partners in this remarkable endeavor. I know some

of them are represented to my right here. Some of them have shared this encampment with you, and some of them are in other places. I got to thinking about what a small world it can be when we are united for democracy and freedom.

Some of you may know that the First Lady, is about to visit two of the countries represented here: Bangladesh and Nepal, Americans there and First Lady and my daughter and others; Bangladeshis and Nepalese here, all standing for freedom all across the world, led by the United States, led by you. You should be very proud.

Even though, my fellow Americans, Haiti is democratic, free, and more secure than ever before, we know there is long hard work ahead. And we know that some of you will have a hand in it as part of the United Nations mission. In the end, of course, we all know the Haitian people themselves must rebuild their country and realize their dreams, just as we must in the United States. But now because of you, they have a chance to do so, just as we do in the United States.

The hand-painted signs seen all over Haiti say it all, "Thank you America." Today, America says thank you to the men and women of our Armed Forces who helped to give Haiti a second chance.

Whether you serve in an active unit, the Reserves, or the National Guard, we ask you to bear many burdens. We ask you to travel far from home. We ask you to stand in the face of danger. We ask you to be away from your families and your friends for a very long time. We ask you to protect your country and to defend democracy and freedom. We ask all these things. And time and again, you have risen to the challenge. Today, because of you, the Haitian people know why we call the United States, "land of the free and the home of the brave."

You have allowed freedom to triumph over fear here. You have helped to remind the world that democracy is still on the march, even though it still has enemies. And you have stood up for a principle upon which our country was founded, that liberty is every-one's birthright.

Thank you, each and every one of you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:28 a.m. at Warrior Base. In his remarks, he referred to Maj. Gen. George A. Fisher, USA, Commanding General, 25th Infantry Division.

### Remarks in an Arrival Ceremony in Port-au-Prince

March 31, 1995

**The President.** President Aristide, Mr. Secretary-General, distinguished guests, and citizens of a free and democratic Haiti, *Bonjour*.

I am deeply honored by President Aristide's invitation to speak with you today. In the many months we have known each other I have learned firsthand of President Aristide's tremendous courage. His strength in the face of great challenge reflects the unbreakable will of the Haitian people. We respect him as the President you elected freely and fairly and for his leadership of all Haitians since his return.

Today, we come together as friends. Today, once again, we give life to the ideals of democracy, justice, and freedom. Today, we celebrate the restoration of democracy to your country. Never—never again must it be stolen away.

For centuries, the Haitian people have known little more than blood and terror. You have been robbed of opportunity and deprived of basic rights. Your children have grown up with too much violence. From Cite Soleil to the smallest village in the farthest corner of your land, you have sacrificed much in your quest for liberty. Now you stand on the brink of a new and more hopeful time. Now you have a chance to make real the dreams of those who liberated your nation nearly 200 years ago.

The tasks ahead will not be easy. Democracy does not flow naturally like the rivers, and prosperity does not spring full grown from the Earth. Justice does not bloom overnight. To achieve them, you must work hard, you must have patience, you must move forward together, with tolerance, openness, and cooperation. I believe you can do it, for as President Aristide has said, your challenge is great, but your will to succeed is greater.

Your democracy will be maintained and strengthened by free elections, and respect

for the rights and obligations enshrined in your Constitution. Your government, the United Nations, and the United States will do all we can to guarantee free, fair, and secure elections, first in June and then in December. We know from experience that when elections are free, fair, and secure, you will participate. That is what democracy requires of you, and we know you will do it.

Your nation has been stripped bare of many of its natural resources. But the most important of these resources, you, the people, have survived with dignity and hope. As the proverb says, "*Espwa fe viv*."

Now you have a chance to come together to make the rice fields come alive and harvest the corn and millet, to build the schools and clinics that promise a better future for your children. We, your neighbors, your allies, and your friends, will support your efforts to create jobs, to attract investment from beyond your borders, and to rebuild and repair your injured land.

In a few months, the program will begin to pave the 1,000 kilometers of your roads. And later this year I will send the American Peace Corps here to help to organize the planting of millions of trees. As the roads are built and the trees are planted, thousands of you will have jobs. As you begin this work, I urge your country men and women who fled the terror to return and to help you to rebuild your land and theirs.

Economic progress will demand much patience. But we will stand with you as you tackle the hard and sometimes painful work ahead. *Men anpil chay pa lou*.

There will be times of great frustration as you build your democracy and move toward prosperity. But today, Haiti has more friends than ever before. And so once again, I urge each and every citizen of this nation to come together in this spirit of unity that President Aristide has so eloquently promoted. I can do no better than to repeat his words, "Say no to vengeance, no to revenge, yes to reconciliation."

[*Inaudible*]*—take the law into their own hands. Each of you must choose, as most of you have already chosen, to build up, not tear down. I congratulate you for the patience you have already shown.*

History records that two centuries ago on the eve of your independence, and during my nation's Revolutionary War, more than 500 of your ancestors came from Haiti to my country and died in the fight to bring the United States to life. More than 200 years later, the United States is proud to have helped to give you a second chance to build your democracy and bring life to the dreams of your liberators.

I have been told that, throughout your land, our soldiers, our diplomats, and our volunteers have been greeted by hand-painted signs with three simple words. These words go right to their hearts and to mine. They are: Thank you, America. Now, it is my turn to say, *Merci à Haiti*. Thank you for the warmth of your welcome and your support for all who have joined hands with you. Thank you for embracing peace, for denying despair, for holding on to hope. Because of your courage, because of your determination, freedom can triumph over fear.

Today, we stand in the warm, bright light of liberty, and together, we can say, *Kenbé fèm, pa lagé. Kenbé fèm, pa lagé.*

*Merci*, and thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:16 a.m. at the National Palace. In his remarks, he referred to President Jean-Bertrand Aristide of Haiti and United Nations Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

---

## 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 27

In the morning, the President met with Prime Minister James Bolger of New Zealand.

### March 28

In the afternoon, the President traveled to Atlanta, GA. Later in the afternoon, he at-

tended a reception for participants of the Economic Conference at the residence of Gov. Zell Miller of Georgia.

### March 29

In the evening, the President traveled to Tallahassee, FL.

The President announced his intention to nominate Tommy Edward Jewell III as a member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute.

The President announced his intention to designate Shirley A. Jackson to be Chair of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission following her confirmation as a Commissioner.

### March 30

In the morning, the President went to the State Capitol where he met with direct loan recipients, police officers, and welfare-to-work mothers in the Senate President's Conference Room. He then met with Democratic leadership members in the House Rules Committee Room.

In the afternoon, the President traveled to Tampa Bay, FL. He traveled to Palm Beach, FL, later in the afternoon.

The President announced his intention to nominate Kenneth H. Bacon to the post of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

The President announced his intention to reappoint Zvi Kestenbaum and to appoint Bernyce Adler, Fred Hochberg, and Lee Seeman as members of the Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad.

The White House announced the President has asked the Intelligence Oversight Board to conduct a Government-wide review of the allegations surrounding the 1990 death of Michael Devine and the 1992 disappearance of Efrain Bamaca Valesquez in Guatemala.

### March 31

In the morning, the President traveled to Port-au-Prince, Haiti.

In the afternoon, the President went to the National Palace where he met with President Jean-Bertrand Aristide and United Nations Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali. Following a reception, he attended the Unit-

ed Nations transition ceremony on the palace lawn.

In the early evening, the President met with U.S. troops at the Warrior Base. He then went to the U.S. Embassy where he met with embassy staff. Following the meeting, he traveled to Little Rock, AR.

The President announced his intention to appoint Karen Lau Sullivan to be U.S. Alternate Representative to the South Pacific Commission.

The President announced his intention to nominate Vera Alexander as a member of the Marine Mammal Commission.

---

### **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 28**

James John Hoecker,  
of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2000 (reappointment).

John M. Deutch,  
of Massachusetts, to be Director of Central Intelligence, vice R. James Woolsey, resigned.

#### **Withdrawn March 30**

Catherine Baker Stetson,  
of New Mexico, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development for a term expiring May 19, 2000, vice James D. Santini, term expired, which was sent to the Senate on January 5, 1995.

#### **Submitted March 30**

Catherine Baker Stetson,  
of New Mexico, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts De-

velopment for a term expiring May 19, 2000, vice LaDonna Harris, resigned.

#### **Submitted March 31**

Michele Driscoll Alioto,  
of California, to be a member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 1996, vice Michael B. Unhjem, term expired.

Wiley Y. Daniel,  
of Colorado, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Colorado, vice Sherman G. Finesilver, retired.

Tommy Edward Jewell III,  
of New Mexico, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 1995, vice Janice L. Gradwohl, term expired.

Tommy Edward Jewell III,  
of New Mexico, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 1998 (re-appointment).

Diane P. Wood,  
of Illinois, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, vice William J. Bauer, 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 27**

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Deputy National Security Adviser Samuel Berger on the President's visit to Haiti

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of the Office of Management and Budget Alice Rivlin, Senior Policy Adviser to the Vice

President Elaine Kamarck, Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt, Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency James Lee Witt, National Aeronautics and Space Administrator Dan Goldin, Small Business Administrator Phil Lader, and Federal Communications Commissioner Reed Hundt on the National Performance Review

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's meeting with King Hussein I of Jordan

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's meeting with New Zealand Prime Minister James Bolger

Announcement of Cabinet/Sub-Cabinet Southern Regional Economic Conference travel

**Released March 28**

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on National Security Adviser Anthony Lake's meeting with families of the victims of Pan Am Flight 103

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the assassination in Haiti

**Released March 30**

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on a Government-wide review of allegations surrounding the death of Michael Devine and the disappearance of Efrain Bamaca Valesquez

**Released March 31**

Transcript of remarks by U.N. Ambassador Madeleine Albright and AID Administrator Brian Atwood to the pool

Announcement of the nomination for judges for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and for the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado

---

**Acts Approved  
by the President**

---

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