AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, May 29, 1995
Volume 31—Number 21
Pages 867–914

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Bill Signings
Democratic congressional dinner—893
Radio address—871
Surgeon General-designate Henry Foster—900, 910
White House Conference on Character Building for a Civil and Democratic Society—872
White House Conference on Trade and Investment in Ireland—901, 909
White House Photographers Association dinner—882
Women's Bureau reception—867

Bill Signings

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, remarks—884

Communications to Congress

Aeronautics and space, message transmitting report—897
Bosnia, letter reporting—898
Romania, message transmitting report on trade—889
Small business, message reporting—905

Communications to Federal Agencies

Romania, memorandum on trade—888

Executive Orders

Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses—911

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Oval Office—910
Rose Garden—900
News conference, May 23 (No. 96)—889

Letters and Messages

National Missing Children's Day—897

Proclamations

National Maritime Day—870
To Modify Duty-Free Treatment Under the Generalized System of Preferences and for Other Purposes—886
World Trade Week—887

Statements by the President

Les Aspin—882, 884
National Voter Registration Act of 1993, anniversary—882
U.N./NATO decision to launch airstrikes in Bosnia—905

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—914
Checklist of White House press releases—914
Digest of other White House announcements—913
Nominations submitted to the Senate—913

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.*

Remarks at the Women's Bureau Reception

May 19, 1995

Thank you very much. I was sitting here listening to my marvelous wife speak, and I was thinking, you know, I've been seeing her lately long distance, on Oprah Winfrey and on the ''Morning Show'' this morning, and I thought, boy, I'm glad she lives here. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Secretary Reich and the Women's Bureau Director, Karen Nussbaum. She has done a wonderful job. I am very grateful to her and to him. I want to say a special word of appreciation to the people who sponsored this event today: from American Home Products, the senior vice president, Fred Hassan, and the corporate secretary, Carol Emerling. Let's give them a hand for what they did. [*Applause*] There are many distinguished women leaders here today, but I do want to recognize one person who has been a friend of mine for more than 20 years now, Congresswoman Eddie Bernice Johnson, from Texas. We're glad to see you. Thank you very much for being here.

You know, the concerns of working women are one of the few subjects that I didn't have to be educated about—[*laughter*]—because I grew up with them. I lived with my grandparents till I was 4, and my grandmother was a working woman from the 1930's on. In the little town where I was born, an awful lot of the women, both white and black, who lived in poor families or near-poor families worked as a matter of course. No one gave much thought to it one way or the other. My mother was a working woman from the 1940's on, beginning shortly after I was old enough to at least crawl around on my own. And it certainly never occurred to me from the first day that I met Hillary that she would do anything other than pursue her career. [*Laughter*] As a matter of fact, I spent the first 2 or 3 years of our relationship trying to talk her out of it because I thought it would be bad for her career. But it's worked out all right for her, I think. [*Laughter*]

You know, 75 years ago a reception like this would not have taken place. In 1920, women had less than one in five jobs in this economy and, as Hillary said, were only then gaining the right to vote. When she said, ''In 25 years from now, the President and her husband would open the time capsule,'' I looked at Karen and Bob and said, ''If the demographic trends continue, the percentages will almost mandate a woman President.'' [*Laughter*] Karen said, ''Yes, if they vote their own interests.'' [*Laughter*] To which I replied, ''We should give them every opportunity.'' [*Laughter*]

When the Women's Bureau was born, it was designed then to improve the lot of women in the work force by fighting for fair wages and expanding opportunities for education and training and protecting women physically at work.

Those folks 75 years ago, I think, would be surprised at how far we've come. Hundreds of women here celebrate the progress that we have made in all walks of American life. I'm proud that in this administration we have six women Cabinet Secretaries, twice as many as has ever served in any Cabinet of the President before. Over 40 percent of our appointees have been women, and a far higher percentage of women have been appointed to the bench and to major Federal positions than previous administrations. Two of these appointees are former Directors of the Women's Bureau: Esther Peterson, the U.S. Representative to the U.N. General Assembly, and the Assistant to the President for Public Liaison, Alexis Herman, who is here with six other Directors of the Women's Bureau. Let's give them all a hand here. [*Applause*]

All of you represent women across this country who work long hours, do your best to raise your families, and contribute to your

communities. Extraordinary working women today are doing their best to hold our country together, our communities together, and frankly, our hard-pressed middle class together. They deserve our admiration, our respect, and most importantly, our support.

I ran for office in large measure because I was afraid that having won the cold war, we might squander the peace and the victory; that having struggled so hard to make the American dream available to other people around the world, we might lose it for large numbers of our people here at home as we move into the 21st century and the global economy, the technological revolution opening all of us to unbelievable pressures and changes which can be good or difficult.

I believe that my job is, first, to provide for the security of the American people; secondly, to give people the tools they need to help themselves live up to their God-given potential; and thirdly, to try to create as many opportunities as I possibly can.

In a way, the first major piece of legislation I signed as President, which had been bouncing around here for 7 years and had suffered through two vetoes, was emblematic of all three of those objectives. It was the family and medical leave law.

Not very long ago, I was home for a couple of days and I went back to my old church, and a lady I didn't know came up to me and said, ''I really want to thank you. I know we're not supposed to talk about politics at church, but I don't really think this is politics. I got cancer, and I had to take some time off and deal with it, and my husband had to take some time off and work with me. And neither one of us lost our jobs, and we're both back working now. And it wouldn't have happened if it hadn't been for the family and medical leave law.''

I am proud of the fact that we have moved aggressively to immunize all of our children under the age of 2; to enroll every pregnant woman and infant in the country who needs it in the Women, Infants and Children Program for nutrition; to expand Head Start and lift the standards in our schools and expand apprenticeship programs for young people who don't go on to universities; and something which will make a big difference in the lives of young women in the future, to dramatically expand and make more affordable loans to go to college.

But there is much, much more to be done. I am proud of the fact that last year the Small Business Administration cut its budget but expanded loans to women entrepreneurs by 85 percent in one year—I might add, without reducing loans to qualified males. [*Laughter*] We expanded for everybody.

But I think it's important that we recognize that women in the workplace are caught in a lot of cross-currents today, because all American workers, or at least more than half of us, are working longer hours for the same or lower pay that we were making 10 years ago. And therefore, more and more parents are working harder for the same or less and spending less time with their children. Women feel this pressure very deeply insofar as they have either sole, primary, or even just half of the responsibility for taking care of their children as well as earning a living. Because male workers over the age of 45, on average, have lost 14 percent of their earning power in the last 10 years, women in the work force and in the home feel the anxiety of their husband's sense of loss and insecurity and frustration and anger.

What is causing all this, and what are we to do about it? Well, what is causing it all is the impact of the global economy and the dramatic revolution in technology on our society, opening up all kinds of new changes in ways that are perfectly wonderful if you can access them but terrifying if you cannot. For example—we don't have the figures yet on '94, but I think '94 will confirm '93's trend—in 1993 we had the largest number of new businesses started in America in any year in history and the largest number of new millionaires in America in any year in history. And that is a good thing. That is a good thing. And that is happening because so many of us are now able to access the world of the future. Many of you in this room are part of the trend toward a brighter, bigger, broader tomorrow.

But there is also a fault line in our society that is splitting the middle class apart, putting unbearable pressures on families, making them less secure and making them less able to live up to the fullest of their abilities. You know it, and I know it.

That's why the family and medical leave law was important. If people are going to be working for smaller companies, not bigger ones, and moving around, at least they ought to know they can take some time off without losing a job if there's someone sick in their family or if a baby is born or some other emergency arises. That's why it was important.

That's why the efforts of the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education to create a fabric, a seamless fabric, of lifelong learning, whenever people lose their jobs or feel that they're underemployed, it's terribly important.

And that's why I believe it is especially important to women that we raise the minimum wage this year. Women represent three out of five minimum wage workers but only half the work force.

I have done everything I could to create a climate in which people are encouraged to choose work over welfare, in which people are encouraged to be successful parents and successful workers. I believe that. That's what the earned-income tax credit was all about in 1993. Let me tell you what that meant: That meant this year that the average family of four with an income under $27,000 got a $1,000 tax cut below what they paid before this administration came into office. And it means 3 years from now, if the Congress will stick with it and not repeal it, we will be able to say that no one who works full-time and has children at home, when they go home from work, will live below the poverty line. That is the best war against welfare we could wage.

But it isn't enough. If we do not raise the minimum wage this year, next year it will be, in real dollar terms, the lowest it has been in 40 years. Now that is not my idea of what the 21st century American economy is all about. I want a smart-work, high-wage economy, not a hard-work, low-wage economy. And the working women of America and their children and their husbands deserve it is well.

You know, I don't get to watch a lot of kind of extra television, but the other night, just by accident, I was watching a news program where a special was being done on the minimum wage. And I don't even know if it was a national program or one of the State networks around here, but they went down South to a town that had a lot of minimum wage workers. And they went in this plant to interview a remarkable woman who worked in this plant at a minimum wage. And they said to this lady, "You know, your employer says, if we raise the minimum wage, that they'll either have to lay people off or put more money into machinery and reduce their employment long-term. What do you say to that?" I could not have written the script. [*Laughter*] This lady sort of threw her shoulders back and looked into the eyes of the television reporter and said, "Honey, I'll take my chances." [*Laughter*]

If we are going to bring our budget deficit into balance, which will be good for all of us, if we are going to have to over a period of years cut back on expenditures that the Government used to make, that makes it even more important for people who do go out into the private sector and work full-time, play by the rules, and want to make their own way without public assistance, to be rewarded for that work. This is a huge issue.

One other thing I want to say that must be done this year: The Secretary of Labor has taken the initiative in trying to consolidate a lot of these various job-training programs into a fund from which you can get a check or a voucher, if you're unemployed or underemployed, to take to the local community college or the training institution of your choice to get permanent reeducation opportunities for a lifetime. And we ought to do that.

I'd like to close by introducing someone who was a working woman, who was a particular influence in my life at an early time. The people who sponsored this event invited me to pick someone to participate, and so I picked this person. Lonnie Luebben was my 11th grade honors English teacher. And I believe that I was in the first class she taught, but anyway, she looked awful young at the time—[*laughter*]—and she still does. She had a remarkable way of making literature come to life. And one of the most memorable trips I ever took in my life—I still remember—it was the first time I ever went to the wild mountains of the Ozarks in north Arkansas, along the river that was

the first river Congress, over 20 years ago, set aside in the national wild rivers act. They thought it was the wildest of all the rivers in the United States. [*Laughter*] And we explored caves that still had ammunition stored from the Civil War. We talked to mountain people who had never been more than 20 miles away from home. It was one of the most remarkable experiences I have ever had. She taught me a great deal about American folklore and literature and life. And just before we walked out here, she gave me a contribution for the time capsule, the textbook with which she taught our class so many years ago.

So if you will forgive me, I would like to close this event by asking my teacher to come up here and accept my thanks for being a working woman over 30 years ago. Thank you very much.

Again, let me thank American Home Products. Let me thank all of you for coming. Let me thank Congresswoman Eddie Bernice Johnson. And I've just been told that Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey is also here somewhere; thank you. There she is, the heroine of the State of the Union Address.

I thank you all. Please stay around. Have a good time. We're delighted to see you. Goodbye. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:38 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, at a 75th anniversary celebration of the Department of Labor's Women's Bureau. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Proclamation 6803—National Maritime Day, 1995

May 19, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

The United States owes much to our merchant sailors. At our Nation's beginning, these outstanding citizens opened new avenues of commerce and helped nurture a fledgling democracy into a beacon of freedom for people around the world. Since President Franklin D. Roosevelt first proclaimed National Maritime Day 62 years ago, the U.S. Merchant Marine has built on its legacy of patriotism. Its great tradition of courage and valor is an inspiration to all Americans.

This year, as we honor those who served and sacrificed for our Nation during World War II, the contributions of the U.S. Merchant Marine are a special source of pride. We will always remember the heroism of those mariners and the dangers they faced to protect our liberty.

America's Merchant Marine and civilian seafarers have put themselves at risk time and again to support our Armed Forces. They provided pivotal service during OPERATION DESERT STORM, during America's humanitarian mission in Somalia, and throughout OPERATION RESTORE DEMOCRACY in Haiti.

Today, our country remains determined to maintain a strong U.S. flag presence on the high seas, a commitment central to advancing our Nation's national and economic security. I urge Americans to join efforts in support of maritime revitalization legislation and our ongoing shipbuilding production program. Americans' pioneering spirit has endowed our Nation with the most innovative maritime technologies and the most skilled innovative maritime technologies and the most skilled maritime labor force on Earth. Working together, we can preserve this critical advantage for generations to come.

In recognition of the importance of the U.S. Merchant Marine, the Congress, by a joint resolution approved May 20, 1933, has designated May 22 of each year as ''National Maritime Day'' and has authorized and requested the President to issue annually a proclamation calling for its appropriate observance.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim May 22, 1995, as National Maritime Day. I urge the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities and by displaying the flag of the United States at their homes and in their communities. I also request that all ships sailing under the American flag dress ship on that day.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:24 a.m., May 22, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on May 23. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

May 20, 1995

Good morning. Today the Secretary of the Treasury, who oversees the Secret Service, will announce that from now on the two blocks of Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House will be closed to motor vehicle traffic.

Pennsylvania Avenue has been routinely open to traffic for the entire history of our Republic. Through four Presidential assassinations and eight unsuccessful attempts on the lives of Presidents, it's been open. Through a civil war, two world wars, and the Gulf war, it was open. But now it must be closed. This decision follows a lengthy review by the Treasury Department, the Secret Service, and independent experts, including distinguished Americans who served in past administrations of both Democratic and Republican Presidents.

This step is necessary in the view of the Director of the Secret Service and the panel of experts to protect the President and his family, the White House itself, all the staff and others who work here, and the visitors and distinguished foreign and domestic guests who come here every day.

The Secret Service risk their lives to protect the President and his family. For 130 years, they have stood watch over the people and the institutions of our democracy. They are the best in the world at what they do. Though I am reluctant to accept any decision that might inconvenience the people who work or visit our Nation's Capital, I believe it would be irresponsible to ignore their considered opinion or to obstruct their decisions about the safety of our public officials, especially given the strong supporting voice of the expert panel.

Clearly, this closing is necessary because of the changing nature and scope of the threat of terrorist actions. It should be seen as a responsible security step necessary to preserve our freedom, not part of a long-term restriction of our freedom.

First, let me make it clear that I will not in any way allow the fight against domestic and foreign terrorism to build a wall between me and the American people. I will be every bit as active and in touch with ordinary American citizens as I have been since I took office. Pennsylvania Avenue may be closed to cars and trucks, but it will remain open to the people of America. If you want to visit the White House, you can still do that just as you always could, and I hope you will. If you want to have your picture taken out in front of the White House, please do so. If you want to come here and protest our country's policies, you are still welcome to do that as well. And now you will be more secure in all these activities because it will be less likely that you could become an innocent victim of those who would do violence against symbols of our democracy.

Closing Pennsylvania Avenue to motor vehicles is a practical step to protect against the kind of attack we saw in Oklahoma City, but I won't allow the people's access to the White House and their President to be curtailed. The two blocks of Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House will be converted into a pedestrian mall. Free and public tours will continue as they always have. For most Americans, this won't change much beyond the traffic patterns here in Washington. For people who work in Washington, DC, we will work hard to reroute the traffic in cooperation with local officials in the least burdensome way possible.

Now let's think for a minute about what this action says about the danger terrorism poses to the openness of our society or to any free society. The fact that the Secret Service feels compelled to close Pennsylvania Avenue is an important reminder that we have to come together as a people and hold

fast against the divisive tactics of violent extremists.

We saw in the awful tragedy of Oklahoma City and the bombing of the World Trade Center that America, as an open and free society, is not immune from terrorists from within and beyond our borders who believe they have a right to kill innocent civilians to pursue their own political ends or to protest other policies. Such people seek to instill fear in our citizens, in our whole people. But when we are all afraid to get on a bus or drive to work or open an envelope or send our children off to school, when our children are fixated on the possibility of terrorist action against them or other innocent children, we give terrorists a victory. That kind of corrosive fear could rust our national spirit, drain our will, and wear away our freedom.

These are the true stakes in our war against terrorism. We cannot allow ourselves to be frightened or intimidated into a bunker mentality. We cannot allow our sacred freedoms to wither or diminish. We cannot allow the paranoia and conspiracy theories of extreme militants to dominate our society.

What we do today is a practical step to preserve freedom and peace of mind. It should be seen as a step in a long line of efforts to improve security in the modern world that began with the installation of airport metal detectors. I remember when that started, and a lot of people thought that it might be seen as a restriction on our freedom. But most of us take it for granted now, and, after all, hijackings have gone way down. The airport metal detectors increased the freedom of the American people, and so can this.

But more must be done to reduce the threat of terrorism, to deter terrorism. First, Congress must pass my antiterrorism legislation. We mustn't let our country fight the war against terrorism ill-armed or ill-prepared. I want us to be armed with 1,000 more FBI agents. I want the ability to monitor high-tech communications among far-flung terrorists. I want to be able to have our people learn their plans before they strike. That's the key. Congress can give us these tools by passing the antiterrorism bill before them. And they should do it now. Congressional leaders pledged to pass this bill by Memorial Day, in the wake of the terrible bombing in Oklahoma City. This is a commitment Congress must keep.

On a deeper level, we must all fight terrorism by fighting the fear that terrorists sow. Today the Secret Service is taking a necessary precaution, but let no one mistake: We will not relinquish our fundamental freedoms. We will secure the personal safety of all Americans to live and move about as they please, to think and to speak as they please, to follow their beliefs and their conscience, as our Founding Fathers intended.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 9:28 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m.

Remarks at the White House Conference on Character Building for a Civil and Democratic Society

May 20, 1995

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Dr. Etzioni. Thank you for that introduction and for the inspiration that your work has given to me and to so many others, for your wonderful book, "The Spirit of Community," and for working on this as hard as you have. I'd like to say a special word of thanks to one of the cofounders of this network—he's been a member of the White House staff since I became President—Bill Galston, for his constant inspiration and prodding to me. I'd like to thank the Secretary of Education and Tom Payzant, the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, for what they have done to try to promote character education as a part of the larger strategy toward a new communitarian vision for our country.

You know, from the time I began thinking about how we would get into the 21st century, and long before I even thought of running for President, it seemed to me that the—there were three words which were inextricably linked, as if you think about America moving into the future: opportunity, responsibility, and community. Those were the three words that basically were at the heart of my campaign for President and have been at the heart of what I have tried to do as

President. I also believe that Government cannot do these things for America. I believe that we have to have, in a complicated, open, pluralistic society like this one, a great network of people working together in every major important center of our society. And that's what I want to talk to you about today.

I'd like to begin with a few comments about the most obvious recent event that, in terms of your Government's action, that you must have noticed when you came in today, which is that I have approved of the Secretary of the Treasury's decision to close the two blocks of Pennsylvania Avenue just here in front of the White House to vehicular traffic.

I did this reluctantly. Pennsylvania Avenue has been open to ordinary traffic since the beginning of our Republic. I did it after an extensive review by the Secret Service, the Treasury Department officials, and a distinguished independent panel of American experts who have served in administrations of both the Democratic and Republican Presidents, all recommending that this be done. They believe it is necessary to protect the President and his family, the structure of the White House, the hundreds of people who work there, and the people who come and visit there, both on official business and as ordinary citizens. They believe it is necessary to protect the White House against the kind of attacks that were sustained in Oklahoma City.

Now, I want to emphasize a couple of things about this. First of all, access to the White House itself will not be limited. The area will be converted into a pedestrian mall, and people will be able to visit as they always have. They'll be able to have their picture taken out front with cardboard figures as they always have. [*Laughter*] They'll able to go to Lafayette Park and protest against the President as they always have. And indeed, they will be able to do that more protected themselves from becoming innocent victims of those who would seek to destroy the symbols of our freedom. We also will be working with the local officials here to make every effort to reroute the traffic in a way that minimizes inconvenience and disruption to the lives of those who live in or work in Washington, DC.

Our society, as an open society, is, as we saw with Japan and the terrible incident in the Japanese subway, vulnerable to the forces of organized destruction from within and beyond our borders. And we must take reasonable precautions against them, not to restrict our freedom but to secure it. And as technology changes the opportunity for organized destruction, we have to respond to that.

I think the American people should see this in the same context that they viewed metal detectors in airports. Do you remember when they started? There were those who say "Oh, this is a big infringement on our freedom." But most of us now are only too happy to go through those metal detectors because we see that there are a lot fewer hijackings. And so it is a way of preserving our freedom by changing to meet the changing realities that technology and time give for the expression of organized destruction. And we should view it in that way.

But we should also recognize that our job is to minimize the fear that can seep into a society. That's one of the reasons that Hillary and I wanted to have the program we had with the children after Oklahoma City, because we were worried about children all across America and especially, of course, children in Oklahoma being literally fixated on these events and their vulnerability to such things.

So, it's important to put them in a larger context. And in that sense, it's also important to prevent such things from happening whenever we can. This is a preventive action we're taking today.

I have asked Congress to pass this anti-terrorism legislation to give me both people and technological tools—not to me but to me being the United States, to us—to deal with the technological and organizational realities of the modern terrorist threat so that we can prevent these things from happening more and more and more. And the leaders of Congress have pledged to pass that legislation by Memorial Day. It is a commitment I hope they will keep because we need the legislation in preventive ways.

Now, what's that got to do with what we're doing here today? The strength of our society is far more than our ability to stop bad things from happening and to punish wrongdoers

when they do such things. This country is still around today after more than 200 years as the most successful, vibrant democracy in all of human history, not because we could stop bad things from happening, although that was important. If the Civil War had turned out differently, we wouldn't be here today as a country. If Hitler had been allowed to prevail in Europe, it would be a very different world today. So stopping bad things from happening is quite important; it shouldn't be minimized.

But the fundamental strength of America, and the real reason we're here after more than 200 years, is not our capacity to stop bad things from happening but our ability to do good and, indeed, our ability to be good. De Tocqueville said, ''America is great because America is good.''

So, the truly great things about our country involve the literally billions of actions that are now taken by our 250 plus million citizens every day of the world. They get up, they go about their business, and most of them do the very best they can to be responsible, first of all, as individuals and then to be responsible for their families, to be responsible at work, to be successful members of their community, to be good citizens.

Most of our fellow citizens do everything they're supposed to do pretty much when they're supposed to do it, even things they find most distasteful, like paying their taxes. It has long been observed by—I know that when I was a young law student taking tax law—and it gave me a headache. I just couldn't stand it. I hated the course, all those rules and regulations. When it was all said and done—the professor said at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the course, ''Now, remember, in spite of all these rules and regulations that no one can keep up with and hardly anyone understands, the real thing that makes this work is that you live in a good country where most people just get up and, on their own, do the right thing because they think this is part of the obligation of citizenship.'' It made a deep impression on me.

So, I think that when we view the problems of America today, and there are plenty of them—the intolerance, the increasing divisiveness of political forces, the seeming two-edged sword of the information revolution where more and more information seems to be organized to harm instead of to enlighten, to divide instead of unite—when we look at all of this, we have to see it against the background of the fundamental fact that this is a very great country full of very good people and almost all of us get up every day and do what we're supposed to do as best we can; that there are new and different challenges we face today that put extreme pressure on us in trying to do good and be good, pressure in the family, pressure in the workplace, pressure in the community and in the larger society; that we are trying to cope with economic and social stresses and with the exposure to all kinds of forces in a complex modern world that we often were not exposed to in the past and that none of—some of us had never been exposed to before.

And I think that the real trick is how we can keep the basic values that have made our country great and take advantage of the modern world with all the things that are different. That has always been the genius of America, to preserve what is right there in the Constitution and to take it throughout history. We know that we are capable of doing it unanimously. What we're really all afraid of is that somehow we'll be undone either by some small minority of us who do wrong and force all the rest of us into a way of living that is so radically different from what's been before that we don't preserve what's uniquely American, or we're afraid that all these forces will upset the internal balance in so many of us that we will lose our way.

And yet, we know that fundamentally we shouldn't be pessimistic about it, and we're reminded of it every time something bad happens in America. When we had a 500-year flood in the Middle West or that massive earthquake in California or the World Trade Center bombing or the horrible, horrible tragedy of Oklahoma City, you see not only the loss and the evil and the darkness, you also see the fundamental goodness of the American people. These people everywhere just stop what they're doing and show up to help.

I remember when they had that awful hurricane in Florida and I went down there. The

first guy I met was an independent trucker from Michigan, who literally canceled all of his runs, stopped all of his business, and filled his one big semi truck and brought it all the way to Florida—stopped his whole life. And he was just a single business person who was not like me, an employee of the Federal Government who could maybe get time off. He risked everything just because—[*laughter*]—he risked everything just because it was the right thing to do. Here was this guy showing up and happy as a clam, didn't have any idea what was going to happen when he went back to Michigan, how he was going to put it back together. He was happy doing something for other people, consistent with his personal values and what he had learned in his family and church and what he had imparted to his children.

Now, the question is, how can we preserve the traditional values and how can we find at least a measure of the fulfillment in doing right and good things in ordinary life that we find when disaster strikes? Is there something endemic to the modern world or human nature that says that we can't do that? I don't think so. But we plainly live in a world that is changing so fast, where people are exposed to so many forces, that the ties that bind us are stretched more than there were in the world in which I grew up. I don't think there's any question about that. The opportunities for individuals to have their internal equilibrium upset are far greater today than they were a generation ago.

It's important not to romanticize the past, however. Remember what Will Rogers said about that? ''Don't tell me about the good ole' days; they never was.'' It's important not to romanticize the past. While I grew up in a society which was much more stable and where I didn't have anything like the kind of forces bearing down on me that teenagers do today, when I was a child I also lived in a segregated society in which a huge number of people my age were never going to be given any opportunities that I took for granted. So it is important for us not to overly romanticize the past but also to recognize that the present is changing so fast and people are exposed to so many different things that it is very, very difficult to build the kind of coherent, character-based society that builds both individual and social responsibility and gives people the necessary balance between stability and change that allows you to live the fullest possible, most rewarding life and to have a society that is both growing and vibrant and stable. I think we all recognize that as a sort of central challenge of this time.

And I think what happens when a big disaster occurs, everybody throws off all the things that are bothering them and gets back to basics. People stop looking at each other as people of different races or religions or philosophical positions or political parties and realize that there is a common humanity there after all. The trick will be to manage our differences on a daily basis in a way that recognizes our common humanity and to find organized ways to stamp out the social evils that are consuming us, without doing away with our personal freedoms. And I believe that we can do these things. I believe that sometimes we throw up our hands too much in the face of all the difficulties that we have. But we have to identify what the problems are and move on them.

I also believe that the central insight of what Dr. Etzioni has done is important to emphasize here. Everyone has a role to play. And we can solve this in a free and open society, not by any Governmental policy but by Government, like every other part of society, playing its own role.

If we could start with some of the problems that are disintegrating forces in our society, I would like to focus on some that we don't often focus on, and those are the economic ones. We all know we have too much crime and violence and drugs and family breakdown. And I don't mean to minimize those things; they are profoundly important. But we are aware and sensitive to those things. I want you also to think about things that may be more pedestrian but also are reinforcing the problem that we come here to talk about.

The average American today is working a longer work week and spending fewer hours with his or her children than they were 25 years ago, for the same or lower wages they were making 15 years ago. Literally 60 percent of the American work force is making the same or less, when you adjust for infla-

tion, than they were making 15 years ago and working harder and spending less time with their children than they were 25 years ago. Family income has gone up in many places only because there are now two workers in the family.

There is also in our country a feeling that there is much less security because more and more people are changing their jobs. The census tells us that there's been about a 14 percent decline in earnings for men between the ages of 55 and 65—excuse me, 45 and 55. It could have something to do with the so-called angry white male phenomenon. So that when people reach the peak of what they thought was going to be their—not only their earning capacity but their ability to have a profound and positive impact on their families and on their society, their communities, many of them now are at a vulnerable period when they're having to deal with changes that they took for granted when they were in their 20's but never expected to have to face all over again in their 40's or early 50's. This is a profound thing.

So that we at least thought when we started out in life we'd have different kinds of things to feel anxieties about as we got older. I mean, just getting older is bad enough. [*Laughter*] And now, we're having to feel anxieties about things that we thought would be behind us as a people into our 40's and 50's. This is a profound thing. No one has really studied the implications this has for citizenship and why more and more people may be vulnerable to siren songs of resentment that divide us instead of unite us.

I'm telling you, there are millions of people that go home every night and sit down at the dinner table and look across the table at their families and wonder whether they have failed them, when all they ever did was show up for work, because of the way the global economy has impacted on them in this society. This is a significant thing.

And when you combine that with the fact that there is so much mobility in this society, much more than ever before, it is more difficult for many of these people to get the kind of support networks they need in their communities because a lot of folks live in communities where neighbors don't know their neighbors anymore. And if there's a high crime rate in the community, they don't have any way to get to know them.

So that all these things need to be seen in that context. There is a great deal of uncertainty out there, which makes people yearn for certainty but also makes them vulnerable to the wrong kind of certainty, certainty that pits people against one another instead of gives them a way to say, ''Here are my problems; what are your problems? Let's get together and figure out how to solve them.''

So I think that the sense of, literally, physical instability so many adults feel make it more difficult to hold our society together and make it more difficult to impart the fundamental character strengths and traits, and the accompanying security of knowing that you're in the right place in your life, that are essential to a strong society—not an excuse for not doing it, but it's important to understand the context in which we operate here.

Now, one of the things that we have thought about in our administration is that in this environment, when so many of our children are in families that are—at least not traditional families, when their parents are working, working harder and maybe spending less time with them, and when their neighborhoods may be less settled and in many cases less safe, it is more important than it has been, perhaps, in immediately previous years to reemphasize the role of character education in our schools. Something which once was taken for granted as a part of education sort of faded away and, we believe, should be brought back. We know it has to be a supplement for the work that families and communities do, not a replacement. We know there's no substitute for the character lessons that are imparted to people by their parents and grandparents, or for the guidance that a father or mother can bring, or maybe even more importantly, for the sense of security and rootedness that the right kind of relationships within families give us all. But still, I think it's important to recognize that all of our children show up for school sooner or later, and character education can be a vital part of building the kind of society that recognizes responsibilities and has a sense of community.

This is an issue I've been involved with for years. Several years ago in the mid-

eighties, I served on the Carnegie commission for middle school education. There were two Governors on that commission; I had the privilege of being one. The other was the distinguished Republican Governor of New Jersey, Tom Kean. And one of the recommendations we made was that we should teach our children in middle school with specific objectives, to, quote, ''behave ethically and assume the responsibilities of citizenship in a pluralistic society,'' and that we had to connect our schools to our communities, which together share responsibility for each student's success.

When I became President, we started to work on this through the Department of Education. Secretary Riley has helped us to go a good ways toward the right kind of introduction of values into our schools. Everybody knows that education is about more than intellect. Everybody knows, as my mother used to say, there's a lot of smart fools running around in this old world. [*Laughter*] And what we want to do is to build good citizens as well as intelligent people.

We need to learn what it takes to build up and not tear down a society over the long run. So we've worked hard on that. Most of you know that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act contained new authority for programs that foster character education, for us to support them. And in partnership with local communities, we are now making States eligible to compete for grants to help to support the institution of character education programs in local school districts all across the country. I personally long for the day when this is once again a regular part of the curriculum of every school district in the United States. I think it is very, very important.

The safe and drug-free school program, which is one of the things I've been fighting for in this little rescission battle we've got going on here in Washington today, also has specific, explicit efforts in it to create an environment in which children are able to learn and in which we not only make drugs—schools safe and drug-free by negative actions like security device but in which we change the attitudes of children about what is acceptable within the schools, what is acceptable conduct within the schools.

All of you know that there is some evidence out there already that these character education programs really work to lower the drop out and to increase educational performance and to increase good citizenship. It is elementary. It is simple. But I think it is profoundly important that young people be taught that it's important to tell the truth, that's it's important to be trustworthy and for people to be able to rely on you, that's it's important not to abuse the freedom you have by undermining other people's ability to exercise their freedom. They need to be taught certain basic things in the context of the school environment, which is after all, for many of them, the first diverse community they will ever be a part of. So I feel very strongly that this is part of what we ought to be doing, but not all.

I think that, as I said, the fundamental insight that I have gotten about how to do this from Dr. Etzioni is that we have to build networks. And this, as you know, is the second conference on character building we've had where we've welcomed people to the White House. I would very much like to see this institutionalized as an annual event that goes way beyond my administration, that encompasses Republicans and Democrats and that has nothing to do with politics.

Indeed, I think we should view this effort in our country not as bipartisan but as nonpartisan. And we need to think about ways that we can continue to build networks that work together for a generation, because a lot of our problems were a generation in coming and they're going to be a generation in going, and because there is nothing we can do that will stop the world from changing as quickly as it is, so we're going to have to work harder and harder to think of ways that keep the ties that bind. Therefore, I believe this should become a permanent fixture of our national dialog.

I would like to also, from my point of view, take this up a notch in the present time because of the dimensions of our challenges. On June 21st, I'm going to invite leaders to come here from all around the country to listen to each other, to open a dialog, to try to find common ground on our great social challenges of the day, and to talk about what it would take to build not only good character

but good citizenship from people individually and in groups, and to see whether or not we can accelerate this dialog throughout the country. I am going to ask academic and business leaders, religious leaders, media people, people from the sports community, people from other aspects of the private sector, and of course, Government folks, to try to build the kind of partnership that I think is necessary.

James Madison once said that all governments required virtue of their citizens, but democracies needed it more than other kinds of government. And I believe that. Some of you may know that Hillary is now working on a book about the responsibilities we owe to our children. The title will come from that old African proverb, it takes a whole village to raise a child.

Now, I ask you to think about this—and I would like to make some closing remarks about where I'm going with this June 21st conference and invite you to give me your ideas about it. I think that in the world we are living in, it will take a lot of people, and not just Government programs, to keep our children off the streets and in school. It will take every parent, teacher, friend, and loved one we can find to teach children, given all their different circumstances in America today, the differences between right and wrong and to give them the kind of self-esteem they need to do well in a troubled world, to say no to the right things but also to figure out what to say yes to, which in the end is the basis of the quality of life we all live.

And I am absolutely convinced, as I have watched the patterns of life in our society, that as people go through different stages in their lives or they're in different places in society, most of them are not most influenced by Government, there are other forces which are influencing them, and that we all have to pull together if we're going to have any hope of succeeding in this enterprise.

If you look at business, for example—I mentioned the economic changes—I had to fight like crazy for the family and medical leave law. It had already been passed by Congress twice and vetoed twice by well-meaning people who thought that—business people said, "Oh, the world will come to an end if the family medical leave law passes." But it cannot be, if you think about it, first and foremost, it cannot be that a society where the economic forces require most adults to work—women and men, even parents of very young children—it cannot be that a good society can be built unless people can succeed as both workers and parents. If we cannot succeed as workers, then our standard of living will fall and everything that we think about America will begin to be eroded. But if we don't succeed as parents, then we'll have a lot of people with money and miserable lives. And we have too many people in this country today, not only poor people but people who aren't poor, who have miserable lives.

So, the first and most fundamental thing we have to say is, how are people going to succeed as workers and as parents? The Government can do the family and medical leave law, but that's just the first step. How can you justify the fact that most people are working harder for less money when business profits are up and corporations are up? We had record numbers of new millionaires last year. I like that, by the way. I don't think wealth formation is bad. I think it's good. But the thing that holds a democratic society together is that everybody gets their fair share.

In the 12 years before I became President—this has nothing to do with Government policies, nearly as I can determine—executive salaries went up 4 times as much as workers' salaries went up in major American corporations and 3 times as much as corporate profits went up. And you can say, "Well, labor's not worth as much as it used to be because technology means fewer people can do more with less." That may be, but all those people are still people. They have children to raise. They have mortgages to pay. They have problems to confront.

One of the companies that I really admire in this country today has set up a system in which both the workers and the executives get paid based on the performance of the company. So that when the company does well, the workers have just a big a gain as the executives. And if the company has a bad turn, the executives have to take an even bigger hit percentage wise than the workers. Now, that the kind—they also have as part

of their bonus program a $2,000 a year grant to every child of every employee in the company that goes to college. They have one person that sent 11 kids to college working for that company. The only reason I'm not telling you who the company is, is I don't want every person with six or more children in America to go apply for work there. [*Laughter*]

But don't you see? Here is a company that says, ''Okay, we want to make money. We want to do well. We think we can do right and do well. We want a—we believe we'll make more money if the people working for us know they can make more money if the company does well.'' This is part of citizenship. I'm not suggesting the Government should mandate this. I'm talking about partnerships, networking, community, open and honest discussion. But first and foremost, most of the work of building character in America is going to be done in the family, and you must make it possible for people to succeed as parents and workers. So, that should be a part of this debate.

Now, the media has a responsibility here. We have tough choices to make as a country. People need to know the facts that will shape their future—important for adults, important for children. Let me give you an example: Weekly Reader is launching a new project to teach the value of citizenship to young children through stories. That's a good thing. That's the sort of thing the media can do. I'm not suggesting the Government should mandate it, but we should talk about it. Nobody should feel threatened or feel like we're trying to encroach on the first amendment by discussing the power on social behavior that the media has. We should be able to discuss it without anybody being defensive about it.

Here in Washington, we are facing difficult but important issues of public policy. We have two huge deficits from a public policy point of view. We've got a Government budget deficit, which is much lower than it was when I became President, but it's too big. And we do need, in a global economy, a balanced budget because we don't want to be more dependent than we have to be on outside forces and we want to be able to invest in our future. But we also have a big education deficit and training deficit compared to many other countries and compared to what we need for America to be the strongest and greatest economy in the world in the 21st century.

So, we've got a big, tough decision here. How are we going to solve one without undermining the other? Can we do both at the same time? If so, how? Now, this can immediately dissolve into a huge political screaming match in which one party sticks up for one, the other sticks up for the other, everybody gets reelected at election time, and nobody gets anything done. That would not be good. What we need to do is to figure out how we can reach across the divides to a common consensus that will permit us to pursue both these objectives at the same time.

The American people are ready for some tough decisions and difficult medicine, but they want to know that it's fair and sensible and what's down there at the end of the road. And to do it, we need to get information in a way that is not designed to divide us but is designed to shed more light than heat. And it is a very difficult thing, but very important.

Religious and community institutions have an important role to play. You know, if every church in America—every church in America—had not only a vigorous program for its own members and the people it's recruiting but also an outreach to a fixed number of families and children to fight the problems of out-of-wedlock birth, teen pregnancy, drug addiction, school dropout—if every single church had just a fixed and reasonable number of kids it was targeting, it might have more impact than all the Government programs we could ever devise.

This is the most religious country in the world. We have the largest number of churches, the most diverse group of people worshiping in different kinds of religions. And again, it's not for the Government to require this, but it's worth talking about. Because there is a great debate today in the religious community about whether the best thing you can do for society to make it better is go out and try to actually work with people who are in trouble and make them better individually, or to simply make political prescriptions that everyone else should follow

and if they do, fine, and if they don't, we'll wait for the next election.

So, I think this is a debate we ought to have. Because—I have no objection, by the way, to the political debate, and I have encouraged the people of faith who come to different political conclusions than I have to be a part of the debate. I don't think that's bad. But I think we are not purely either political animals, people who go to work, or churchgoers. We also have community responsibilities and opportunities. And the organized churches of this country can have a big impact on changing the lives of people and improving the character of people and the prospects of people today in the country. And many do, many do. If all did, it would make a big difference in our ability to move forward on common ground.

If you think about—let me mention the entertainment industry. There's been a lot said about that, and I got a big standing ovation at the State of the Union from both Republican and Democratic Members of Congress when I talked about the damage that comes to our society from incessant, repetitive, mindless violence coming through entertainment. There are lots of studies showing that young people tend to get numbed to violence and to the consequences of it from constant overexposure to it. And I say this not to point the finger at anybody. I have enjoyed more than my fair share of what I would call cheap thrills movies in my time. So I am not being sanctimonious about this. I'm just saying it is an established fact that if children from very early ages are exposed to huge volumes of a certain kind of entertainment, it desensitizes them to the same sort of conduct in the real world. There's lots of evidence about that.

And that's why, frankly, I welcome the networks' recent efforts to reduce prime-time violence and why I would applaud the decision that Time-Warner announced this week to set standards for controversial music and to balance creative expression with corporate responsibility. And I applaud the efforts of Bill Bennett, who was here yesterday, to get that done. The country owes him a debt of gratitude, and we should applaud Time-Warner, as well.

The Children's Educational Television Act—Television Education Act was passed back in 1990. I think there is more to do here. We need—the broadcasters need to read that act again and adhere to its spirit as well as to its letters. We should be thinking twice before movies and rap music that celebrate violence against women or law enforcement officers are put out there in huge volume, in piling one on top of one another. There is a connection, in this sense, between words and deeds. We do get dulled of that to which we are overexposed in a banalizing way.

Let me finally say that I think politicians have a responsibility here. And instead of criticizing others, let me start with myself. If you want to be an elected official in a democracy you must, first of all, get people to identify with you more than your opponent. And you must say, ''Here are the differences between us, and here's what I stand for. Here are the choices we face, and here are the decisions I would make. And here is why I would make those decisions.'' So in that sense, conflict and difference and dividing up the electorate are the essence of politics.

But there is a big difference between division and difference of opinion and destruction and demonization. And there is a big difference between difference and dehumanization. Let me just begin—let me just—I'll start with me, because this is something I've been through in the last few weeks.

I know that I—I don't know of a politician that hasn't done this that's been around very long, but I don't know how many times that I have made references to Government bureaucrats, right? Because when a politician stands up and says something about Government bureaucrats, 99 times out of 100, the word is used in a pejorative sense, right? And it's used to remind you of the fact that the person you've elected is not really a part of the Government, he's a part of you, that he's more like a tax payer than a tax consumer. And we know you resent paying your taxes, and we know you think a lot of it is wasted. And so, if we who are elected talk about Government bureaucrats, you'll know we're still on your side, even though we're living over here on the other side.

You know what I'm talking about. Now, almost—first of all, there is some individual truth to all this. That is, there is hardly an American living who hasn't had some encounter with the Government that was distasteful, right? [*Laughter*] Because as long as people are running the Government, they will be like people running churches, people running businesses, people running whatever it is you do: People are imperfect, and they'll mess up, and when they do, they drive other people up the wall.

But the Government has a special relationship to people because it has the power of law behind it. So, almost everybody can remember someone who was at least rude or perhaps a law enforcement official that abused authority on occasion or a tax person who was really unfair or a regulator who was overbearing. Almost everybody has had some experience because we live in a society of human beings where people mess up. So there is some truth to that.

It is also true that at this time, the Government tends to lag the private sector in changes. Sometimes that's good; sometimes that's bad. But it does because the environment in which the Government operates is not as competitive. But that is, we normally have—we have more of a monopoly on income and customers, so it lags. On the other hand, that's not all bad because it helps to be a force of stability too, sometimes, in times of great change. But the Government, in the end, must follow the great trends of the day.

So, must the Government become less bureaucratic, more flexible, more open? Will it be smaller? Will fewer people do more with less? Absolutely. All that will happen. We had to take the size of the Government down. It's already over 100,000 smaller than it was when I became President. We had to get rid of hundreds of programs that just didn't make any sense any more. We have to do these things. And we have to take it down more. We have to continue to reduce unnecessary spending. And we'll have to have more people take these early retirement packages and all that. That's all true.

But that's different from saying "Government bureaucrats" in a demeaning way. Let me tell you something—you think about this. The children who died in that child care center in Oklahoma City were the children of Government bureaucrats. The people who were carried out of that building from the Agriculture Department, from the Veterans Affairs Administration, from the Housing and Urban Development Department, and from all of our law enforcement agencies, the Secret Service, the ATF, all of them, they were all Government bureaucrats. And I will never, knowingly, use that term again.

So we've all got to start with each other here. I don't know that that's a very good character example. I don't know that that does much to build good character, when you identify a group as a group and pretend that as a group there's something wrong with them.

So I would say to you, to all of you, I am basically very optimistic about the future of this country. I know we're more violent than we need to be, but we always have been. We always have been, and we need—we've got to get a hold of it. And I know we have too many out-of-wedlock births, but it's a trend that is gripping an awful lot of Western countries. And people have forgotten, in my judgment, the profound emotional consequences to the children who grow up in unstable and inadequately supported environments. So we're not alone in that. We have way too much drug addiction, and we are really almost alone in that. Hardly any other advanced country has anything approaching the levels of violence and drug addiction we do. So we do have profound problems.

Our political debate is too polarized. And we have a lot of people who talk a lot about what's wrong with everybody else and don't do very much to change it. There are all kinds of problems. But look, this is not the Great Depression; this is not World War II; this is not the Civil War; we are not starting from scratch like the Founders did.

We know what to do. We know the difference between right and wrong. We know how to do this. And we can do what we have to do. We can do this. This is not a cause for wringing of hands. It is difficult. It is a new challenge to figure out how we all work together and still leave room for our differences, how we identify the specific roles

of the various influence centers in our society to reinstill character and give a good life to our people. But the fundamental fact is that this is a very great country, and nearly everybody is still getting up every day and doing the very best they can to do what is right. Nearly everybody desperately wants to have children who have good character and who do good and who are good, nearly everybody.

So I think what you are here about is profoundly important. But what I want to say to you is, do not be discouraged. In the light of the whole history of our Republic, this is our job at this time. It is not an undoable job. It is profoundly important. It will be difficult because of all the forces working on people's state of mind that undermine what we have to do. Because it's so much easier in the world today to identify what we're against instead of what we're for. It's so much easier in the world today not to look at the problems within our own hearts and minds because we can always find somebody we think is worse. So it is so much easier to put this off and delay it. And there are no institutions really for bringing us all together, across all the lines that divide us, in our common cause of building what is good about America and building up what is good within the character of our people. But we can do it. And I believe we will.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:30 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Amitai Etzioni, founder and chair, Communitarian Network.

Statement on the Hospitalization of Former Defense Secretary Les Aspin

May 20, 1995

I was saddened to hear that former Defense Secretary Les Aspin was hospitalized earlier today. Hillary and I wish him a speedy recovery. Our prayers are with him and his family at this time.

Statement on the Second Anniversary of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993

May 20, 1995

Two years ago today, I signed into law the National Voter Registration Act, better known as "motor-voter." This common sense law is making it easier for all Americans to register to vote. Motor-voter promised to open up the democratic process, and I am pleased to report that it is delivering on that promise.

Across America, nearly 2 million citizens have registered to vote in the 5 months since the law went into effect. In Georgia, 180,000 people registered in the first 3 months of this year, compared to only 85,000 all last year. In North Carolina, 30,000 citizens are registering per month, up from 6,000 a month in 1991. And in Alabama, 43,000 people registered in the first 3 months of this year, compared to only 23,000 in the same period last year.

Motor-voter is working because it makes sense. The Act simply requires States to make registration easier by making more forms available, at motor vehicle offices, social agencies, and through the mail. It is that simple.

Motor-voter is the latest step in our Nation's efforts to enfranchise all our citizens, giving them the power to affect their own destiny and our common destiny by participating fully in our democracy. I am proud to see it working so well.

Remarks at the White House Photographers Association Dinner

May 20, 1995

I want to gets lots of records of you clapping for me. [*Laughter*] Well, ladies and gentlemen, tonight, I feel your pain. [*Laughter*] Is there a courier around here anywhere? [*Laughter*] I hate these name tags. [*Laughter*]

I just wanted you to see what it feels like to have your picture taken when you're eating. [*Laughter*]

I am here tonight to address a very relevant issue: The President is funny. The power of the Presidency makes me funny. [*Laughter*] If you don't believe me, don't laugh at these jokes, have a nice audit. [*Laughter*]

You know, I used to complain about how all of you were trying to get my attention, you know, for photos—''Over here!'' ''Over here!'' ''Over here!'' ''Over here!'' ''Just one more!'' ''Just one more!''—and I didn't like the way you tried to get my attention until I heard about how the Russian police tried to get Jeremy Gaines' attention last week. [*Laughter*] Now you can ''just one more'' me from now to Kingdom come, and I won't bite. [*Laughter*]

You know, I thought Mike McCurry was a model Press Secretary, even before I saw this month's Esquire. Did you see him, with his model picture from the 1970's? This man used to be a model. This goes to show you that not all plastic surgery works. [*Laughter*] If you like the outfit he's wearing tonight, however, you can order it from the White House spring catalog. [*Laughter*]

You know, I'm sorry I've never been here before. I really do like all of you very much. But it wasn't until a few days ago that I found out that this is the only place I could be with you and you wouldn't have all those question-askers around with you. [*Laughter*]

One of the things I want to do is to compliment Mike McCurry's policy of having the Press Office staff in the White House send him a note each day to show what good deeds they've done for the press corps or kick a dollar into the pizza fund. This, of course, was an expansion, an improvement on my original idea in which everybody at the White House kicks in a dollar anyway and we just order pizza. [*Laughter*]

Tonight I want to share with you some of the notes Mike has received from the staff:

To Mike from McNeely: ''Yesterday, I performed my annual ritual of getting out of the shot.'' Think about that. [*Laughter*]

To Mike from Josh: ''I held Paul Hosefros, of the New York Times by the feet and suspended him from the ceiling so the New York Times could run one more bizarre angle of the President's picture.'' [*Laughter*]

To Mike from Ralph: ''I gave Ira Wyman CPR after he jogged with the President.'' [*Laughter*]

To Mike from Sharon: ''I helped Ken Lambert prepare for his interview with Jesse Helms regarding his pending NEA grant.'' [*Laughter*]

Now, not everybody could meet Mike's challenge, so the pizza fund only had about 20 bucks in it. So I decided the First Lady should manage the fund. [*Laughter*] And she has invested it so wisely—[*laughter*]—that beginning Monday morning, daily, the Four Seasons will be catering filet mignon in the Press Office. [*Laughter*]

I had a wonderful time tonight being on the other end of the camera.

I want to congratulate the award winners and to say to all of you, the photographers, editors, engineers, producers, and cameramen and women with whom I've shared these extraordinary past couple of years, I watch your work with great appreciation. You have transmitted images that no one who was there could every forget. I know I'll never forget, from the DMZ in Korea to the swollen banks of the Mississippi River to the beaches of Normandy, the NCAA championship—the one I liked—[*laughter*]—this remarkable picture on the cover of your program, which hangs in my private office in the White House because I liked it so much.

And like the priest who gave us the wonderful invocation, I want to say a special word of thanks for the work all of you did to make Oklahoma City real to us, both the agony and America at its best.

The great photojournalists, the men and women who are carrying on the great tradition of Mathew Brady, from the Civil War to Robert Capa's D-Day photography to Joe Rosenthal's remarkable memory of Iwo Jima, I salute you all.

I thank you for what you have done. And I hope that as we continue our journey together, me in the limo and you guys 20 cars behind—[*laughter*]—you will every now and then cut me a little slack for being nearly 50 and a bit on the heavy side. [*Laughter*]

Now before I leave tonight, I want to make one very important policy announcement. I will not jog in the morning. In fact, I will

do nothing until 10:45 a.m., so the pool call time is 10:30 a.m., not 6:45 a.m. [*Applause*]

Now I'm going to go so you can enjoy the rest of the evening. Now, I'll start late so you can have a good night's sleep. The pool has to go with me and the rest of you can stay. [*Laughter*] Ralph, you can stay, too. [*Laughter*]

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

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:10 p.m. at the Washington Hilton. In his remarks, he referred to official White House photographer Ralph Alswang.

Statement on the Death of Les Aspin

May 21, 1995

I speak for millions of Americans when mourning the death today of Les Aspin and join many others in saying that he was my friend.

As a Member of the House of Representatives for 22 years, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee for 8, Secretary of Defense, and Chairman of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, Les rendered our Nation extraordinary, selfless service.

Les Aspin accomplished greatly because he cared greatly. He brought the same commitment to his most recent assignment that he brought to Washington as a young Congressional aide, staff assistant at the Council of Economic Advisors, and Defense Department official in the 1960's.

No one knew better than he how Washington works, but he never thought of it as a game for its own sake. He was here to make a difference. And he did. He probed and helped shape a generation of American defense policies and budgets, culminating in the decisive bottom-up review of our military strategy, which he conducted as Secretary of Defense.

Les Aspin was unique. He brought the light of his joy in living and the heat of his intellect to every occasion. He never met a person who didn't like him. And we all will miss him.

Remarks on Signing the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

May 22, 1995

Thank you very much. Mr. Bersoff, thank you for your comments and for the outstanding example of the family business you have built to such a remarkable extent. Thank you, Sally Katzen.

Before I begin, as a matter of personal privilege, I would just like to say a brief word about the death of my good friend Les Aspin. Hillary and I grieve his loss, and along with all other Americans, we thank him for the remarkable service he rendered to our country as a distinguished Congressman from Wisconsin, as the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, as Secretary of Defense, and as head of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. He did a lot of work to keep us safe through a turbulent time, and we are all very, very much in his debt.

Let me thank the Members of Congress who are here. You know, I've got to say, I was sitting here listening to Mr. Bersoff talk, and I thought it'll be a miracle if we get this on the news tonight, because this is something we did without anybody fighting. [*Laughter*] And the real reason this languished around for 5 years was because nobody was fighting anybody else about it. And after I got here, I discovered some of the best ideas in Washington were not being implemented simply because there was no anger attached to them. It's a sad thing to say, but it's absolutely right.

And so, sometimes energy is not behind things that hang around here for years, because there's no real brutal conflict. And in that context, I want to thank the Members of Congress who are here for overcoming all the inertia against consensus—[*laughter*]—and actually passing a bill that everybody was for. And I thank you. I thank Senators Nunn, Roth, and Glenn; Representatives Meyers, Sisisky, Peterson, and Davis, all of whom are here, and of course, former Congressman Horton and former Senator, now Governor Lawton Chiles for the work that they have done.

This is a remarkable bill, and I want to talk about what it does. But first, let me say

that for a bill in which there was not a lot of opposition, there was an awful lot of support and input about exactly how to do this. People all over our country, big and small businesses, organizations from the National Governors' Association to the National Association of Towns and Townships to librarians actually testified in favor of this bill—what we ought to do and how it ought to be done.

The legislation recognizes that the private sector is the engine of our prosperity, that when we act to protect the environment or the health of our people, we ought to do it without unnecessary paperwork, maddening redtape, or irrational rules.

We have to reform our regulatory system in ways that protects the larger public interest without strangling business. These changes reflect the right way to reform Government. It is very consistent with the things that I believe need to be done. In the last 2 years we have already reduced the size of the Federal bureaucracy by more than 100,000 employees, going down under existing budgets to a reduction of more than 272,000, and if the last few weeks are any indication, we're about to reduce the Government some more.

This Paperwork Reduction Act helps us to conquer a mountain of paperwork that is crushing our people and wasting a lot of time and resources and which actually accumulated not because anybody wanted to harm the private sector but because we tend to think of good ideas in serial form without thinking of how the overall impact of them impacts a system that is very dynamic and very sensitive to emerging technologies but which Government does not always respond to in the same way.

I want to say again how much I appreciate the work that Sally Katzen and her shop have done. And I want to thank the Congress for enabling them to continue on the job.

In recent months, some others have made similar announcements. Carol Browner, at the EPA, announced that she would cut the paperwork requirements of the EPA on the private sector by 25 percent. To give you an idea of what that means, that is 20 million hours of labor a year.

We often debate here what we can give the American people. We're about to have a debate: Should we give the American people more funds for education, more funds for Medicare, or more money back in a tax cut? But nothing is more precious, I see as I get older, than your own time. And for a Government to give the American people back, at no cost to the public interest, 20 million hours, is an extraordinary gift and worth a great deal of money and additions to the quality of life.

The FDA is going to dramatically speed approvals of many different kinds of medical devices. The SBA has reduced the inch-thick loan form applications to one page.

Here are some other places we will cut. The Department of Agriculture so far has eliminated the need for more than 3 million pages of Government forms from a quarter million farmers. The Department of Energy took these three big binders here, filled with reporting requirements, and sliced them to 11 pages—11 pages from those three big binders. That saved $48 million a year, but it also gave the gift of time back to the people who were subject to it.

The Department of Education required both parents to sign a student loan and other financial aid forms. This is impossible in some cases when the non-custodial parent is not available. In lots of homes today, it's hard for both parents to be in the same place at the same time anyway. Now, one parent signature is all that's required.

So far, we have eliminated the forms represented in this large stack of papers here on the table. When you count all the people and all the businesses that have to fill out the forms already eliminated, in one year, we've eliminated paper that would stretch end to end from Washington, DC, to San Francisco, California.

To further reduce these burdens, I have directed our agencies to continue to review their regulations, to eliminate the outdated and streamline the bloated. I have also directed them, whenever possible, to cut in half the frequency of reports they require from citizens. For example, if they ask for quarterly reports, why don't we just have them twice a year instead?

As we reform, we need not compromise the quality of life or the needed oversight from the Government. But the truth is, we

can actually improve the system by making it less hidebound and by innovating as Americans are innovating.

Today I want to add another dimension to this effort: From this point forward, I want all of our agencies to provide for the electronic submission of every new Government form or demonstrate to OMB why it cannot be done that way. The old way will still be available, but I think once people see how fast and efficient electronic filing can be, we'll see less paperwork and more of these. So, we're trying to do our part to act in good faith the way these Members of Congress intended the executive branch to act.

As you know, these little things store incredible volumes of information—incredible. My daughter knows more about it than I do, but I'm learning myself just in the things that we do incredibly how much more we can do and at a tiny fraction of the space involved, not to mention the speed. So the more we use electronic transmissions, the more we'll all be working quicker and smarter, giving better service to the American public, a more efficient Government, and far, far less paperwork.

I want to say again, the remarkable thing about this effort was that at the time we actually got it through the Congress, there was not a single dissenting vote. But very often the things we do not do in life are the things we all know we should do. That is a principle that extends beyond this bill.

And we owe a great debt of gratitude to the Members of Congress, especially those here present, who exercised the leadership to get this done as well as to Governor Chiles and former Congressman Horton for the work they did to pave the way. So I would like to ask the Members to come up while we sign the bill, and Congressman Horton and Governor Chiles to come up as well. Please come up, and we'll do it.

Thank you very much.

[*At this point, the President signed the bill.*]

Thank you very much. We're adjourned. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:18 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Ed Bersoff, president and chief executive officer, BTG, Inc. S. 244, approved May 22, was assigned Public Law No. 104–13.

Proclamation 6804—To Modify Duty-Free Treatment Under the Generalized System of Preferences and for Other Purposes

May 22, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

1. Pursuant to section 504(c) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended ("Trade Act") (19 U.S.C. 2464(c)), beneficiary developing countries, except those designated as least-developed beneficiary developing countries pursuant to section 504(c)(6) of the Trade Act, are subject to limitations on the preferential treatment afforded under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). I have determined, pursuant to sections 504(a)(1), (c)(1), and (c)(2) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2464(a)(1), (c)(1), and (c)(2)), that certain beneficiary developing countries should no longer receive preferential tariff treatment under the GSP with respect to certain eligible articles.

2. To reflect clearly the names of certain beneficiary developing countries under the GSP, I have decided that it is necessary and appropriate to modify general note 4 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS).

3. In Proclamation No. 6767 of February 3, 1995, conforming changes with respect to certain articles under the GSP were omitted. I have decided that it is necessary and appropriate to modify the HTS to make such conforming changes.

4. Proclamation No. 6763 of December 23, 1994, implemented the Uruguay Round Agreements, including Schedule XX, with respect to the United States and incorporated in the HTS tariff modifications necessary and appropriate to carry out the Uruguay Round Agreements. Certain technical errors, including inadvertent omissions, were made in that proclamation. I have determined that it is necessary to reflect accurately the intended tariff treatment provided for in the Uruguay Round Agreements to modify certain provi-

sions of the HTS as set forth in Annex III to this proclamation.

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

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, acting under the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, including but not limited to sections 504 and 604 of the Trade Act, do proclaim that:

(1)(a) To make certain conforming changes, the Rates of Duty 1–Special subcolumn for each of the HTS subheadings enumerated in Annex I(A) to this proclamation is modified: (i) by deleting the symbol ''A*'' in parentheses, and (ii) by inserting the symbol ''A'' in lieu thereof.

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

(2) To reflect clearly the names of certain beneficiaries and to provide that one or more countries are no longer to be treated as beneficiary developing countries with respect to an eligible article for purposes of the GSP, general note 4 to the HTS is modified as provided in Annex II to this proclamation.

(3) The HTS is modified as provided in Annex III to this proclamation.

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

(5)(a) The modifications made by Annexes I and II to this proclamation shall be effective with respect to articles both: (i) imported on or after January 1, 1976, and (ii) entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after July 1, 1995.

(b) The modifications made by Annex III to this proclamation shall be effective with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the dates specified in such annex.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-second day of May, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

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

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on May 25.

Proclamation 6805—World Trade Week, 1995

May 22, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

American exports bolster the quality of life for countless people, supporting 10.5 million jobs here at home and supplying popular American products to millions worldwide. They fuel our Nation's economy, create high-wage jobs for our citizens, and link us to countries everywhere. That is why my Administration supported NAFTA and brought the Uruguay Round GATT negotiations to a successful conclusion. As we celebrate World Trade Week this year, we pause to recognize the many ways in which ''Exporting is Everybody's Business.''

In the two years since my Administration launched this country's first National Export Strategy, America has led the way in trade promotion and advocacy efforts, strengthening existing programs and developing new initiatives to serve U.S. exporters. The Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee (TPCC) has worked to create a more streamlined, responsive, and effective system that enhances our Nation's economy and helps our firms to compete successfully around the globe.

During the past year, we have worked to develop a new, innovative trade finance strat-

egy. The Export-Import Bank of the United States, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Trade and Development Agency, the Small Business Administration, and the Departments of the Treasury and Commerce have provided new forms of trade finance that help our firms to compete in the global marketplace. We are addressing the removal of unnecessary and ineffective export controls and streamlining the licensing process, liberalizing controls on a range of high-technology products and increasing the effectiveness of multilateral control regimes.

With the restructuring of the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service, now the Commercial Service of the United States, the Department of Commerce is working in partnership with the businesses it serves, promoting U.S. exports, advocating U.S. business interests abroad, assisting U.S. firms to realize their export potential, and supporting the export promotion efforts of other public and private organizations. By the end of this year, 15 U.S. Export Assistance Centers will be open across the country, offering virtually every American business person a coordinated, multi-faceted, international trade team close at hand.

Already, U.S. exports to our neighbors in the Southern Hemisphere exceed $92 billion, generating good jobs for our workers and demonstrating our competitiveness throughout the international marketplace. At the Summit of the Americas this past December, our Nation reaffirmed its commitment to the extension of free trade throughout the Hemisphere by the year 2005—an opportunity that promises to bolster our economy even further. These efforts, combined with our progress with the countries of the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), mean trade gains of historic proportions. And that means more jobs for hard-working Americans.

Still, much remains to be done. U.S. exporters must be given every opportunity to sell our products freely and fairly. Our companies must meet the challenge of venturing into new markets. They must keep quality high and production efficient, while marketing American goods and services to new customers around the world. The work is difficult, but the rewards are great: a strong economy, better goods and services, and a brighter future for all of us.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim May 21 through May 27, 1995, as ''World Trade Week.'' I invite the people of the United States to join in appropriate observances to celebrate the potential of international trade to create prosperity for all.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-second day of May in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 3:15 p.m., May 23, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on May 25.

Memorandum on Trade With Romania

May 19, 1995

Presidential Determination No. 95–22

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Presidential Determination Under Subsections 402(a) and 409(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, as Amended—Emigration Policies of the Republic of Romania

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by subsections 402(a) and 409(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2432(a) and 2439(a)) (''the Act''), I determine that the Republic of Romania is not in violation of paragraph (1), (2) or (3) of subsection 402(a) of the Act or paragraph (1), (2) or (3) of subsection 409(a) of the Act.

You are authorized and directed to publish this determination in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

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

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Trade With Romania

May 19, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit a report concerning emigration laws and policies of the Republic of Romania as required by subsections 402(b) and 409(b) of Title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended ("the Act"). I have determined that Romania is in full compliance with the criteria in subsections 402(a) and 409(a) of the Act. As required by Title IV, I will provide the Congress with periodic reports regarding Romania's compliance with these emigration standards.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 19, 1995.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 23.

The President's News Conference

May 23, 1995

The President. Good afternoon, I want to speak with you today about legislation that Congress is considering which would place new restrictions on how America conducts its foreign policy and slash our budget in foreign affairs. I believe these bills threaten our ability to preserve America's global leadership and to safeguard the security and prosperity of the American people in the post-cold-war world. The world is still full of dangers but more full of opportunities, and the United States must be able to act aggressively to combat foreign threats and to make commitments and then to keep those commitments.

These bills would deprive us of both those capabilities. Supporters of the bills call them necessary cost-cutting measures. But in reality, they are the most isolationist proposals to come before the United States Congress in the last 50 years. They are the product of those who argue passionately that America must be strong and then turn around and refuse to pay the price of that strength or to give the Presidency the means to assert that strength.

The price of conducting our foreign policy is, after all, not very high. Today, it's slightly more than 1 percent of the budget. Let me say that again: slightly more than 1 percent of the budget. That's about one-fifteenth of what Americans think it is, according to the most recent surveys. And it's only one-fifth of what Americans believe would be about the right amount to spend.

In other words, we don't spend 15 percent of the budget on foreign policy, or even 5 percent, but just a little over 1 percent. And that 1 percent, which includes our contributions to the multilateral development banks, helps to dismantle nuclear weapons, saves lives by preventing famines, immunizing children, and combating terrorists and drug-traffickers. Bills in both the House and the Senate place new restrictions on our ability to meet these dangers as well as to take advantage of all the opportunities that are out there for the United States.

For example, one bill, "The American Overseas Interests Act", which is being debated on the House floor just this week, would compromise our efforts to stop North Korea's nuclear program, impose conditions that could derail our support for democratic reform in Russia, and restrict the President's ability to prevent illegal immigration. The bill would also mandate an ill-conceived restructuring of agencies responsible for our foreign affairs.

Taken together, these constraints represent nothing less than a frontal assault on the authority of the President to conduct the foreign policy of the United States and on our Nation's ability to respond rapidly and effectively to threats to our security.

Repeatedly, I have said there are right ways and wrong ways to cut the deficit. This legislation is the wrong way. We did not win the cold war to walk away and blow the opportunities of the peace on shortsighted, scattershotted budget cuts and attempts to micromanage the United States foreign policy.

That's why Secretaries Christopher, Perry, and Rubin and Ambassador Albright have recommended that I veto this bill being considered by the House this week. But it is not

too late to reconsider. These are dangerous proposals. Our administration is ready to work with Congress, and I remain hopeful that the long tradition of bipartisanship in foreign affairs, which I have appreciated and been a part of, will continue throughout this session of Congress.

I urge Congress to send me a bill that protects the fundamental interests of the American people, a bill that I can sign.

Budget Proposals

Q. Leon Panetta said that trying to balance the budget in 7 years would be nuts. Laura Tyson said it would be bad for the American economy. And over the weekend, you said it could be done and that after the Republicans propose and dispose of the budget they're dealing with now, you would offer your own plan to do so. Can you tell us why the disagreement within your administration, and what exactly you do intend to propose?

The President. Well, it can be done, but it is not good policy to do it. Those things are not inconsistent. It is mathematically possible to do it, but having analyzed the alternatives for doing it, we believe that it cannot be done consistent with the interests of the American economy.

Now—in other words, I believe that all Americans should be committed to bringing our budget into balance within a reasonable amount of time that we can determine. And I believe we should be committed to working together toward that end. But I do not believe it is good policy, based on my understanding of this budget, which is pretty good now, to do it in 7 years.

Keep in mind—let's back up a minute. What is the fundamental problem with the American economy? Is it the deficit? I have worked hard to reduce the deficit. But what happened when we reduced the deficit—the Republicans now use 7-year terms, so let's talk about 7 years.

In 1993, the deficit reduction plan we adopted reduced the deficit by $1 trillion over 7 years. And even though not a single one of them voted for it and never engaged us in any kind of cooperative effort, they obviously like building on it, and it makes it possible for them to argue that now the budget can be brought into balance.

What did we get out of it? We got declining interest rates and a growing income for the economy, 6.3 million new jobs. What is the problem now with the American economy? The incomes of the American people are not going up in the global economy. If you reduce the deficit to zero, if you balance the budget in 7 years, with the evidence we now have, that would either require massive tax increases or massive budget cuts, which would be unfair to our long-term objective to stabilize the incomes and the way of living of the American people. If you ignore it, the same thing would happen. So that's the point that we made. I don't think the two things are inconsistent at all.

Q. What are you going to do? What are you going to do, sir?

The President. I'm going—well, for one thing, the Republicans have to resolve the differences between themselves. They have to produce a budget resolution. The President has no role in the budget resolution and cannot veto it; it's a guidance. Then the budget process will begin. That's the reconciliation process, and that process the President has a role in, because I have a veto. I have shown—if you look at the debate in the rescissions bill, you see that I have shown good faith. I will not do what they did 2 years ago. I will not walk away from this process.

Look at the rescission bill. At the appropriate time, I sat down with the Republicans in the Senate, who made it clear that they wanted us to do that; we worked out an agreement for big spending cuts. Then, when it was changed behind closed doors, I offered an alternative budget in the rescission context—what I have done today. It was a responsible thing to do. I still want deficit reduction in the rescission bill. I still want to work with the Congress, and I will do so.

And if you look at how I handle the rescission business, we put people first, we put investment first, but we reached agreement on how much we should cut, spending and rescissions. We can do the same thing here.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—your own counterbudget and to get the budget into balance in less than 10 years. Could you share with us some ideas about how you would do that?

The President. Well, we've already made clear—I've already made clear what my

problems are and where we need to start. First of all, I told everybody, including the White House Conference on Aging, that we were going to have to make some changes. But let's deal with what I think the problems are.

Both of the Republican budget proposals propose big cuts in Medicare outside the context of health care reform. When I presented my initial budget to the Congress, I said we can cut the deficit much more, but we have to do it in the context of health care reform. Otherwise, you're going to have a lot of hardship on elderly people and others.

Secondly, the tax cut is way, way too big, and it is essentially paying for tax cuts to people who are not needy and who are doing well in this economy by cutting Medicare. Thirdly, the education cuts are too deep. And fourthly, the Senate proposal cuts—raise taxes on working Americans with children with incomes under $28,000 and lowers taxes on people with incomes over $200,000. That's the reverse of what we ought to be about. And finally, the 7-year period is an arbitrary period not dominated by an analysis of economic policy and what's good to raise incomes, but basically just a figure picked out of the air. So that's where I think we ought to begin.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Funding and Conduct of Foreign Affairs

Q. Mr. President, are you going to veto the foreign affairs bill on the recommendation of your Cabinet if the changes you asked for are not made?

The President. I can't conceive of permitting it to become law, because it is an assault on the ability of the President to protect the interests of the American people and to pursue the foreign policy of the country.

And let me say that, again, I have worked with Congressman Gilman, with Chairman Gilman, for 2 years on many issues. I have worked with Republicans in both the House and the Senate. I have appreciated the support, even on controversial issues, given to me by the leadership of the House and the Senate when we were dealing with the very difficult issue of Mexico, for example.

So I do not want to jumpstart what has been—an unusual partisan split over foreign affairs. But while I hope it doesn't happen any time soon, someday there'll be a Republican President here again. And this is about the Presidency. The Presidency cannot be hamstrung. We must allow the President to conduct the foreign policy of the United States in ways that make us safer, more secure, and more prosperous. This bill will undermine that objectives.

And again, I'd say, the one good thing that could come out of this great debate is, every single survey shows that the American people think we're spending 15 to 20 percent of their tax money on foreign aid. When you ask them what the right amount would be, they say, "Oh, about 5 percent." What would be too little? "Under 3 percent." But we're just spending a little more than one percent. We're spending about what the American people think—maybe they think we should spend more. We should not destroy the foreign aid budget.

But, furthermore, we should not handcuff the President. That is not the way to conduct the foreign affairs of this country. You cannot micromanage foreign policy.

Q. So is the answer, you will veto it?

The President. If this bill passes in its present form, I will veto it, yes.

Peace Process in Northern Ireland

Q. Mr. President, the Irish Economic Conference is taking place here this week. I wonder if you could tell us if the tragedy, the terrible tragedy in Oklahoma City, has in any way altered your attitude toward the Sinn Fein party in Northern Ireland or towards Mr. Gerry Adams who has defended terrorist actions in Britain?

The President. As long as he continues to renounce terrorism and as long as they continue on the progress that they—the path that they have set, including the willingness to talk about weapons decommissioning, then I think we're doing the right thing. We are supporting an end to terrorism and the beginning of peace and, I hope, more prosperity in Northern Ireland. That is consistent with our position here. And I think that's the right thing to do.

We're supporting an end to the kind of agonies that the people in Northern Ireland and Great Britain generally have suffered in the last 25 years and that the American people suffered most significantly in Oklahoma City but also at the World Trade Center.

Q. If the Republicans don't make a move on the budget in the areas you've asked them to on Medicare in the context of health care reform and so on, will you still lay out a counterproposal that gets to balance?

The President. Well, when we get into the—when we get into the reconciliation process—I don't believe in idle exercises. When we got into the—look what we did in the rescission bill. I was very specific in dealing with the rescission bill. First of all, I sat down and tried to have a good-faith negotiation at the first opportunity. The first opportunity I had to negotiate in good faith with the Republican majority in Congress was in the United States Senate, and we did it in good faith and in great detail. And we did it in the context of agreeing to meet a target of significant deficit reduction.

Then, when the House and Senate went behind closed doors and put all that pork in the bill and took the education out of it and took the investments in environmental protection out of it, I said we had to make some changes, and I offered a specific alternative in the context of a decisionmaking process where I could have an impact. That is the procedure I will follow in dealing with the larger budget.

If you look at the rescission bill, you will see the way I am prepared to go forward. I will bargain and negotiate and deal in good faith, because I believe in deficit reduction. I believe in a balanced budget. But I also know we've got to invest in the people of this country if we're going to raise their incomes.

Bosnia

Q. You spoke earlier about keeping foreign commitments and why you thought that was important. Two years ago in this room, Secretary of State Warren Christopher said, the clock is ticking on Serb aggression. The blockade of Sarajevo has been tightened, the snipers are back at work. Apparently you're the only person in the world who can stop this. Are you prepared to do more?

The President. Well, I do not—let me just say this: From the beginning of my campaign for President, I said that the one thing I did not think we should do is to send American troops into combat into Bosnia, nor did I believe we could be part of a United Nations mission in Bosnia with the kind of conditions on involvement that have been imposed on the UNPROFOR forces. I do not apologize for that. I think I was right then. I think that has still been the right case, right decision.

Every effort to be more aggressive in promoting peace and fighting aggression in Bosnia that has been made in the last 2 years has been made at the initiative of the United States. I thought for sure after the events of a few days ago, once again NATO airpower would be called into action. And I strongly supported it, and I was very surprised after the commanders on the ground asked for it that the United Nations stopped it.

But I believe that we are doing, at the moment, all we can do. We do not want to collapse the U.N. mission. And I believe the United Nations made a mistake in not calling NATO airpower in when the commanders asked for it. We are still doing the airlift there, now the biggest one in the history of the United States, the biggest one in world history. And we are prepared to do more. But I do not believe the United States has any business sending ground troops there. Yes?

Q. Mr. President, there were talks over the weekend between American industry and Saudi officials to try to expedite the transaction you brokered for Saudi Arabia to buy Boeing and McDonnell-Douglas commercial transports. Do you know what the outcome of those talks were? And do you know if there's going to be further delay in consummating the transaction, or is there a fixed date to close on it?

The President. I'm sorry, I do not know. I have done what I could to make sure that the contract stayed on track, but I do not know.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 96th news conference began at 2:24 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Remarks at the Democratic Congressional Dinner

May 23, 1995

Thank you, Senator Daschle, for your leadership and your stirring introduction and your wise predictions. [*Laughter*] Thank you, Congressman Gephardt, for your leadership and your steadfastness. Congressman Matsui, Senator Dorgan, Senator Kerrey, and Congressman Frost, thank you for taking on the burden of our campaign committees and the hard work of recruiting our candidates and raising our funds and rebuilding our majorities. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for being here.

I thank all the Democratic Senators and Members of the House who are here, and many Members of Congress who are former Members of Congress who are here. If you will forgive me, I'd like to ask for a moment of applause for the memory of a former Member of Congress who is not here, Les Aspin, one of the finest people I ever knew. [*Applause*]

This has certainly been an interesting time, hasn't it? [*Laughter*] What's that old adage that we should—somebody should spare us from living in interesting times. It is a great honor and a great obligation for us to have the chance to serve in an interesting and profoundly important time, a time of great change, great opportunity, great dislocation, great difficulty, and great challenge for the people of this country and, therefore, those of us who wish to serve them.

At a time when many are so preoccupied with their own difficulties, it is difficult to sort through the blizzard of information and disinformation they get, even to understand what it is we are trying to do, much less to grasp how it will affect them. But I think, more and more, as time goes on now, the choices before the American people are becoming clearer, and I trust the direction we must take is as well.

We now hear the folks in the other party claiming great high ground for wanting to reduce the deficit and asking us to help. You remember how much help we got from them in the last 2 years? And I would remind you, those of you who voted for that, to remember that by their new 7-year calculations the 1993 budget plan that the Democrats adopted, without any help or even so much as serious discussion, cut the deficit a trillion dollars. They predicted the world would come to an end. Instead, the recession came to an end, and we had lower unemployment, low inflation, a booming stock market; first time in 20 years we've had unemployment among African-Americans below 10 percent; highest number of high-wage jobs in 6 years; a real sense of change in the economy, according to all the numbers.

But that hasn't filtered down to a lot of Americans yet. And that's what I want to talk to you about tonight. What are we doing here? Why are we Democrats? What do we hope to achieve? How do we communicate with the American people? And what does it all mean?

Well, the first thing I want to say is that we should just be grateful that we've had the chance in the last 2 years to do the right things. And we should understand if we failed, either through our own limitations or because of the circumstances of the time, to communicate what we had done to the people of this country, the fact is that in the light of history, the last 2 years will be viewed as a time when we got the deficit down, regained control of our economic destiny, actually invested more in our people and in their education and in their future, and made a serious effort to have the American people move into the 21st century with the American dream alive and well and with our security better protected at home and abroad.

In the last 2 years, we had the most productive time in terms of a partnership between the President and Congress in the last 30 years. And what was done in the crime bill, in the trade legislation, in the family and medical leave law, in act after act after act, was good for the American people. And we should be proud of that, and we should talk about it. And we should move forward.

We should also say to our friends in the other party, we do not intend to do you the way you did us, even though you were richly rewarded for doing it—[*laughter*]—because, unlike you in the last 2 years, we care so much about this country, we'll work with you. But you have to remember what we stand

for, and you have to be willing to deal with what we stand for.

They are learning a little lesson now with their budget proposals and the real meaning of their contract on America, of what all people in public life learn, and that is that there are limits to calls for sacrifice. [*Laughter*]

My senior Senator, Dale Bumpers, he loves to tell a story about Huey Long being out on a country cross—is he here? I heard somebody clapping; I thought he was clapping. [*Laughter*] He loves to tell a story about Huey Long being out on a country crossroads speaking to a group of people about—in the Depression—about how we needed to share the wealth. And he spotted a farmer he knew, and he said, ''Now, brother Jones, as hard as times are, if you have three Cadillacs, wouldn't you give one of them up so we could go around and take up all the little kids in the country and take them to school during the week and to church on Sunday?'' And he said, ''Sure, I'd do that.'' And he said, ''If you had $3 million, wouldn't you give up a million dollars so we could feed all the people in this county and put a roof over their head?'' He said, ''Of course, I would.'' He said, ''And if you had three hogs—'' He said, ''Now, wait a minute, I've got three hogs.'' [*Laughter*]

You think about that. We might have had some difficult cases to make in the last 2 years, but we never had to try to argue with a straight face why we ought to cut Medicare and Medicaid for elderly people in nursing homes to pay for a tax cut for people who have done very, very well in the 1980's and 1990's, and will do well in the 21st century. At least we didn't have to make that case.

On the other hand, it is important for us to participate and to be a part of changing this country for the better. The Democrats are a positive party. We win by promoting hope over fear, by promoting unity over division, by promoting progress over the status quo. And fundamentally, the difference between our party and the other party is still that we believe in the potential of every human being, and we believe that every person has a right to be protected from oppressive forces that would weigh him or her down, and every person has the right to be empowered to make the most of their own lives.

We believe in ''cut and invest,'' not ''slash and burn.'' We believe not in trickle-down, but in growing the middle class and shrinking the under class. We believe not in cutting people loose in a market-only world that is a cold and hard world but in having a partnership between the people and their Government and the private sector that grows the economy, creates jobs, and also makes sure everybody has a chance to stake out their piece of the American dream. We believe that the power of the Government ought to be used to elevate people. We believe that we should have a partnership with business that challenges them to train their workers and treat them right but challenges us here in Government to create policies that will enable us to succeed at home and abroad. And we have done that. And we will continue to do that.

Now, what are some examples of that? Well, the Commerce Department is one. Sometimes I think the reason our friends on the other side of the aisle are so anxious to eliminate the Department of Commerce is they are absolutely livid that a Democratic Secretary of Commerce has gotten more jobs for Americans abroad than all the Republicans in the last several decades.

We believe you can cut Government and make it work better for people. What are some examples of that? The Small Business Administration has lowered its budget and dramatically increased its loan volumes to women, to minorities, and to white males all at the same time. And nobody unqualified got a loan, and America is stronger as a result of that kind of effort.

We believe America has more than one kind of deficit. Yes, there is a budget deficit. We know all about it. It's a lot lower than it was before we went to work on it. And yes, we want to bring it down again. If, in fact, by bringing it down we could lower interest rates, put money into the pockets of ordinary Americans in the business sector, and invest and grow and get more jobs in this economy, that's what we ought to do. But let's not pretend that nothing we do here is worthwhile. We also have an education

deficit in this country, and we have to address that as well.

And it isn't popular to say anymore because there is this sense that all of the money we spent on poor people is wasted, but that's just not true. And whether we like it or not, an increasing percentage of the babies that are born in this old world, in this country, are poor. And they need food to eat, and they need medical care and medicine for their bodies, and they need an opportunity to get off to a good start in life. And if we don't give it to them, we may balance the budget for the next 5 years, but in 15 years we'll have the ''awfulest'' deficit you ever saw, and we'll be spending it all on prisons and drug rehab programs instead of education and training and job creation.

Something else that isn't popular to say—today it's all the rage, if you ask any American what should you do to balance the budget, they'll say, ''Cut foreign aid.'' But a recent poll has done us a great service. It's told us what the American people really mean. They were asked, ''Well, how much money is in foreign aid?'' The American people say, ''Fifteen percent of the budget.'' ''How much is too much?'' They say, ''Ten percent is way too much.'' ''What's about right?'' ''Five percent.'' ''What's too little?'' ''Under 3 percent.'' ''How much do we really spend?'' ''Just a little over one percent.'' [*Laughter*]

So this matters, folks. It matters to our ability to grow in the 21st century whether these countries that have embraced democracy and free markets are going to be given a little bit of help now, most of which immediately benefits us, by the way, to have their people get a good education and a good job and encourage American investment and become people who can buy our products and our services in the 21st century.

The Democrats believe, in short, that we have a budget deficit and an education deficit, that we need a thriving free market that is vigorous and competitive, but that the Government has a role to play in partnership with that market to help us abroad and to strengthen us at home, and that if we can grow the middle class and shrink the under class and keep a healthy economic environment, the rest of us will do very well indeed.

I am proud of the fact that in the last 2 years we've had more new businesses and more new millionaires created in the United States than at any comparable time in the history of our Republic. I am proud of that. But, let's not kid ourselves. One of the reasons that we had difficulty in 1994, having both the White House and the Congress, is that millions and millions of Americans are out there working harder today than they were 10 years ago for less money. Millions of Americans go home every night from work and sit across the table from their children and their spouses and wonder if somehow they have failed. They hear all this stuff about the glories of the global economy and all these things about the glories of the market. And they read all these things that I say about how we've gotten the deficit down and got the jobs up. And all they know is, they're in it tight, and they're scared, and they're concerned about the future. And they wonder if anybody's still on their side. They wonder if anybody really cares about them.

Did you see the story of the young woman who brought her sister and her mother to see me, whose husband was—her father, the young girl's father, was on the picket line at the Bridgestone strike? And because her father was on strike and because they'd been replaced, this family had to pick up their own health insurance, as the law now provides. And so she missed out on her trip to Washington until Jesse Jackson ran into this young girl and paid to bring her family up here, because this girl and her sister were diabetics. And they were paying $600 a month for health insurance while they were unemployed. That's true all over America today.

There are people out there who just want to know that we are on their side, that we are still fighting for them, that we still believe in them, and that we're going to make America work for them. And they're entitled to know that.

I'm very proud of the fact that the crime rate has come down in this country now in both years I've been President. I am proud of that. And we've worked on that. But before we get carried away, let me remind you that the rate of violent, arbitrary crime by teenagers against teenagers is still going up, because we've got all these kids out there

who are disconnected and they need to know somebody cares about them. And they need to know that they don't have to resort to violence, they don't have to resort to a gang, they don't have to leave school and do something terrible to feel like they're a part of something that will get them through to tomorrow.

This is not all that complicated. Oh, I know we're living in a new and different and exciting time, and I'm the biggest policy wonk in town. [*Laughter*] But when you strip it all away, we, the Democrats, have got to be there to say you can have economic growth and social justice. In fact, you cannot have economic growth over the long run without justice.

Do we want to make folks on welfare go to work when they can? You bet we do. Do we want to be able to reexamine our programs? Of course, we do. Do we want to be able to shed unnecessary bureaucracy? Yes, we do. Our administration has shrunk the Federal Government more than the folks that were here before us, and we will do more. We will do that. But let's not forget: Why are we doing all of this? Why are we here? Because we believe we can make a difference to the future of this country. And there is no other reason.

So I say to you, you should be of good cheer. We have a lot of things to do. We've taken a lickin', and we're—as Mark Twain said, ''The reports of our demise are entirely premature.'' [*Laughter*] But the most important thing is, we have a chance tomorrow to go out and do something good for America. And we're going to do it. We're going to do it.

We're going to prove that you can reduce the deficit, that we can bring this budget into balance over a period of time without ignoring the investment deficit in our people, without gutting the environment, without destroying our future, without forgetting our obligation to grow the middle class, to shrink the under class, and to give our people some hope and decency and dignity in life. We're going to prove that you can do that. We are. They are. The Members here are. We're going to do that for America, and we can.

So you go home tonight, you just remember, one of the biggest problems with Washington is most of our headlines and most of our conversation is consumed by process and conflict within the Beltway. And when we talk about people beyond the Beltway, we're normally talking about them in terms of the latest poll numbers: Who are they for this week? What are they saying this week? The fundamental reality of those people's lives has not changed all that much yet. And we have to give them a strong economy, a decent sense to empower themselves through education, a real commitment to a Government that serves everybody and not just the special interests, and does not forget the poor, because the children are the poor in this country, the children are the new poor in America, and they will be not children before you know it.

And we have got to find a way to solve all these problems together. The biggest problem we face today I sometimes think is that there aren't any simple answers to complex challenges. But there are answers. There are answers. And I have the privilege to go all over the world in your behalf. And I can tell you that nearly anybody would gladly trade places with where we are now at this point in our history. And that's because—so I say again, be of good cheer, but don't forget why you're here.

Yes, we want to win elections, but we want to win elections for a purpose—because we believe you can attack the budget deficit and the investment deficit, the education deficit, because we believe we can make more millionaires and grow the middle class and stop this awful two decades of stagnant and declining incomes and increasing inequality, because we believe most poor people will go to work and do the right thing, given the opportunity and the responsibility to do so, because we believe we have a responsibility to the national security of this country in terms of making our streets safer at home and America safer abroad. And we are making progress on all those fronts.

So I say to our friends across the aisle: We will be your partner. We will not walk away from you in spite of our experience in the last 2 years. But we will come on our own terms with our own values, putting the American people first.

Thank you, God bless you, and good night.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:25 p.m. at the Washington Hilton.

Message on the Observance of National Missing Children's Day, 1995

May 24, 1995

Greetings to everyone observing National Missing Children's Day, 1995. I am pleased that so many Americans are joining together to improve safety and reduce crime in communities across the country.

In the wake of the tragedy in Oklahoma City, we have drawn strength from reaffirming our commitment to protecting our children—making their well-being and security our highest national priority. Until we have done everything in our power to help young people lead happy, productive lives, we cannot say that our country is prepared for the great challenges that lie ahead.

The devastating effects of child abduction threaten our hopes for a brighter future. It is a tragedy that occurs daily and causes untold anguish to the families and children involved. I commend the many caring organizations who have dedicated their resources to raising public awareness of child abduction and to protecting young people from victimization. Your efforts are serving to return many children, safe and sound, to their families and homes.

Hillary and I join you in offering our prayers for all missing children and their families, and we wish you the best for a memorable day.

Bill Clinton

NOTE: National Missing Children's Day was observed on May 25.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report on Aeronautics and Space

May 24, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit this report on the Nation's achievements in aeronautics and space during fiscal year 1994, as required under section 206 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2476). Aeronautics and space activities involve 15 contributing departments and agencies of the Federal Government, as this report reflects, and the results of their ongoing research and development affect the Nation as a whole in a variety of ways.

Fiscal year 1994 featured many important developments and changes in U.S. aeronautics and space efforts. It included 7 Space Shuttle missions successfully completed, 15 Government launches of Expendable Launch Vehicles (ELVs), and 4 commercial launches from Government facilities. Among notable developments in the ELV area were the launch of the Deep Space probe, Clementine, initial use of the Titan IV Centaur upper stage, and the first launch of the Taurus launch vehicle. Highlights of the Shuttle missions included the highly successful servicing mission for the Hubble Space Telescope (HST), which replaced several faulty parts and installed a sophisticated package of corrective optics to compensate for the spherical aberration in HST's primary mirror. Also, the flight of the Space Radar Laboratory began to provide information on environmental change, and a mission with a Russian astronaut, Sergei Krikalev, as a member of the crew signalled the beginning of a three-phased cooperative program in space between Russia and the United States.

In a year of tremendous accomplishments for the international Space Station, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) developed an initial set of specifications that included Russian elements as part of the design. Russia's agreeing to join the 12 original participating nations as a partner resulted in the expansion of the existing Shuttle/Mir program into Phase I of the international Space Station program, which officially began with Sergei Krikalev's flight on the Shuttle. All of the partners held a successful systems design review in Texas in March, and in June Russia and the United States signed an interim agreement on the Space Station and a $400 million contract for Russian space hardware, services, and data. In August, the program completed a vehicle architecture review and in September, the Space Station Control Board ratified the recommendations it included. The redesigned

Space Station costs $5 billion less than Space Station Freedom and still offers increased research capability and user flexibility.

In aeronautics, activities included development of technologies to improve performance, increase safety, reduce engine noise and other environmental degradation, improve air traffic management, lower costs, and help American industry to be more competitive in the world market. For example, high-speed research continued during fiscal year 1994 to focus on resolving critical environmental issues and laying the technological foundation for an economical, next generation, High Speed Civil Transport (HSCT). In this connection, the United States reached agreement with Russia to use the Tu-144 supersonic transport as a testbed for HSCT development. In addition, efforts in advanced subsonics focused on reducing aircraft and engine noise levels, on development of wind shear sensing devices, and on creating technologies that will improve general aviation aircraft.

In space science, astronomers using HST's revitalized optics discovered disks of protoplanetary dust orbiting stars in the Orion Nebula, suggesting that the formation of planets in the Milky Way and elsewhere may be relatively common. Also, HST's revelation of helium in distant constellations provides valuable information about the conditions in the universe during its initial evolution. The Spacelab Life Sciences–2, U.S. Microgravity Payload–2, and International Microgravity Laboratory–2 greatly increased our understanding of the role of gravity on biological, physical, and chemical processes. In biology, we learned that gravity affects the function of the neural connections between brain cells; this can have profound implications for rebuilding damaged brain cells due to strokes and disease. In Earth science, the Space Radar Laboratories–1 and –2, plus the Lidar In-Space Technology Experiment payload, used powerful radar and laser technology to penetrate cloud cover and map critical factors on a global scale. Also, the highly successful launch of the Clementine Deep Space Probe tested 23 advanced technologies for high-tech, lightweight missile defense. The relatively inexpensive, rapidly-built spacecraft constituted a major revolution in spacecraft management and design; it also contributed significantly to lunar studies by photographing 1.8 million images of the surface of the Moon.

Additionally, on May 5, 1994, the White House announced that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the Department of Defense, and NASA were establishing a joint program to effect the convergence of civil and military polar-orbiting operational environmental satellite systems into a single operational program. Other White House announcements during the year included a policy for licensing U.S. firms by the Secretary of Commerce to operate private remote sensing systems and sell their images to domestic and foreign entities and a national space transportation policy that will sustain and revitalize U.S. space transportation capabilities by providing a coherent strategy for supporting and strengthening U.S. space launch capabilities to meet the growing needs of the civilian and national security sectors.

Thus, Fiscal Year 1994 was a highly successful one for the U.S. aeronautics and space programs. Efforts in both areas have contributed significantly to furthering the Nation's scientific and technical knowledge, international cooperation, a healthier environment, and a more competitive economy.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 24, 1995.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Bosnia

May 24, 1995

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

In my report to the Congress of November 22, 1994, I provided further information on the deployment of U.S. combat-equipped aircraft to support efforts of the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to achieve peace and stability in Bosnia-Herzegovina. On December 22, 1994, I also provided my fourth report on the continuing deployment of a U.S. Army peacekeeping contingent as part of the U.N. peacekeeping mission in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. I am now pro-

viding this follow-up report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to ensure that the Congress is kept informed about important U.S. contributions in support of multilateral efforts in the former Yugoslavia.

U.S. combat-equipped fighter aircraft and other support aircraft continue to contribute to NATO's enforcement of the no-fly zone in the airspace over Bosnia-Herzegovina. In accordance with U.N. Security Council Resolutions 781, 786 and 816, this operation has since April 1993, enforced a ban on flights not authorized by the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR). Enforcement of the no-fly zone, has resulted in the almost complete elimination of fixed-wing air to ground bombing and other air combat activity within the zone thereby greatly limiting the scope of the conflict in the region. Military personnel from 11 other NATO member nations have joined us in this effort, which has involved almost 60,000 sorties since the operation began. U.S. forces currently assigned to this operation consist of approximately 100 tactical aircraft as well as supporting tanker and other support aircraft.

The U.N. Security Council has established safe areas in Bosnia-Herzegovina and has authorized Member States and regional organizations, in close coordination with the United Nations, to take all necessary measures, through the use of air power, to support UNPROFOR in its mandate related to the safe areas. The Council has also authorized Member States and regional organizations, in close coordination with the United Nations, to take all necessary measures to extend close air support to protect U.N. forces in Croatia. More than 70 U.S. aircraft, including those identified above, are available for participation in authorized NATO missions for these purposes.

On March 31, 1995, the Security Council separated UNPROFOR into three operations: The United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia (UNCRO); The United Nations Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP) in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; and UNPROFOR in Bosnia-Herzegovina. A U.S. Army contingent remains deployed as part of UNPREDEP. Through observation and monitoring along the Serbian border, UNPREDEP continued to be effective in preventing the Balkan conflict from spreading and thereby contributes to the stability of the region. The approximately 500 U.S. soldiers contributing to this mission are assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 12th Infantry, 1st Armored Division, Baumholder, Germany.

In addition to these operations, U.S. forces have conducted more than 4,300 missions in support of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees airlift to Sarajevo. U.S. medical and other support personnel continue to provide critical services in support of UNPROFOR and UNCRO. U.S. naval forces are also continuing to assist in enforcing U.N. sanctions, subject to the restrictions of the Nunn-Mitchell Amendment, as part of NATO's participation in Operation SHARP GUARD.

The United States strongly favors a continued U.N. peacekeeping presence in the former Yugoslavia and a continuation of negotiations through the Contact Group. However, given the increase in fighting in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia, it may become necessary for NATO to assist in the withdrawal of peacekeepers from these areas. Because of the significant period of time needed to prepare and deploy the necessary forces to support such a withdrawal, our senior military commanders recommended that we take certain steps now to preposition the necessary communications network in order to be prepared to meet this contingency. Accordingly, on April 6, 1995, the North Atlantic Council authorized the Supreme Allied Commander for Europe to assemble, train and deploy into Croatia 80 communications personnel. Twenty U.S. soldiers are participating in this operation.

These continuing efforts are being taken in conjunction with our allies to implement the decisions of the U.N. Security Council and the North Atlantic Council and to assist the parties to reach a negotiated settlement to the conflict. I have directed the participation of U.S. Armed Forces in these operations pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief, and in accordance with various statutory authorities.

I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed,

consistent with the War Powers Resolution. I am grateful for the continuing support that the Congress has provided, and I look forward to continued cooperation with you in this endeavor. I shall communicate with you further regarding our efforts to foster peace and stability in the former Yugoslavia.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate.

Remarks Following a Meeting With Surgeon General-Designate Henry Foster and an Exchange With Reporters

May 25, 1995

Surgeon General Nomination

The President. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Doctor Foster and I have just had coffee. We discussed some of the issues we always discuss in terms of the health challenges our country faces. And of course, we discussed the upcoming vote in the Senate committee on the question of his confirmation. I want to say again, he has my strong support. I believe that he should be voted out of the committee and he certainly should be confirmed by the United States Senate.

In the hearings, he clearly demonstrated his qualifications to be America's doctor. And as I have said repeatedly, I hope the American people will never forget the group of young people who came up from his home State and his home town to talk about the work he had personally done to urge them to live upright and healthy and productive lives and the work that he had done to rescue them from difficult circumstances. If he is not qualified to be America's doctor, it's hard to imagine who would be.

There have been a lot of politics and a lot of talk back and forth on this nomination, but now the time has come to do the right thing. And I trust that the committee and, ultimately, the Senate will do the right thing and confirm Dr. Foster as Surgeon General.

Q. Do you think they will—the committee and the Senate?

The President. I believe they will.

Q. What do you base your optimism on?

The President. Well, I base my optimism on the fact that, usually in this country, right prevails over political pressure over the long run. They have—we have dragged this thing out. You known, Dr. Foster was never a political football before—President Bush thought enough of him to make him one of the Points of Light—and because we had a hearing, and he demonstrated in the hearing why he should be a Surgeon General and he answered all the questions.

Q. Do you think you can overcome the filibuster, sir?

The President. Let's get out of committee first. I think you've got to get out of the committee, and then I think he certainly should be. We'll have lots of arguments to make about that in the appropriate time. I think, if the majority of the United States Senate is for him, he should certainly be confirmed.

Budget Proposals

Q. Mr. President, it looks like the rescission bill is going to pass today. Do you still intend to veto it? And what happens next?

The President. Well, the answer to your question is yes, if it passes in this form.

I want to emphasize, first of all, I am for a rescission bill that cuts this much spending. I have sent a bill to the Congress that cuts even more from the deficit. I have been very specific about it.

My objection is that having—after I negotiated with the Senate on spending reductions, we got politics as usual. Congress went behind closed doors and cut a lot of education and training out and put some pork in the bill for specific Congressmen and specific congressional districts and States. That's the old politics. What we're doing here now is new and different, and we can't continue to do it.

So if the bill comes to me in the same form, without the restoration of the education and training, yes, I will veto it. Well, what happens next? Then—well, they have a bill right now which they could vote on today and send to me before they go on recess, which would cut the spending, restore

the education by not protecting the pork. Now, that's my position. And that's what I think should be done.

If instead I get the bill and there's a veto and they go home for their break, then when they come back, we ought to get together and restore the education and the training funds, reduce the deficit by as much or even more than is in this present bill, and then let them send it to me, and I will sign it. I am for making a down payment on the deficit reduction in this rescission bill.

I certainly want to get the money out to Oklahoma City, to finish our obligations in the California earthquake, to deal with the floods in the South, and of course we've got some other problems in other parts of the country, to fulfill the commitment of the United States on the Jordan issue as part of our Middle East peace process. I want to do all of that—to cut the spending and to get that money out there. But if we're going to be cutting around here, we cannot afford pork protection, politics as usual. We have to do what we're going to do in the open, not go behind closed doors and change all the priorities. We need to do this in a disciplined, good way.

So that is my position. It is very clear, and it has nothing to do with deficit reduction. I am for as much—I will support more spending reduction, but not in this form.

Bosnia

Q. Do you support, sir—do you support NATO air strikes around Sarajevo today?

The President. Well, my position is that NATO should be prepared to react when our commanders on the ground need them. And you know, I've been—of all of our NATO allies, the United States has been the most vigorous proponent of the use of NATO airstrikes in all appropriate circumstances. And we've laid those out repeatedly.

Thank you.

White House Security

Q. Mr. President, after still one more attack on the White House, are you starting to think, "Why me?"

The President. No. [*Laughter*] I do think—first of all, the American people should know that the system here worked and the Secret Service did a terrific job. And the two agents in question immediately put themselves in harm's way to do their job. And the system worked exactly as it is supposed to work. And the whole rest of the system worked. It was amazing. It worked. It worked quickly. And it's something that every citizen of this country can be very proud of.

I—to answer your other question, I don't, no. I just think that in a couple of cases, we've had people who for their own personal reasons have seen this as a symbol of something that they could attach themselves to in some way or another.

I do—I will say again that in our country today, we all need to try to reach out to each other and to talk and to reach across our divides when a lot of people out there may be like this gentleman, in trouble, and maybe can be brought back just by people reaching out to them and by trying to avoid letting things get to that point. And certainly I think that about the political rhetoric and dialog.

So I hope that we'll take another opportunity to reexamine, all of us, how we might make this country work better and have more thoughtful words and try to keep people from getting to extreme positions in their lives. But in this case, I don't feel badly at all. The Secret Service did a terrific job, and I'm very proud of them.

Thank you.

Q. So you have no fears?

The President. No.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:54 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Remarks to the White House Conference on Trade and Investment in Ireland

May 25, 1995

Thank you very much. Secretary Christopher, Secretary Brown, Senator Mitchell, Deputy Prime Minister Spring, Sir Patrick Mayhew, Mr. Ambassador, ladies and gentlemen, to all of you of Irish, British, and American heritage from the business communities of these great nations, I thank you for being here. I have looked forward to this day for a long time, to having people like you here who see the opportunities for trade and in-

vestment that come from peace and the opportunities for trade and investment to support peace. I'm especially delighted that so many are here from Ireland and the United Kingdom. And to all of our friends from Northern Ireland, your attendance here shows your dedication to a future of cooperation and prosperity, and we're particularly glad to have you.

Let me say a special word of thanks to George Mitchell for the tremendous work he has done in organizing this conference. His devotion to the cause of nurturing peace and growth in Northern Ireland and the Republic's border counties has played a central part in the progress that we celebrate here today. I'm delighted that he will lead another mission to Ireland this summer and even more pleased that he's agreed to continue his work in overseeing our economic initiatives through the end of this year.

Ireland is lucky to have George Mitchell on its side, even if it has to put up with the envy of the United States Senate, the Supreme Court, and Major League Baseball. [*Laughter*] You know, George is Irish and Lebanese. Maybe when we succeed in Ireland, if the Secretary of State is not finished, he'll volunteer for other duty. [*Laughter*]

As all of you know, the United States has a keen interest in a stable and democratic and prosperous Europe, but that interest is particularly strong when it comes to Ireland. Our strong bonds of kinship, culture, and history shared with the peoples of the United Kingdom in Ireland are well-known.

This is a moment of historic opportunity for you and historic interest for the United States. For my own part, people ask me from time to time why this is a matter of such deep personal interest to me. It goes beyond my Irish roots. I wish I could just say that's all there was to it. But an important part of our mission at this moment in time as Americans is to help reconcile the divisions which keep people apart and lead them sometimes to violence both within our own country and around the world.

If you look into the next century, you could thank the good Lord that we may—we may—succeed in removing the nuclear threat from the children of the 21st century. But we still see these ancient impulses that keep people apart based on religious or racial or ethnic differences. I tell my fellow Americans all the time that the great genius of our country in the next century may be our ability to exalt the greatest amount of diversity of any large country in the world. But it is still a challenge for us here. You see it all the time. And we can think of no greater mission in our quest to reconcile diversity than trying to help peace and prosperity succeed in Northern Ireland and in Ireland in general.

This is, as I'm sure you know, an extraordinary gathering of which you are a part. Never before have representatives of all the political parties in Northern Ireland, officials from the United Kingdom and Ireland, and so many business leaders joined to help us to build a better tomorrow. The conference shows anew the historic progress that has been made toward a just and lasting settlement and toward a peace that respects the rights and traditions of both communities.

In the last few months, thanks to the ceasefire and the momentum of the negotiations, a powerful transformation has begun. Peace is closer than it's been in a generation. For the first time in decades, children can walk to school without worrying. Families that have endured so much violence with so much dignity can now enjoy the blessings of days without violence and nights without fear. The roads between North and South are more open than they have been in 25 years. And citizens of the Republic are visiting the North in even greater numbers. In Belfast, the army patrols have ended, the body armor and helmets are gone, hundreds of troops are now going home.

These landmark achievements would not have been possible without the leadership and courage of Prime Minister Major, Prime Minister Bruton, and before him, Prime Minister Reynolds. With the Joint Framework Document, they are paving the way for a new and hopeful era of reconciliation. All true friends of Ireland are grateful to them and to the parties that have risen to their challenge. I salute them, and I salute others who work for peace, individuals such as Foreign Minister Spring, Sir Patrick Mayhew, and that tireless advocate of peace, our friend John Hume.

We pay tribute as well to the brave people of Northern Ireland, whose courage has brought them to this point. The United States is proud to have helped them and all peacemakers, and today I renew my pledge to do everything in my power to support their efforts. I know—[*applause*]—thank you. I know I speak for all Americans when I say that people who take risks for peace, here and anywhere else in the world, will always be welcome in the White House, in Washington, and throughout our country.

This momentum must be maintained. The ministerial-level talks represent a step of tremendous promise. I hope the parties can soon sit down together to discuss the future and their differences. That is the best guarantee of a permanent peace.

But there must be progress as well outside the conference rooms. Violence is diminished, but it has not disappeared. I call on all those who continue to employ violence to end the punishment beatings and the intimidation. And to all who are observing the cease-fire, I appeal to you to take the next step and begin to discuss serious decommissioning of weapons. Paramilitaries on both sides must get rid of their bombs and guns for good. And the specter of violence that has haunted Ireland must be banished, once and for all.

It is also time to begin healing the wounds of a generation. Many innocents disappeared during ''the troubles.'' Others were banished from their homes. Today there are families that have still not had the chance to grieve in peace, to visit the graves of their loved ones, to reunite after years of separation. It is time to allow families to be whole again.

As everyone knows, peace is more than cease-fires and formal agreements. It demands real hope and progress in the hearts of people. It demands common striving for the common good. It is time for those who have been most affected by the fighting to feel this kind of hope and this sense of progress. As Yeats wrote, ''Too long a sacrifice can make a stone of the heart.'' There must be a peace dividend in Northern Ireland and the border counties so that everyone is convinced that the future belongs to those who build, not those who destroy, so that the majority that supports peace is strengthened, so that there is no slipping back into the violence that frustration breeds.

That is why this conference is so important. It underscores that all sides have an interest in investing in the future of Northern Ireland and that all sides will benefit from the peace. Our own experience here in America shows what a difference that kind of progress and benefit can bring. More than a century ago, our great sage Ralph Waldo Emerson said that trade was the principle of liberty, that it made peace and keeps peace. That is what we wish for Ireland, and now it is time to realize that wish. The end of organized violence makes that possible.

So I urge American businesses and all others to consider investing in Northern Ireland and the border counties. The opportunities are excellent. The work force is well-educated and well-motivated. The productivity levels are high. The unit labor costs are low. The labor relations are good. The infrastructure, the communications, the access to the European market are fine. With the prospect of an enduring settlement on the horizon, business confidence is rising fast. Experts predict investment booms on both sides of the border and an increase in tourism in the North that could exceed 100 percent.

Already, the United States is the number one investor in both Northern Ireland and the Republic. American companies employ nearly 10 percent of all the workers in Northern Ireland's manufacturing sector. And Ireland imports almost $3 billion worth of American goods. The firms that we have in these markets are increasing their investments, strengthening their positions in Europe, building businesses that create jobs on both sides of the Atlantic. By doing well, these companies are also doing good.

More investment in Northern Ireland promises to lift the region out of the cycle of despair that leads to violence. It will reduce the chronic unemployment than runs around 50 percent in some urban areas and has deadened the dreams of so many. If growth is accompanied by an end to discrimination, by fair and nonsectarian employment practices, and encouraging investment in areas in greatest need, then both Catholics and Protestants will feel that they have a stake in their society and its peaceful future.

When both communities feel the benefits of peace and see that they are distributed fairly, despair will lose its hold, and all will have the chance they deserve to fulfill their God-given potential.

"Peace," Yeats said, "comes dropping slow." The past will not be overcome in a day, but the perception of change provides the kindling for hope, and the opportunities for positive, powerful, profitable change clearly are now present in Northern Ireland.

As long as I am President, the United States will continue to encourage that change. I am proud of all that Secretary Brown has done in achieving—on his mission to Ireland last December. I'm proud of the many efforts of the Department of Commerce, USAID, USIA, and other Government agencies to support reconciliation in Ireland. I am proud of the work of the State Department, and I want to say a special word of thanks to our Ambassadors in the area, Ambassador Crowe and Ambassador Jean Kennedy Smith, for the outstanding work that they have both done. Thank you.

Ours is the first administration ever to include appropriations for the International Fund for Ireland. The IFI have lived up to our hopes for it. The fund supports over 3,000 economic development projects and has created some 23,000 jobs in areas that were recruiting grounds for the paramilitaries. It is promoting cooperation across the border and between communities.

The record challenges us to go even further. So we have increased our funding request for the IFI to almost $60 million over the next 2 years. And we are working to build more bridges across the ocean through exchange programs for managers, students, agricultural experts, artists, and scholars, programs that establish bonds of friendship, while transporting ideas and information, benefiting people on both sides of the ocean.

There are some in Washington who would like to cut our funding for these and other programs that support peace in Ireland and throughout the world. That would be a grave error. The United States has an abiding interest in creating peace and the opportunities it brings. We must have the resources to foster peace and stand by those who take the hard risks for peace. We have seen time and again that our investments in peace, whether in the Middle East, southern Africa, Haiti, or Ireland, have always yielded great benefits for the American people in growing markets, great stability, increased security.

I hope all those who want to see peace in Northern Ireland will keep that in mind. Peace has a price, but it is a small one compared to the alternative, and it is a price very much worth paying.

I'm also glad we've been able to help the cause of peace through this conference and other economic initiatives, because Ireland has given us so much. The two communities that today are coming together in cooperation have each given America a rich legacy. In our Nation, Catholic and Protestants have been intertwined, and together they have contributed immensely to the greatness of our people and the success of America. There is evidence all around us. In places like New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, counties, cities, and towns with names like Londonderry, Ulster, and Antrim dot the map. Often these places mark the frontier in the 18th century when Ulster Protestants, some of them my ancestors, pushed west to build new lives and a new nation. These settlers were the forebears of nearly a dozen American Presidents, including Andrew Jackson, William McKinley, and Woodrow Wilson.

Irish Catholics contributed just as much to our country's rise, whether in building railroads or institutions. A visiting journalist in the last century took the measure of that effort when he said that in America you could see water power, steam power, horse power, and Irish power. [*Laughter*] And, he concluded, "the last works hardest of all." [*Laughter*]

In this half of our century, the names John F. Kennedy, Justice William Brennan, Speaker Tip O'Neill only began to tell the story of Irish Catholics' contribution to all the branches of American democracy. These true traditions, harnessed together in the New World for common goals, has been America's great fortune. Time and again, we have seen peoples of different backgrounds and ancestries put freedom over faction, the goals of the community over the interests of its separate parts.

Of the gifts we can give to Ireland, this example of people joining together for the common good clearly is the greatest. The challenges of the coming century demand that we keep in mind the example of those who went before us, who built bridges across their differences and found the strength to pull together.

We now face a whole new set of challenges in this new era. The global economy, the explosion of information, the advance of technology, the growing mobility of people, all these forces are bringing us into a more integrated world, more full of possibilities than ever before. The next century can be the most exciting time in all human history because of the opportunities for human possibilities.

But we have to recognize that all these forces of integration have a darker side, as well. If we do not rise to the challenges they present, we become vulnerable to the organized forces of destruction and evil, for the modern world requires us to be open in order to take advantage of all the forces of integration. And as we become more open, we become more vulnerable to those who would hate and those who would destroy.

As the people of Northern Ireland are showing, we can seize the moment. We can turn away from terror. We can turn away from destruction. We can turn toward peace and unity and possibility. But to keep this process going, to lock in the accomplishments, we must make hope real. To grasp the opportunity, we must build stronger businesses and communities and families. We must have more and better jobs. We must strengthen the prospects of a better tomorrow.

That is the way to preempt fanaticism. That is the way to close the book on old and bloody conflicts. That is the way to give our children the future they all deserve. The chance is there. It is here. It is now. We have it in our power to make all the difference. Let us do it.

Thank you, and bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:48 a.m. at the Sheraton Washington Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to George Mitchell, Special Adviser for Economic Initiatives in Ireland; Deputy Prime Minister Richard Spring, Prime Minister John Bruton, and former Prime Minister Albert Reynolds of Ireland; Prime Minister John Major and Secretary of State for Northern Ireland Sir Patrick Mayhew of the United Kingdom; Ambassadors to the U.S. Sir Robin William of Great Britain and Dermot Gallagher of Ireland; John Hume, leader, Northern Ireland Social Democratic and Labor Party; U.S. Ambassador to Ireland Jean Kennedy Smith; and U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain William J. Crowe.

Statement on the United Nations/NATO Decision To Launch Airstrikes in Bosnia

May 25, 1995

I welcome the decision of the U.N. and NATO to launch airstrikes today against a Bosnian-Serb ammunition site following the violence of the past several days in and around Sarajevo. This action was taken in response to Bosnian-Serb defiance of yesterday's UNPROFOR demand for the return of heavy weapons to designated weapons collection points in accord with existing agreements.

This action should help NATO and the U.N. sustain their ability to ease suffering in the region. I hope that today's airstrikes will convince the Bosnian-Serb leadership to end their violations of the exclusion zone and comply with their other agreements with the U.N.

I appreciate the courage and dedication of the U.N. forces on the ground in the former Yugoslavia, and trust that this evidence of U.N. and NATO determination will serve to enhance the ability of these forces to remain and perform their missions.

Message to the Congress on Small Business

May 25, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to forward my second annual report on the state of small business, and to report that small businesses are doing exceptionally well. Business starts and incorporations were up in 1993, the year covered in this report. Failures and bankruptcies were down. Six times as many jobs were created as in the previous year, primarily in in-

dustries historically dominated by small businesses.

Small businesses are a critical part of our economy. They employ almost 60 percent of the work force, contribute 54 percent of sales, account for roughly 40 percent of gross domestic product, and are responsible for 50 percent of private sector output. More than 600,000 new firms have been created annually over the past decade, and over much of this period, small firms generated many of the Nation's new jobs. As this report documents, entrepreneurial small businesses are also strong innovators, producing twice as many significant innovations as their larger counterparts.

In short, a great deal of our Nation's economic activity comes from the record number of entrepreneurs living the American Dream. Our job in Government is to make sure that conditions are right for that dynamic activity to continue and to grow.

And we are taking important steps. Maintaining a strong economy while continuing to lower the Federal budget deficit may be the most important step we in Government can take. A lower deficit means that more savings can go into new plant and equipment and that interest rates will be lower. It means that more small businesses can get the financing they need to get started.

We are finally bringing the Federal deficit under control. In 1992 the deficit was $290 billion. By 1994, the deficit was $203 billion; we project that it will fall to $193 billion in 1995.

Deficit reduction matters. We have been enjoying the lowest combined rate of unemployment and inflation in 25 years. Gross domestic product has increased, as having housing starts. New business incorporations continue to climb. We want to continue bringing the deficit down in a way that protects our economic recovery, pays attention to the needs of people, and empowers small business men and women.

Capital Formation

One area on which we have focused attention is increasing the availability of capital to new and small enterprises, especially the dynamic firms that keep us competitive and contribute so much to economic growth.

Bank regulatory policies are being revised to encourage lending to small firms. Included in the Credit Availability Program that we introduced in 1993 are revised banking regulatory policies concerning some small business loans and permission for financial institutions to create ''character loans.''

New legislation supported by my Administration and enacted in September 1994, the Reigle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994, establishes a Community Development Financial Institutions Fund for community development banks, amends banking and securities laws to encourage the creation of a secondary market for small business loans, and reduces the regulatory burden for financial institutions by changing or eliminating 50 banking regulations.

Under the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 1994, the Small Business Administration (SBA) is authorized to increase the number of guaranteed small business loans for the next 3 years. The budget proposed for the SBA will encourage private funds to be directed to the small businesses that most need access to capital. While continuing cost-cutting efforts, the plan proposes to fund new loan and venture capital authority for SBA's credit and investment programs. Changes in the SBA's 7(a) guaranteed loan program will increase the amount of private sector lending leveraged for every dollar of taxpayer funds invested in the program.

Through the Small Business Investment Company (SBIC) program, a group of new venture capital firms are expected to make available several billion dollars in equity financing for startups and growing firms. The SBIC program will continue to grow as regulations promulgated in the past year facilitate financing with a newly created participating equity security instrument.

And the Securities and Exchange Commission's simplified filing and registration requirements for small firm securities have helped encourage new entries by small firms into capital markets.

We are recommending other changes that will help make more capital available to small firms. In reauthorizing Superfund, my Administration seeks to limit lender liability for

Superfund remediation costs, which have had an adverse effect on lending to small businesses. Interagency teams have been examining additional cost-effective ways to expand the availability of small business financing, such as new options for expanding equity investments in small firms and improvements to existing microlending efforts.

We've also recognized that we can help small business people increase their available capital through tax reductions and incentives. We increased by 75 percent, from $10,000 to $17,500, the amount a small business can deduct as expenses for equipment purchases. Tax incentives in the 1993 Budget Reconciliation Act are having their effect, encouraging long-term investment in small firms. And the empowerment zone program offers significant tax incentives—a 20 percent wage credit, $20,000 in expensing, and tax-exempt facility bonds—for firms within the zones.

Regulation and Paperwork

But increasing the availability of capital to small firms is only part of the battle. We also have to make sure that Government doesn't get in the way. And we're making progress in our efforts to create a smaller, smarter, less costly and more effective Government that is closer to home—closer to the small businesses and citizens it serves.

In the first round of our reinventing Government initiative—the National Performance Review—we asked Government professionals for their best ideas on how to create a better Government with less red tape. One recommendation was that Federal agency compliance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act—that requires agencies to examine proposed and existing regulations for their effects on small entities—be subject to judicial review. In other words, they said we need to put teeth in the legislation requiring Federal agencies to pay attention to small business concerns when they write regulations. That proposal has been under debate in the Congress.

Federal agencies are already considering and implementing specific ways to streamline regulations and make paperwork easier for small businesses to manage. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) responded to small business owners and advocates who said that the agency's toxic release inventory rule was especially costly and burdensome. In November 1994, the EPA announced a final rule that will make it easier for small businesses to report small amounts of toxic releases.

And SBA has slashed the small business loan form for loans under $100,000 from an inch-thick stack to a single page. The SBA is also piloting a new electronic loan application that will involve no paperwork, but will allow business owners to concentrate on the business at hand—building a successful operation.

When businesses are unable to succeed, no one is served by a process that entangles small business owners in an endless jumble of paperwork. Sweeping changes made to bankruptcy laws in the past year will help small businesses reorganize. Small firms with less than $2.5 million in debt may utilize a streamlined reorganization process that is less expensive and more timely.

My Executive order on Regulatory Review provides a process for more rational regulation, and we've been listening to the concerns of small firms through a Regulatory Reform Forum for Small Business. Five sector-specific groups have made specific proposals for regulatory relief. These groups have said that a comprehensive, multiagency strategy, with better public involvement, is probably the most cost-effective way to improve both the quality of regulations and compliance with them. The key is to make sure that Government serves small business and the American people, not the other way around.

Electronic Commerce and Government Procurement

The reinventing Government initiative also called for expanded use of electronic marketing and commerce, and we have made great strides in providing information about Government programs electronically. These methods will increase small business access to markets.

Another area that has been sorely in need of reform is the Government procurement process. In October 1994, I signed into law the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act, which will change the way the Government does business. The law modifies more than

225 provisions of procurement law to reduce paperwork burdens, improve efficiency, save the taxpayers money, establish a Federal acquisition computer network, increase opportunities for women-owned and small disadvantaged businesses, and generally make Government acquisition of commercial products easier. This report documents how small businesses are doing under the old system; my hope is that opportunities for small business success will be even greater once these reforms are in effect.

Human Resources

Beyond encouraging an economic environment that supports small business success, opening doors to capital resources, buying more of our goods and services from small firms, and getting out of small business' way, I believe we in Government have a responsibility to ask whether we are doing enough to ensure a healthy and adequately prepared work force.

I remain committed to seeking a way to provide health insurance coverage for all Americans. As this report clearly shows, the number of uninsured Americans is too high—and it's growing. Millions of those citizens are in working families. And the sad fact is that many of those workers are in small businesses, which have seen their premiums and deductibles soar. We must make sure that self-employed people and small businesses can buy insurance at more affordable rates—whether through voluntary purchasing pools or some other mechanism.

We also ought to be able to ensure that our citizens are adequately provided for when they reach the end of their working years. Here too, small firms have been at a disadvantage. Our proposed pension legislation exempted most small plans from compliance and reporting increases.

And while our industries restructure and move from an age of heavy industry to an information age that demands new skills and new flexibility, we need to make sure that our work force has the skills and tools to compete. That is why I proposed the Middle Class Bill of Rights, which would provide a tax deduction for all education and training after high school; foster more saving and personal responsibility by permitting people to establish an individual retirement account and withdraw from it tax-free for the cost of education, health care, first-time house buying, or the care of a parent; and offer to those laid off or working for a very low wage, a voucher worth $2,000 a year to get the skills they need to improve their lives.

International Trade

We also want to empower small businesses to succeed in a global economy. One of the greatest challenges in the next century will be our international competition. Ninety-six percent of all exporting firms are small firms with fewer than 500 employees, but only 10 percent of small firms export; therefore the potential for increasing small firm exports is significant. I believe the North American Free Trade Agreement and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade will benefit small firms interested in expanding into international markets in this hemisphere and beyond.

Lending to small exporters is being eased through reforms in the Export-Import Bank's Working Capital Guarantee Program. New one-stop export shops are moving in the right direction to assist small firms by providing access to export programs of the Department of Commerce, Export-Import Bank, and Small Business Administration all under one roof.

Hearing from Small Business

Small businesses are too important to our economy for their concerns not to be heard. That is why I have given the SBA a seat on the National Economic Council and invited the SBA Administrator in to Cabinet meetings.

Over the past 2 years, my Administration has been asking questions of small business owners and listening to the answers—seeking advice and guidance from a diverse audience of business leaders to determine the most critical problems and devise solutions that work.

This year presents a special opportunity for small business persons to make their concerns known at the White House Conference on Small Business, set to convene in Washington in June 1995. In State conferences leading up to the national conference, small

business owners have been frank about their concerns. I look forward to hearing their small business action agenda.

I firmly believe that we need to keep looking to our citizens and small businesses for innovative solutions. They have shown they have the ingenuity and creative power to make our economy grow; we just need to let them do it.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 25, 1995.

Remarks at the White House Conference on Trade and Investment in Ireland Reception

May 25, 1995

Thank you very much. Let me welcome all of you again, and say a special word of welcome to Deputy Prime Minister Spring, Sir Patrick Mayhew, Ambassador Gallagher, Ambassador Renwick, Ambassador Crowe, Ambassador Smith, to Senator Mitchell, to the people who are here from the International Fund for Ireland. Let me say a special word of thanks to the Chairman, Willie McCarter, and to my good friend and appointee, Jim Lyons. And let me remind all of you that, appropriately enough, the band that just entertained us is known as Celtic Thunder. We arranged the Irish weather here tonight—[*laughter*]—to remind you that we are all here under a very large tent in more ways than one.

[*At this point, there was a loud clap of thunder, followed by audience laughter and applause.*]

If yesterday and today all of us have done what we set out to do, then we will all be sharing the same hopes and joining the same work for the future of Northern Ireland and the border counties of Ireland. We are especially committed to the economic revival of the people who live there, all of the people who live there.

We know that many people will be skeptical about the possibilities of peace, and others will be skeptical about the possibilities of economic progress. George Bernard Shaw once recognized that skepticism about economic matters dies hard, and since he had a foot in Ireland and a foot in England, I thought I would remind you of what he said. He said, "If you lined up end to end all the economists in the world, you still would not reach a conclusion." [*Laughter*] I think today, even Mr. Shaw would share our optimism.

I hope that this conference stirred your thoughts and your imagination for the future, that you have had an opportunity to exchange ideas and plans, that you will act on the things that you have thought about and dreamed about here. The people who are gathered here have the opportunity to make all your ideals real. We in government can make a difference in political negotiations as the first bridge between groups that history has separated. We can be a catalyst for change. But sustained progress will require more. It demands the engagements of all the major groups within society, the companies that provide the economic lifeblood, the churches, the political parties, the civic associations.

Already there has been tremendous progress. We can see that in the desire for peace that runs throughout Northern Ireland, and let me emphasize this, in the work of the 200 community and civic leaders who traveled here at their own great expense to advance the cause of reconciliation. We thank them especially for being here. These men and women are on the frontlines bringing down the barricades, bringing together the people of the Shankill and the people of the Falls.

I want to thank, as well, the Irish-American community, the business community, and the nongovernmental organizations. You have risen to the task. Now let me say that, as I thank you—is the sound off? That's good, because I'm almost through. [*Laughter*]

I asked you here tonight mostly to celebrate and not to hear another speech. I ask you to remember that the United States is always with you.

Just behind me here, through the—you can almost see them even through the plastic cover—are the two oldest trees at the White House, two grand magnolias planted over 165 years ago by Andrew Jackson, the son of an immigrant farmer from the

Carrickfergus in County Antrim. Every day, I look at those two old trees and think about our Nation's past and our Nation's future. Today, I will look at them with fresh eyes to think about Ireland's past and Ireland's future, the future of the people of Northern Ireland and the people of Ireland.

Thank you all, good luck, God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:19 p.m. on the South Grounds at the White House.

Remarks During a Meeting With Surgeon General-Designate Henry Foster and an Exchange With Reporters

May 26, 1995

Surgeon General Nomination

The President. I want to thank the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee for endorsing the nomination of Dr. Foster to be Surgeon General, and for doing it in a bipartisan fashion. I'd also like to say a special word of appreciation to the people of Tennessee who stood with him, and especially to the young children in the "I Have A Future" program, who came up here and talked about how he helped to turn their lives around, helped to convince them to stay in school, to keep working, to turn away from drugs, from teen pregnancy, from the other problems that bother so many of our children.

This is a good day for the United States, and I look forward to going on to the next stage, and to working right through until we get Dr. Foster confirmed.

Q. Mr. President, what are you going to do if the——

The President. I would like for Dr. Foster to say something, too.

Dr. Foster. I, too, would like to thank the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee for a fair hearing and for moving this forward to the full Senate. I also particularly want to thank the person on that committee who knew me best, Senator William Frist, for supporting my nomination. And lastly, I want to thank the President, his administration, congressional Members, and my family for supporting me so stoutly during these times.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, what are you going to do if the U.N. peacekeepers are harmed in Bosnia by the Serbs? They have threatened to retaliate on the bombing.

The President. We'll have to examine their actions as they take them. The United States is in a—I want to make clear the position we're in here—we, as a part of and a leader of NATO, responded to the request of the United Nations, which I thought was very appropriate, to deal with the shelling of Sarajevo and the shelling of civilians by the Bosnian Serbs, in clear violation of the understandings that have been in place for quite some time now. And we did that in an appropriate way against military targets, so that the taking of hostages, as well as the killing of civilians by them is totally wrong and inappropriate, and it should stop.

The United Nations, the forces on the ground and the United Nations Command obviously will have to analyze these circumstances on a daily basis. We will work with them, and we'll do whatever is appropriate. And I still believe that the action we took was appropriate. It was in response to the request from the U.N., and it certainly was provoked by the inappropriate shelling of civilians by the Bosnian Serbs.

Q. Do you have a backup plan if something happens? You're sending an aircraft carrier to the Adriatic? Does that have a——

The President. I can't comment any further on what's going on now. I think it's important for the United Nations, who have the forces on the ground, to be able to deal with this situation, and as the events unfold, I'll be happy to comment.

China

Q. Mr. President, why are you giving China MFN again, sir?

The President. Well, I haven't made a decision on that yet. But as you know, I said last year—and I believe—that we should continue to press China on the human rights issues, but I don't believe that singling China out on the MFN is necessarily the best way to do it. There are other countries with whom

we have human rights differences as well, and we have certainly pressed our differences with China, not only person-to-person, face-to-face with the Chinese but also in the appropriate international forum, and we will continue to do that.

And we also have other differences with them. I agreed to let President Li from Taiwan come here. I thought that was the appropriate thing to do. We won't always agree with the Chinese, but I think it's important that when we disagree, we do it in the right way, aggressively and forthrightly, but in the proper forum.

Q. President Yeltsin has called Mr. Major and Mr. Kohl complaining about the—[*inaudible*]—has he tried to reach you, and what would you tell him?

The President. Not yet, no. If he did, I would tell him just what I told you, that the United Nations asked for this; they certainly weren't put up to it, that the Bosnian Serbs went way beyond the bounds of acceptable conduct. There have been clear restrictions on bombing civilians and the shelling those areas for a long time now. I would ask him to call the Serbs and tell them to quit it and tell them to behave themselves and that this would not happen.

Surgeon General Nomination

Q. Are the Democrats ready to overcome a filibuster on the Foster nomination if it happens?

The President. The Democrats are not numerous enough to overcome a filibuster. But Senator Frist and Senator Jeffords put their country above their party today and did what they thought was right, and I think there will be others. There may even be some who may not think they should vote for him, Dr. Foster, who believe that it's wrong to filibuster a nomination of this kind.

In the past, when the Democrats were in the majority in the Senate, they often did that as well. They often gave Republican Presidents votes on their nominees, even if they didn't agree with them. This—it would be unusual and unwarranted if this fine man were denied his day in court in the Senate, and I don't believe the American people want that to happen, and I don't believe that a majority of the Senate wants that to happen.

Q. What are you doing for the rest of the day?

The President. Working. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:33 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom; Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany; and President Boris Yeltsin of Russia. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Executive Order 12961—Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses

May 26, 1995

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Establishment.* (a) There is hereby established the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses (the "Committee"). The Committee shall be composed of not more than 12 members to be appointed by the President. The members of the Committee shall have expertise relevant to the functions of the Committee and shall not be full-time officials or employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government. The Committee shall be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, 5 U.S.C. App. 2.

(b) The President shall designate a Chairperson from among the members of the Committee.

Sec. 2. *Functions.* (a) The Committee shall report to the President through the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(b) The Committee shall provide advice and recommendations based on its review of the following matters:

(1) *Research:* epidemiological, clinical, and other research concerning Gulf War veterans' illnesses.

(2) *Coordinating Efforts:* the activities of the Persian Gulf Veterans Coordinating Board, including the Research Coordinating

Council, the Clinical Working Group, and the Disability and Compensation Working Group.

(3) *Medical Treatment:* medical examinations and treatment in connection with Gulf War veterans' illnesses, including the Comprehensive Clinical Evaluation Program and the Persian Gulf Registry Medical Examination Program.

(4) *Outreach:* government-sponsored outreach efforts such as hotlines and newsletters related to Gulf War veterans' illnesses.

(5) *External Reviews:* the steps taken to implement recommendations in external reviews by the Institute of Medicine's Committee to Review the Health Consequences of Service During the Persian Gulf War, the Defense Science Board Task Force on Persian Gulf War Health Effects, the National Institutes of Health Technology Assessment Workshop on the Persian Gulf Experience and Health, the Persian Gulf Expert Scientific Committee, and other bodies.

(6) *Risk Factors:* the possible risks associated with service in the Persian Gulf Conflict in general and, specifically, with prophylactic drugs and vaccines, infectious diseases, environmental chemicals, radiation and toxic substances, smoke from oil well fires, depleted uranium, physical and psychological stress, and other factors applicable to the Persian Gulf Conflict.

(7) *Chemical and Biological Weapons:* information related to reports of the possible detection of chemical or biological weapons during the Persian Gulf Conflict.

(c) It shall not be a function of the Committee to conduct scientific research. The Committee shall review information and provide advice and recommendations on the activities undertaken related to the matters described in (b) above.

(d) It shall not be a function of the Committee to provide advice or recommendations on any legal liability of the Federal Government for any claims or potential claims against the Federal Government.

(e) As used herein, ''Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses'' means the symptoms and illnesses reported by United States uniformed services personnel who served in the Persian Gulf Conflict.

(f) The Committee shall submit an interim report within 6 months of the first meeting of the Committee and a final report by December 31, 1996, unless otherwise provided by the President.

Sec. 3. *Administration.* (a) The heads of executive departments and agencies shall, to the extent permitted by law, provide the Committee with such information as it may require for purposes of carrying out its functions.

(b) Members of the Committee shall be compensated in accordance with Federal law. Committee members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, to the extent permitted by law for persons serving intermittently in the Government service (5 U.S.C. 5701–5707).

(c) To the extent permitted by law, and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Department of Defense shall provide the Committee with such funds as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

Sec. 4. *General Provisions.* (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other Executive order, the functions of the President under the Federal Advisory Committee Act that are applicable to the Committee, except that of reporting annually to the Congress, shall be performed by the Secretary of Defense, in accordance with the guidelines and procedures established by the Administrator of General Services.

(b) The Committee shall terminate 30 days after submitting its final report.

(c) This order is intended only to improve the internal management of the executive branch and it is not intended to create any right, benefit or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any person.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 26, 1995.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:36 a.m., May 30, 1995]

NOTE: This Executive order will be published in the *Federal Register* on May 31.

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.

May 22

The President announced the nomination of Dwight P. Robinson as Deputy Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The President announced his intention to reappoint Jean Kennedy Smith to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

The White House announced that the President will meet with President Jacques Chirac of the European Council, and President Jacques Santer of the European Commission, at a summit on June 14 in Washington, DC.

May 24

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary Clinton hosted a tea for King Juan Carlos and Queen Sophia of Spain in the Yellow Oval Room.

The President announced his intention to appoint Rose Dobrof to the Federal Council on the Aging.

The President nominated Linda L. Robertson of Washington, DC, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Legislative Affairs.

The President announced his intention to nominate Peggy A. Nagae to be a member of the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund Board of Directors.

May 25

The President announced the appointment of Richard Nuccio as Special Adviser to the President and Secretary of State for Cuba.

The President named Melvin E. Clark, Jr., and Charles A. Docter to the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation Board of Directors.

May 26

The President declared a major disaster in South Dakota and ordered Federal funds to supplement State and local recovery efforts in communities struck by severe storms, flooding, and ground saturation due to high water tables, beginning March 1.

The President announced his intention to appoint Phyllis Middleton Jackson to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

The President announced the appointment of Joyce Lashof to be Chair and the following individuals to be members of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses: John Baldeschwieler; Arthur Caplan; Donald Custis; Frederick M. Franks, Jr.; David A. Hamburg; James A. Johnson; Marguerite Knox; Philip Landrigan; Elaine L. Larson; Rolando Rios; and Andrea Kidd Taylor.

The President announced he has selected the following individuals to serve as delegates to the White House Conference on Small Business to be held in Washington, DC, on June 11–15: Sarah Barela; John Burgess; Robert Calcaterra; Lorrie J. Carey; Mary Ann Carlson; Barbara L. Cash; Audrey L. Davis; Deborah D. Dolman; Charles J. Dorame; Sue Ling Gin; Omar M. Kader; Kathy Kemp; Nadine Mathis; Urban Miyares; Ann L. Mulholland; Kathy Neal; Harry Posey; Barbara Skelton; Edward I. Weisiger, Jr.; and Buck W. Wong.

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 May 24

Linda Lee Robertson,
of Oklahoma, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury, vice Michael B. Levy, resigned.

Joseph H. McKinley, Jr.,
of Kentucky, to be U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky, vice Ronald E. Meredith, deceased.

Robert H. Whaley,
of Washington, to be U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Washington, vice Justin L. Quackenbush, retired.

B. Lynn Winmill,
of Idaho, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Idaho, vice Harold L. Ryan, retired.

Submitted May 25

Kenneth H. Bacon,
of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense (new position).

Sheryl R. Marshall,
of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring October 11, 1998, vice Stephen Norris, term expired.

Peggy A. Nagae,
of Oregon, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund for a term of 3 years (new position).

Checklist of White House Press Releases

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

Released May 22

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the U.S.-EU summit in Washington, DC, on June 14

Released May 23

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the White House visit of a delegation from the Ulster Unionist Party on May 22

Statement by Chief of Staff Leon Panetta on the budget bill

Fact sheet on the "American Overseas Interests Act of 1995" (H.R. 1561)

Released May 24

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Announcement of nomination for three U.S. District Court judges

Released May 25

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the appointment of Richard Nuccio as Special Adviser to the President and Secretary of State for Cuba

Released May 26

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Acts Approved by the President

Approved May 22

S. 244 / Public Law 104–13

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995