

Weekly Compilation of  
**Presidential  
Documents**



Monday, October 11, 1993  
Volume 29—Number 40  
Pages 1951–2040

## Contents

### Addresses to the Nation

Somalia—2022

### Addresses and Remarks

*See also* Bill Signings

Arts and humanities awards

Dinner—2025

Presentation ceremony—2018

California

AARP in Culver City—2002

AFL-CIO in San Francisco—1982

Arrival in Sacramento—1960

Community in San Francisco—1993

Town meeting in Sacramento—1965

Democratic National Committee breakfast—  
2026

Middle East peace process—1952

Radio address—1958

Russia—1960

White House fellows—2015

### Appointments and Nominations

*See also* Statements by the President

Agriculture Department, Assistant Secretary—  
2038

Defense Department, Assistant Secretaries—  
2001

Justice Department, Special Counsel—2018

Navy Department, Under Secretary—2001

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency,  
Director—2017

### Bill Signings

*See also* Statements by the President

Hatch Act Reform Amendments of 1993

Remarks—2012

Statement—2014

### Communications to Congress

National Corporation for Housing

Partnerships report, message transmitting—  
2017

National Institute of Building Sciences report,  
message transmitting—2016

Naval petroleum reserves, message—2025

Strengthening America's shipyards, message—  
1958

Whaling activities of Norway, message—2000

### Communications to Federal Agencies

Freedom of Information Act, memorandum—  
1999

Refugee admissions, memorandum—1957

### Executive Orders

Labor-Management Partnerships—1955

Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee—  
1951

### Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters

San Francisco, CA—1992, 1993

South Lawn—1952, 1960, 2036

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

**Editor's Note:** The President traveled to New Brunswick, NJ, on October 8, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

## WEEKLY COMPILATION OF PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

## Contents—Continued

### **Meetings With Foreign Leaders**

*See also* Statements Other Than Presidential  
Israel, Foreign Minister Peres—1952  
Jordan, Crown Prince Hasan—1952

### **Proclamations**

Child Health Day—1999  
Columbus Day—2037  
Country Music Month—2026  
German-American Day—2010  
Leif Erikson Day—2036  
Mental Illness Awareness Week—2009  
National Disability Employment Awareness  
Month—2015

### **Statements by the President**

*See also* Appointments and Nominations; Bill  
Signings  
Arts and humanities awards recipients—2011  
Assistance to earthquake victims in India—  
1958  
NATO Supreme Allied Commander,  
Europe—2001

### **Statements by the President—Continued**

Rebuilding the Cypress Freeway in  
California—1998  
Retirement of basketball player Michael  
Jordan—2017

### **Statements Other Than Presidential**

Nuclear testing by China—2012  
President's meeting with Foreign Minister  
Shara of Syria—2025  
President's meeting with NATO Secretary  
General Woerner—2017  
President's telephone conversation with  
President Yeltsin of Russia—2011

### **Supplementary Materials**

Acts approved by the President—2040  
Checklist of White House press releases—  
2039  
Digest of other White House  
announcements—2038  
Nominations submitted to the Senate—2039

Week Ending Friday, October 8, 1993

**Executive Order 12870—Trade  
Promotion Coordinating Committee**  
*September 30, 1993*

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the Export Enhancement Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-429, 106 Stat. 2186), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

**Section 1. Establishment.** There is established the “Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee” (“TPCC”). The Committee shall comprise representatives of each of the following:

- (a) Department of Commerce;
- (b) Department of State;
- (c) Department of the Treasury;
- (d) Department of Agriculture;
- (e) Department of Energy;
- (f) Department of Transportation;
- (g) Department of Defense;
- (h) Department of Labor;
- (i) Department of the Interior;
- (j) Agency for International Development;
- (k) Trade and Development Agency;
- (l) Environmental Protection Agency;
- (m) United States Information Agency;
- (n) Small Business Administration;
- (o) Overseas Private Investment Corporation;
- (p) Export-Import Bank of the United States;
- (q) Office of the United States Trade Representative;
- (r) Council of Economic Advisers;
- (s) Office of Management and Budget;
- (t) National Economic Council;
- (u) National Security Council; and
- (v) at the discretion of the President, such other departments or agencies as may be necessary.

Members of the TPCC shall be appointed by the heads of their respective departments or agencies. Such members, as well as their

designated alternatives, shall be individuals who exercise significant decision-making authority in their respective departments or agencies.

**Sec. 2. Chairperson.** The Secretary of Commerce shall be the chairperson of the TPCC.

**Sec. 3. Purpose.** The purpose of the TPCC shall be to provide a unifying framework to coordinate the export promotion and export financing activities of the United States Government and to develop a governmentwide strategic plan for carrying out such programs.

**Sec. 4. Duties.** The TPCC shall:

- (a) coordinate the development of the trade promotion policies and programs of the United States Government;
- (b) provide a central source of information for the business community on Federal export promotion and export financing programs;
- (c) coordinate official trade promotion efforts to ensure better delivery of services to U.S. businesses, including:
  - (1) information and counseling on U.S. export promotion and export financing programs and opportunities in foreign markets;
  - (2) representation of U.S. business interests abroad; and
  - (3) assistance with foreign business contacts and projects;
- (d) prevent unnecessary duplication in Federal export promotion and export financing activities;
- (e) assess the appropriate levels and allocation of resources among agencies in support of export promotion and export financing and provide recommendations, through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to the President, based on its assessment; and
- (f) carry out such other duties as are deemed to be appropriate, consistent with the purpose of the TPCC.

**Sec. 5. Strategic Plan.** To carry out section 4 of this order, the TPCC shall develop and implement a governmentwide strategic plan for Federal trade promotion efforts. Such plan shall:

- (a) establish a set of priorities for Federal activities in support of U.S. exports and explain the rationale for the priorities;
- (b) review current Federal programs designed to promote the sale of U.S. exports in light of the priorities established under paragraph (a) of this section and develop a plan to bring such activities into line with those priorities and to improve coordination of such activities;
- (c) identify areas of overlap and duplication among Federal export promotion activities and propose means of eliminating them;
- (d) propose, through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, to the President an annual unified Federal trade promotion budget that supports the plan for priority activities and improved coordination established under paragraph (b) of this section and eliminates funding for the areas of overlap and duplication identified under paragraph (c) of this section; and
- (e) review efforts by the States to promote U.S. exports and propose means of developing cooperation between State and Federal efforts, including co-location, cost-sharing between Federal and State export promotion programs, and sharing of market research data.

**Sec. 6. Report.** The chairperson of the TPCC, with the approval of the President, shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, not later than September 30, 1993, and annually thereafter, a report describing the strategic plan developed by the TPCC pursuant to section 5 of this order, the implementation of such a plan, and any revisions to the plan.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
September 30, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 1:15 p.m., October 1, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on October 4. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

### **Remarks on the Middle East Peace Process and an Exchange With Reporters**

*October 1, 1993*

**The President.** Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I have a brief statement and then I want to give the Crown Prince and the Foreign Minister an opportunity to make a few remarks.

I have just had the privilege of hosting what to date has been an unprecedented meeting in the Oval Office between His Royal Highness Crown Prince Hassan of Jordan and Foreign Minister Shimon Peres of Israel. This meeting is another important step on the road toward a comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

With me in the Oval Office were Shimon Peres, a principal architect of the pathbreaking Israel-PLO agreement, and Crown Prince Hassan, a leader who has literally devoted his life to the promotion of peace and a better future for his entire region. I am grateful to both of them for accepting my invitation to further the cause of peace.

On September 13th we bore witness to an event that should serve as a turning point in the history of the Middle East. Then I spoke of my commitment to help build a new future for the Middle East and all its people. Today we have taken two additional steps to turn that hope into reality.

This morning at the State Department, in an extraordinary demonstration of international support for peace, 43 nations from every region of the world helped to usher in this new era by providing their political and financial backing to those who would make peace in the Middle East. They pledged more than \$600 million in immediate needs of the Palestinians and over \$2 billion over the next 5 years to help establish Palestinian self-government.

And now this meeting has just taken place in the Oval Office, coming as it does some 2 weeks after Jordan and Israel signed their agreement on a common agenda to guide their negotiations. This symbolizes a new relationship between Jordan and Israel, marked by dialog and acceptance rather than confrontation and rejection.

The special relationship between the United States and Israel is central to the pursuit of peace, and I want to emphasize the great importance the United States attaches to Jordan's critical role in achieving lasting peace in the region.

In our meeting, both the Crown Prince and the Foreign Minister spoke of their hopes for the future of peace and prosperity for Israelis, Palestinians, Syrians, Lebanese, and Jordanians all alike, indeed, for the entire region. To help to work toward this goal they discussed ways to give more energy and force to their bilateral negotiations to resolve all outstanding issues.

They also agreed today that Israel and Jordan should establish a joint economic committee, much like the one agreed to in the Israel-PLO agreement of 2½ weeks ago. And we all agreed that Israel, Jordan, and the United States should establish a working group to be convened by the United States with two representatives from each country so that Israel and Jordan can agree, together with this Nation acting as facilitator, on the next steps in economic development in their two nations. They share so much in common, as they both pointed out. Now they want a common economic agenda.

They also agreed to work through this working group on common steps to reduce the certification in the area. We want to reduce the problems of the environment and especially the problems the desert presents as a part of the long-term economic growth of the Middle East, and especially of Israel and Jordan.

And finally, they both agreed that we should all get to work as soon as possible. That's the kind of action and the kind of attitude that I hope we can keep alive, coming as it does on the heels of so many other encouraging signs in the Middle East.

Finally, let me say that they spoke of their common commitment to work in close coordination with the Palestinians as this peace

process goes forward. In this way, we can all act as partners with the Palestinians and work toward our common goals.

Let me say personally that I enjoyed this meeting very much. I applaud the Crown Prince. I applaud the Foreign Minister for coming here, for being a part of it. We believe that together we can work toward a peace that benefits everyone. And we believe there are things we can be doing now to benefit the countries and the peoples economically in ways that strengthen their inner sense of security and commitment to this remarkable process.

I'd like now to offer the microphone first to the Crown Prince and then to the Foreign Minister.

[At this point, Prince Hassan of Jordan and Foreign Minister Peres of Israel made brief statements.]

**The President.** Let me say first of all, to reiterate one of the things that the Crown Prince has said, this working group that we have agreed to set up will clearly operate within the framework and the context of the peace process and not independent of it but will focus on the economic and the environmental issues I have mentioned.

Second, I appreciate what the Foreign Minister said about the Secretary of State. In the privacy of our meeting, he said that today's speech by the Secretary of State was outrageous because it was the most expensive in memory. He raised more than a million dollars for every minute he talked today, which I appreciated.

And finally, let me say, this is somewhat to my chagrin, but one of the many matters that the Crown Prince and the Foreign Minister agreed on in the meeting is that they would not take any questions today, but I could. So here I am.

### **Arab Boycott**

**Q.** Mr. President, what about the Arab boycott? Can you tell us your feelings about whether the continued Arab boycott is an obstacle to the kind of economic cooperation that you gentlemen are trying to forge here today?

**The President.** Well, I think, first of all, they have agreed to find common economic

objectives which they can pursue and seek investment for from all around the world, and they've asked us to help them do that. And so we intend to. Obviously, the region can grow more rapidly when all its partners can trade with one another and invest in one another.

I think the statement, though, of the countries in continuing their position was not altogether discouraging. Obviously, as you know, the United States wanted the boycott lifted now, but basically they were saying we have to finish the peace process. Well, we all agree with that. Israel agrees with that. No one disputes that. And so I don't want us to be deterred.

This is a really historic day. We have this meeting and the agreement coming out of it. We have the remarkable donors conference today and the results coming out of this. We are moving this process very quickly, and I am confident that in the course of time we'll get the boycott lifted.

#### **Peace Process**

**Q.** Mr. President, now that you've brought Israel and the PLO together here on the White House lawn, and Israel and Jordan today, what are the prospects of bringing Israel and Syria together here at the White House?

**The President.** I thought you were going to ask me if I could get both parties together in the Congress on a health care plan.

Well, I'm hopeful. We have to take these things as we can, but I'm quite hopeful. I will say again, I am committed to finishing the peace process. I have told President Asad that. I have made it clear to Prime Minister Hariri, and we met at the United Nations and discussed Lebanon. Nothing that Prime Minister Rabin or Foreign Minister Peres has said to me leads me to believe that they have a different position.

But I will say again, the most important thing we can do at each step along the way is to build the support among the ordinary people of Israel, among the Palestinians, among the Jordanians for the agreements that have been made, for the processes that are underway, so that people all over the Middle East have a greater sense of confidence and security about what has been

agreed to and what is being done. The Crown Prince made a very important point that I think needs to be reiterated.

We are trying to make our statements brief and our actions and commitments long. And that is what we have to do. And so, I understand that this whole thing has to be finished. But to finish it, to get to the end, we have to absorb the full implications of the enormity of the things which have been done and implement them in a way that keeps the support for the process going. And I am committed to finishing it with all parties, more so than when we began.

#### **Economic Agenda**

**Q.** Mr. President, how much of the money that was given today at the donors conference will or should go to Jordan? Or will all of this go exclusively to the Palestinians? And if so, what will Israel and Jordan be cooperating about?

**The President.** Well, what we are going to do, this committee is going to come up with a whole different economic agenda for Israel and for Jordan and for how to deal with the overlapping Palestinian issues. And there are some overlapping ones which might lead to some different decisions down the road about what we do with commitments that have already been made. But I think that we need a whole different economic agenda there.

I think, as you know, I'm extraordinarily excited about this group of American Jewish and Arab American business people we got together who want to see an enormous private sector commitment in the Middle East. They are particularly interested in what can be agreed upon between Israel and Jordan and whether they could play a role in that. So I wouldn't rule out anything.

But the purpose of the donors conference today was to give life and meaning and reality to the agreement we saw between Israel and the PLO. There will have to be other investments, other commitments that will help to deal with the problems of Jordan, including the enormous problem Jordan has of accumulated debt. There needs to be some debt relief for Jordan, and the United States will support that. And there are a whole lot of

other things that we need to be doing on that.

Yes?

### **Confederation**

**Q.** Do you think that this is leading to a confederation between Jordan, Israel, and the Palestinians? Is this the beginning? Is this the basis to something like that?

**The President.** That's a question that I haven't answered and shouldn't answer. Anything regarding the political organization of the Middle East, that's a decision that will have to be made by the parties themselves. The United States will support the process and will support the decision of the people there.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:29 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

### **Executive Order 12871—Labor-Management Partnerships**

*October 1, 1993*

The involvement of Federal Government employees and their union representatives is essential to achieving the National Performance Review's Government reform objectives. Only by changing the nature of Federal labor-management relations so that managers, employees, and employees' elected union representatives serve as partners will it be possible to design and implement comprehensive changes necessary to reform Government. Labor-management partnerships will champion change in Federal Government agencies to transform them into organizations capable of delivering the highest quality services to the American people.

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, including section 301 of title 3, United States Code, and in order to establish a new form of labor-management relations throughout the executive branch to promote the principles and recommendations adopted as a result of the National Performance Review, it is hereby ordered:

**Section 1. The National Partnership Council.** (a) *Establishment and Membership.* There is established the National Partnership Council ("Council"). The Council shall comprise the following members appointed by the President:

- (1) Director of the Office of Personnel Management ("OPM");
- (2) Deputy Secretary of Labor;
- (3) Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget;
- (4) Chair, Federal Labor Relations Authority;
- (5) Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director;
- (6) President, American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO;
- (7) President, National Federation of Federal Employees;
- (8) President, National Treasury Employees Union;
- (9) Secretary-Treasurer of the Public Employees Department, AFL-CIO; and
- (10) a deputy Secretary or other officer with department- or agency-wide authority from two executive departments or agencies (hereafter collectively "agency"), not otherwise represented on the Council.

Members shall have 2-year terms on the Council, which may be extended by the President.

(b) *Responsibilities and Functions.* The Council shall advise the President on matters involving labor-management relations in the executive branch. Its activities shall include:

- (1) supporting the creation of labor-management partnerships and promoting partnership efforts in the executive branch, to the extent permitted by law;
- (2) proposing to the President by January 1994 statutory changes necessary to achieve the objectives of this order, including legislation consistent with the National Performance Review's recommendations for the creation of a flexible and responsive hiring system and the reform of the General Schedule classification system;
- (3) Collecting and disseminating information about, and providing guidance on, partnership efforts in the executive branch, including results achieved, to the extent permitted by law;

(4) utilizing the expertise of individuals both within and outside the Federal Government to foster partnership arrangements; and

(5) working with the President's Management Council toward reform consistent with the National Performance Review's recommendations throughout the executive branch.

(c) *Administration.* (1) The President shall designate a member of the Council who is a full-time Federal employee to serve as Chairperson. The responsibilities of the Chairperson shall include scheduling meetings of the Council.

(2) The Council shall seek input from non-member Federal agencies, particularly smaller agencies. It also may, from time to time, invite experts from the private and public sectors to submit information. The Council shall also seek input from companies, non-profit organizations, State and local governments, Federal Government employees, and customers of Federal Government services, as needed.

(3) To the extent permitted by law and subject to the availability of appropriations, OPM shall provide such facilities, support, and administrative services to the Council as the Director of OPM deems appropriate.

(4) Members of the Council shall serve without compensation for their work on the Council, but shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law, for persons serving intermittently in Government service.

(5) All agencies shall, to the extent permitted by law, provide to the Council such assistance, information, and advice as the Council may request.

(d) *General.* (1) I have determined that the Council shall be established in compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 2).

(2) Notwithstanding any other executive order, the functions of the President under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, except that of reporting to the Congress, that are applicable to the Council, shall be performed by the Director of OPM, in accordance with guidelines and procedures issued by the Administrator of General Services.

(3) The Council shall exist for a period of 2 years from the date of this order, unless extended.

(4) Members of the Council who are not otherwise officers or employees of the Federal Government shall serve in a representative capacity and shall not be considered special Government employees for any purpose.

**Sec. 2. Implementation of Labor-Management Partnerships Throughout the Executive Branch.** The head of each agency subject to the provisions of chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code shall:

(a) create labor-management partnerships by forming labor-management committees or councils at appropriate levels, or adapting existing councils or committees if such groups exist, to help reform Government;

(b) involve employees and their union representatives as full partners with management representatives to identify problems and craft solutions to better serve the agency's customers and mission;

(c) provide systematic training of appropriate agency employees (including line managers, first line supervisors, and union representatives who are Federal employees) in consensual methods of dispute resolution, such as alternative dispute resolution techniques and interest-based bargaining approaches;

(d) negotiate over the subjects set forth in 5 U.S.C. 7106(b)(1), and instruct subordinate officials to do the same; and

(e) evaluate progress and improvements in organizational performance resulting from the labor-management partnerships.

**Sec. 3. No Administrative or Judicial Review.** This order is intended only to improve the internal management of the executive branch and is not intended to, and does not, create any right to administrative or judicial review, or any other right, substantive or procedural, enforceable by a party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
October 1, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 5 p.m., October 4, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on October 6. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Memorandum on Refugee Admissions**

*October 1, 1993*

Presidential Determination No. 94-1

*Memorandum for the Secretary of State*

*Subject:* Determination of FY 1994 Refugee Admissions Numbers and Authorizations of In-Country Refugee Status Pursuant to Section 207 and 101(a)(42), Respectively, of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and Determination Pursuant to Section 2(b)(2) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act, as Amended

In accordance with Section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act ("the Act") (8 U.S.C. 1157), and after appropriate consultation with the Congress, I hereby make the following determinations and authorize the following actions:

The admission of up to 121,000 refugees to the United States during FY 1994 is justified by humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest; provided, however, that this number shall be understood as including persons admitted to the United States during FY 1994 with Federal refugee resettlement assistance under the Amerasian immigrant admissions program, as provided below.

The 120,000 funded admissions shall be allocated among refugees of special humanitarian concern to the United States as described in the documentation presented to the Congress during the consultations that preceded this determination and in accordance with the following regional allocations; provided, however, that the number allocated to the East Asia region shall include persons admitted to the United States during FY 1994 with Federal refugee resettlement assistance under Section 584 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related

Programs Appropriations Act of 1988, as contained in Section 101(e) of Public Law 100-202 (Amerasian immigrants and their family members); provided further that the number allocated to the former Soviet Union shall include persons admitted who were nationals of the former Soviet Union, or in the case of persons having no nationality, who were habitual residents of the former Soviet Union, prior to September 2, 1991:

Africa .....	7,000
East Asia .....	45,000
Former Soviet Union/Eastern Europe .....	55,000
Near East/South Asia .....	6,000
Latin America/Caribbean .....	4,000
Unallocated (funded) .....	3,000

The 3,000 unallocated federally funded numbers shall be allocated as needed. Unused admissions numbers allocated to a particular region within the 120,000 federally funded ceiling may be transferred to one or more other regions if there is an overriding need for greater numbers for the region or regions to which the numbers are being transferred. You are hereby authorized and directed to consult with the judiciary committees of the Congress prior to any such use of the unallocated numbers or reallocation of numbers from one region to another.

Pursuant to Section 2(b)(2) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2601(b)(2), I hereby determine that assistance to or on behalf of persons applying for admission to the United States as part of the overseas refugee admissions program will contribute to the foreign policy interests of the United States and designate such persons for this purpose.

The 1,000 privately funded admissions are not designated for any country or region and may be used for refugees of special humanitarian concern to the United States from any region provided that private resources are available to fund the reasonable cost of their admission and resettlement.

An additional 10,000 refugee admissions numbers shall be made available during FY 1994 for the adjustment to permanent resident status under Section 209(b) of the Act (8 U.S.C. 1159(b)) of aliens who have been granted asylum in the United States under Section 208 of the Act (8 U.S.C. 1158), as

this is justified by humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest. An estimated 7,000 aliens were granted asylum during FY 1993 under Section 208 of the Act.

In accordance with Section 101(a)(42) of the Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(42)) and after appropriate consultation with the Congress, I also specify that, for FY 1994, the following persons may, if otherwise qualified, be considered refugees for the purpose of admission to the United States within their countries of nationality or habitual residence:

- a. Persons in Vietnam.
- b. Persons in Cuba.
- c. Persons in Haiti.
- d. Persons in the former Soviet Union.

You are authorized and directed to report this Determination to the Congress immediately and to publish it in the *Federal Register*.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 1:51 p.m., October 5, 1993]

NOTE: This memorandum was published in the *Federal Register* on October 7. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

### **Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Strengthening America's Shipyards**

*October 1, 1993*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the requirements of section 1031 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484), I transmit herewith a report entitled "Strengthening America's Shipyards: A Plan for Competing in the International Market."

The U.S. shipbuilding industry is unsurpassed in building the finest and most complex naval vessels in the world. Now that the Cold War has ended, these shipyards, like many other defense firms, face a new challenge—translating their skills from the military to the commercial market. Individual shipyards already have begun to meet this challenge. The enclosed report describes

steps that the Government is taking and will take to assist their efforts. I look forward to working with the Congress and the industry to ensure a successful transition to a competitive industry in a truly competitive marketplace.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
October 1, 1993.

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

### **Statement on Emergency Assistance to Earthquake Victims in India**

*October 1, 1993*

The people of the United States are shocked and saddened by the devastating earthquake that has taken thousands of lives and left thousands more homeless. I have directed our Government to take immediate action to help ease the suffering. I have also asked Ambassador Ray Flynn to accompany the supplies, to assess the situation, and report back to me.

NOTE: The President's statement was included in a White House statement announcing that the President had directed the Defense Department and U.S. Agency for International Development to provide humanitarian assistance to earthquake victims in India. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

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

*October 2, 1993*

Good morning. This week the good will and hopefulness that surrounded the announcement of our health security plan continued to grow. A consensus is developing that our central goal, comprehensive health benefits for you and your family that can never be taken away, is now within reach and must be achieved. For the first time in our lifetimes, the question before Congress is no longer whether to provide health security but how.

Something unique is happening here in Washington: A coalition is taking shape across political boundaries, a coalition concerned more with passing health care than with scoring political points. And when the Congress passes health care reform, it won't have a label that says Democrat or Republican, it will be delivered to you with a label that says made in America.

This week as Congress began its deliberations, health care reform and the American people have had an extraordinary advocate on their side, the First Lady. Before, in our history, only Eleanor Roosevelt and Rosalynn Carter have testified before Congress. I'm proud of the intellect and compassion and the leadership Hillary is bringing to this issue and to our country. Her commitment to health care is a human issue. She says to find a solution, it must pass the "mom test," something that she could explain to her mother and her mother would support. That certainly has cut through the heart of a very complex health care debate.

During her testimony before the Senate Finance Committee this week, something extraordinary happened: Republican Senator James Jeffords of Vermont, a leading expert on health care, stepped forward and endorsed our plan. I'm sure that after the acrimony of the budget debate, this cooperative spirit comes as welcome news to all of you as it does to me. Solving health care must remain above politics. Indeed, I hope every one of our legislative efforts in the months ahead is done in the same bipartisan spirit.

I've said since the beginning of this debate, I welcome—I need—good ideas and options from everyone. No party, no person, no segment of the health care community owns all the good ideas. After all, it was a Republican President, Richard Nixon, who first recommended over 20 years ago extending health coverage by asking every employer to take responsibility for paying some of his employees' health care costs. A current Republican Senator, Bob Packwood of Oregon, sponsored that bill 20 years ago.

Already the fruits of bipartisan cooperation are visible. In just a few months, we've moved from deep alarm over health care to designing a proposal, to crafting a solution. As I said, we don't have all the answers, and

we know that. But we have to find them, and we do have a plan.

I believe this plan will work. It will guarantee comprehensive health benefits to every one of you. It's based on the notion of preserving and protecting what is best about American health care and fixing what has gone wrong.

My goal is to make the world's finest private health care system work better and work for everyone. We've rejected a big Government solution. We've rejected broad-based taxes. We've insisted that small business be protected. And I embrace the compassionate American view that no one should go without health care.

This plan will drastically cut the paperwork that now clogs the American health care system. It will maintain the highest quality health care, and it will retain your right to choose your doctors. In fact, for most of you, your choices in health care will increase, not decrease, if this plan passes.

The plan will keep health care costs down by controlling spending, by providing free preventive care that keeps us healthy and saves money in the long run. It also asks all of us to take more responsibility for paying for a health care system that all of us use but only some of us pay for.

We also ask everyone, every American, to take more responsibility for personal behavior. Just as insurance companies and doctors and lawyers and the Government must take more responsibility upon themselves to make the system work better, so must each individual. It is the common sense and shared values of our health security plan that are bringing people of all political persuasions to the cause.

I watched some of Hillary's testimony. I wish I could have seen more. We spent a lot of time talking together about what she learned from the Congress and how we can make health care a reality for each of you. I think we've done the responsible thing by accepting this challenge, a challenge too long delayed, and by beginning a truly constructive bipartisan debate on what many have characterized as the most important piece of domestic legislation in a generation.

And I believe that once we succeed in providing health security to each of you, every

family will have a chance to prosper and dream again, freed from today's fears: freed from the fear that if you lose your job, you'll lose your health care; if your business goes down, you'll never have health care coverage; if you get sick and you really need it, you won't have health care. Those fears have to be done away with.

As we move forward we'll continue to carry with us the indelible memory of the thousands of people we've talked to who have tangled with the health care system and lost, of the thousands who live in fear of losing their health care, and to the plight of so many of you who have played by the rules and lost to a system that often doesn't follow them. Once heard, no one forgets those voices.

Thank you for making this a great beginning, and thanks for listening.

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

## Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters on Russia

October 3, 1993

**The President.** Ladies and gentlemen, I have received a rather extended briefing on what we know about what is going on in Russia, and I want to make a couple of comments about it. First of all, it is clear that the violence was perpetrated by the Ruskoy-Khasbulatov forces, that there has been significant violence today in Moscow. It is also clear that President Yeltsin bent over backwards to avoid the use of force, to avoid excessive force from the beginning of this, and I still am convinced that the United States must support President Yeltsin and the process of bringing about free and fair elections. We cannot afford to be in the position of wavering at this moment or of backing off or giving any encouragement to people who clearly want to derail the election process and are not committed to reform in Russia. So we are following events moment by moment. As you know, we have access to television coverage there so you are also pretty current on it. But that is the most I know now, and that is our position.

**Q.** Do you think that Yeltsin can survive, Mr. President, and will you cut off aid if he is deposed?

**The President.** Well, I don't expect him to be deposed. I wouldn't overreact to this, now. I think the people clearly stand far more supportive of him than the Ruskoy-Khasbulatov and they seem—they don't have any organized military support that we're aware of. So we'll just have to wait for developments, but I have no reason to believe that he would be deposed.

**Q.** Mr. President, have you spoken to President Yeltsin?

**The President.** No. I'm sure he's got more important things to do right now than to talk to me, and I don't think the United States should be involved in the moment-to-moment management of this crisis, but I do want him to know of my continued support and the support of the United States.

**Q.** What can the U.S. Government do right now?

**The President.** Well first of all, we can get as much intelligence, as quickly as possible, about what's going on, and we can do our best to look after the safety of the Americans who are there and the security of the Embassy, which has received some attention from our folks, and so far the reports on that are good.

**Q.** Do you have any plans to cancel your trip or postpone your trip in any way?

**The President.** No.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:09 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

## Remarks to the Community in Sacramento, California

October 3, 1993

Thank you very much. Thank you for coming. Thank you for being here. Thank you for doing what you have done for the United States. It's wonderful to be here. It's wonderful to be in Sacramento, and it's great to be at McClellan, and I thank you for all being here with me today.

I'd like to say a special word of thanks to General Phillips and the people at this base for the work they have done and the work they did with your Mayor and others to keep this base alive. You are a good testimony to the wisdom of that decision, and I thank you for that.

I also want to thank General Yates, the Commander of the Air Force Materiel Division, for flying all the way across the country to be with us today. And I want to tell you one thing, he made a real sacrifice because this is his birthday, and I thank him for spending it with us today.

I want to say, also, a special word of thanks to Congressman Hamburg, Congressman Matsui, and Congressman Fazio——

*[At this point, audience members interrupted the President's remarks.]*

You all ignore them. They don't want you to hear, but you want to hear it. Just come on. Most people in this country still believe in free speech. That's one of the things worth fighting for. I also want to say a very special word of thanks to these Members of Congress who have supported our efforts to deal with the problems of America.

I got interested in making that long and challenging race for President because I was worried about three things: I thought this country was coming apart when it ought to be coming together; I thought we were going in the wrong direction economically and we risked losing the American dream for millions of young people; and I thought that politics had become a sideshow of shouting words, instead of an instrument by which the American people could forthrightly face their problems and do something about it.

I am reminded, too, on this day, because of the events in Moscow and in Somalia, that we still live in a dangerous world. And I ask you to take just a few moments, once again, to quietly express your support for the people who are fighting for freedom in Russia and for the brave men and women in our Armed Forces, including those in Somalia today who lost their lives in a very successful mission against brutality and anarchy. My deepest condolences go to the families and the friends of those brave young Americans, and I know that all of you support them, as well.

One of the hardest things we have had to learn as a people, in the last few years, is that there is now no longer an easy division between our national security at the end of the cold war abroad and our economic and social security here at home. There's no longer an easy division between foreign policy and domestic policy, and it is perfectly clear to everyone now that if we are not strong at home, we cannot continue to lead the world. And so I have done what I could to help us to become stronger at home.

That means, as much as anything else, as we attempt to revive this economy, we have got to focus on the economy of California, the State which has 12 percent of our Nation's people but 25 percent of our Nation's unemployed. It is clear to me that we must take this problem which has developed for you over a period of years and go after it with a vengeance, step by step, with discipline and concentration.

This last week, in Washington, we made several announcements which mean more jobs and a brighter future for California. Last week, the Vice President and I announced that the United States, in recognition of the end of the cold war, would remove export controls on 70 percent of the computers and supercomputers made in the United States. That will increase exports by billions and tens of billions of dollars. It means more jobs for California. In this State, that order frees up \$30 billion of exports in computers, \$2 billion in telecommunications, and \$5 billion in supercomputers. In a State where one in 10 jobs depends on exports, that is very good news, indeed.

Last week, I also announced a plan to help our shipbuilders to be more competitive in the global economy. There are 124,000 Americans employed in shipbuilding, many of them in California, in places like the Nasco plant in San Diego. This plan will help them get access to foreign markets which they deserve and which they have been denied for too long.

And last week, with so many people in this country desperate for work and knowing we have to find a way to help create jobs through supporting the environment, something you've done here, we announced a groundbreaking research plan involving our defense

labs, our military facilities, and the Big Three automakers to triple the fuel efficiency of our automobiles within a decade, creating tens of thousands of new jobs for Americans.

Earlier this year we announced a project very important to the future of this area, a technology reinvestment program to convert defense technology either to dual uses, defense and commercial, or purely commercial uses, something you are doing here. We have received, in return for what will soon be about \$1 billion in Federal matching money, over 2,800 proposals. And guess what? Twenty-five percent of them came from the State of California. That means more jobs for California.

Tomorrow I know that Congressman Fazio and others will release the details of a new joint partnership between the Government and automakers to develop and produce electric cars, taking advantage of dual-use technology right here at McClellan. That means more jobs for California and a brighter future for America.

And let me thank you, especially here at McClellan, for the partnership you have formed with the Environmental Protection Agency and the California EPA. By streamlining Government and working together, you have performed a cleanup that, under the old rules, would have taken 6 years and \$10 million. You did it in 8 weeks at a fifth of the cost. And we intend to do that all over America, copying your leadership.

Let me say to you, my fellow Americans, my biggest task as your President is to try to clearly define the time in which we live, point the way to positive change, and give the American people the security they need to make those changes. We cannot, any of us in our personal lives, in our family lives, and in our communities, make changes we need to make unless we are personally secure enough to make them. But we cannot deny the changes that are abroad in the world and pretend that they're not there.

When I leave you and walk back into this hangar, I will see some of the work that is being done here in McClellan to develop dual-use technologies. That means that the people here have decided that change will be our friend and not our enemy. When faced with a time of profound change, we

can take one of two courses. We can hunker down, turn away, and pretend it's not there, and that works about one time in 100. Most of the time, you know as well as I do, when you see profound change and you want to preserve what is most important in your values, your family, your community, you have to find a way to make that change your friend. That is what this administration is dedicated to doing, both in trying to change the rules of the economic game and in trying to open up a new era of time when Americans who work hard and play by the rules have a certain basic security.

Yes, I think we ought to change our economic policies. We are giving this country the toughest trade policy it's had in years and years, demanding access to our markets. Yes, we cannot continue to have massive trade deficits with the Far East, where 40 percent of our exports are going. And yes, I favor opening up trade to Mexico and ultimately to Latin America because we have a trade surplus there and it means more jobs for Americans. I do favor it.

But let me say something. If you listen to the people who are opposed to the trade agreement, they have some very good arguments, but they're arguing against things that happened for the last 12 years. They're arguing against the insecurity of the times our people have faced and the fact that our Government has not responded to them. And so we have sought to give the American people more security by bringing this deficit down, which threatens our children and grandchildren; by changing the tax laws so that working families with children in the home, without regard to their incomes, will be lifted above poverty so there will never be an excuse to stay on welfare because work will be rewarded for people; but by reforming the student loan program so that we lower the interest rates and string out the repayment terms and make college available to every American for the first time; by giving tens of thousands of our young people the chance to serve their country in their community through a program of national service that will also enable them to earn credit against a college education or other education and training.

Yes, security is important, and we have other challenges before us, as well. If you look at the number of people who have been killed in this country just in the last month in drive-by shootings and mindless acts of violence, and you consider the fact that this is the only advanced country in the world where children can be in cities with no supervision, no support, roaming the streets, better armed than the police because we refuse to take automatic weapons out of their hands or pass the Brady bill, or check on it, that is wrong, and we must change that. We must change that.

But, my fellow Americans, at the root of so much of our security is the fact that we are living in a changing economy where the average young worker will change jobs eight times in a lifetime; where more and more, when people lose their jobs and they go on unemployment—it's not the way it was when I was young, where people would go on unemployment for 4 weeks or 8 weeks and then they'd get their old job back. Now most people get another job, but it's a different job. So we don't need an unemployment system anymore, we need a reemployment system to retrain our workers for the jobs that are there and for the future.

More than anything else, if you look to the heart now of our Federal budget deficit, if you look to the heart now of the economic problems of many of our leading exporters, and if you look to the heart of the gnawing insecurity that grips hardworking American families, you will find lurking behind it all the most expensive, least efficient health care system in the entire Western world.

Only in America—only in America do we spend over 14 percent of our income on health care—Canada's at 10, Germany and Japan below 9—going up more rapidly than any other country; going up twice as fast as inflation. And we still leave 35 million people, 35 million permanently without health insurance, 2 million more every month, another 100,000 every month permanently losing their health insurance.

Only in America do we have 1,500 separate insurance companies writing thousands of different policies, creating mountains of different paperwork and always, always looking for ways not to cover the people who bought

their insurance. That only happens in this country.

Only in America are the doctors who hired out to keep people well and help people who are sick spending more and more countless hours, some of them as much as 25 hours a week now, filling out forms and paperwork. Only in America has that happened. Only in America have, in the last 10 years, we seen the work of clerical workers in the hospitals grow at 4 times the rate of new doctors and health care providers. That is not happening anywhere else.

Why? Because while we have the finest doctors and nurses and technology and research in the world, we have a system of financing and delivering health care that is a nightmare. It is a nightmare for people who have lost their health insurance. It is a nightmare for people who don't get it. It's a nightmare for people who have to depend on the Government to get theirs, when not all the providers will cover Medicaid. It has been bad. And guess what? It is the primary cause of the exploding Federal deficit. It is the primary cause of many of our biggest companies' inability to compete more overseas. It is the primary cause that millions of American workers will not get a raise between now and the end of the decade because all the new profits of the companies that are trying to cover their health care will go into the exploding cost of premiums. And only in America do we spend 10 cents on the dollar in a \$900 billion health care bill on paperwork that no other country has.

I say to you, my fellow Americans, it's time to give the American people health care that is always there, health care that can never be taken away, health care that is simpler and better.

Now, you know, since we're here at this magnificent air base, let me just ask you something: Can you think of a single institution in this country in the last 10 years, in the midst of all the chaos and social breakdown and violence and family troubles in America, is there any institution that has worked better than the United States military to train and educate people to perform missions, to continually give people new skills, and to provide the coherence that we need? And is there any institution that's done a bet-

ter job of opening opportunities to people without regard to race or gender? No. Why? One reason is, there is order, security, and support. Could the military have done its mission if they had the same health care system the rest of the American people have and half the people in the service could lose their health care on a given day by some accident or because a wife or a husband or a child turned out to have an illness that wasn't covered in the fine print of some policy? You know it couldn't have happened. We owe the rest of the American people that security in the face of the changing times in which we live.

Let me say, people say to me, oh, you can't slow the growth of health care costs. I say to them, look at California. I want to thank your insurance commissioner for the work he's done with my wife's Health Care Task Force to develop a health care system. You look at the California experience. Look at what happened to the health care costs of the people who had the benefit of being in the California public employee system, when the people who were providing it knew that the State was broke and didn't have a lot of money and when there were enough people there that they had bargaining power to get high-quality health care at an affordable price. What happened? The inflation rate and the premiums was less than one-third the national inflation rate in health care.

And let me say some other things about this health care system, because there's been a lot of misinformation put out there. I see all these children here. One of the things that is killing this health care system of ours is that so many people have no coverage, that when they get health care, it's when they're real sick, and it's real expensive, and they show up at the emergency room. Under this plan, for the first time in history, there will be a comprehensive package of benefits which will guarantee preventive and primary health care services to pregnant mothers, to little children, to women who need mammograms, to men who need cholesterol tests. Those are the things that will lower the cost of health care and strengthen the fabric of our economy.

Look at the burden that California alone pays because of the uninsured cost of caring

for AIDS patients. Look at that. Under this system, when everybody gets covered and all people are in big pools so that one high-risk patient's cost is spread across a lot of folks, we will have coverage in the regular system and you will not have particular States going broke because they have disproportionate burdens of immigrants, of AIDS patients, or anything else. This is another important feature of this.

But finally, let me say two other things. Under this system the American people will have more choice than most Americans do now. If you have a health care plan that's better than the one we're writing into law, your company can keep giving it to you, and the cost of it won't go up as rapidly. But there's a limit for the first time to what can be taken away. If you don't have one, you will get one. And you'll have more choices today. Only one in three workers in a plant with a health insurance plan has any choice in the way they get their health care. Every American worker will be guaranteed at least three different options in the health care plan. And that's a plus for America, to give the consumers of this country more choices.

And finally, I want to say a special word of thanks to the thousands of Americans from all across this country who helped us to put this plan together and especially to the literally hundreds and hundreds of doctors and nurses and others who told us their stories, so that we found, unbelievably, we had doctors who were miserable, nurses who were unhappy, and the people who lost their insurance in the 11th hour when they didn't know what was going to hit them. So for the first time in the history, we are going to have a health care plan that has significant input on the front end from the people who provide the health care because they know, the ones who've been involved in this process, that we cannot go on.

And finally, let me just make this point: At some point in life when you have a problem, whatever it is, you have to ask yourself a pretty simple question, because every change involves taking a chance, you have to ask yourself which is greater: the cost of change or the cost of staying the same? It is clear that the greater cost is to keep on doing what we're doing and letting America

go bankrupt and breaking the hearts of millions of American families.

And so I say to you, we've got a lot of work to do to turn the California economy around. But we've taken important steps that were not taken before, and there's more to come. We've got a lot of work to do to work through all the complexities of the health care issue. We've got a lot of work to do to convince Americans to have the courage and to give Americans the security they need to change. But I am telling you, folks, if we do what we ought to do, California and this country will walk into the 21st century with their heads held high, with the American dream still alive for our children, with our diversity a strength, not a weakness, in a nation that is still leading the world, if we have the courage to change and the will to give our people the security they deserve.

That is what I'm dedicated to. And I thank you for being here today to support that. God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:04 p.m. at McClellan Air Force Base.

### **Remarks in a Town Meeting in Sacramento**

*October 3, 1993*

**The President.** First of all, let me thank all of you for being here tonight, and also thank all those I can't see yet who are at the other stations, and all the people of California who are watching.

I want to talk about whatever you want to talk about tonight, but just by way of introduction, let me say that when I ran for President, I ran basically because I thought our country was headed in the wrong direction economically, because I thought our people were coming apart instead of coming together as a country, and because I thought our Government wasn't facing up to our problems. And since taking office, I've tried to address those things by changing our economic focus, by trying to bring people together across regional and racial and other lines, and by trying to just take the tough problems of the country, one after the other, starting with the deficit, trying to make some progress on it.

There are a lot of things I hope we get to talk about, including the California economy tonight, which I spent countless hours on since I've been President. But I want to talk a minute just about the health care issue, because it relates to so much else.

We are in a time of great change. You know that out here. You've benefited from some of these changes in the last 10 years. Now you've suffered for the last 3 years from a lot of those economic changes. In order for America to make change our friend instead of our enemy, we have to have a certain base level of personal security and family security in this country. In order for us to do that, we have to be competitive with other nations, too. And both of those things bring us always back to health care, where we spend more money and have less to show for it and where we're the only advanced country that doesn't provide health security for all our people.

So the thrust of this health care effort is, first of all, to guarantee Americans security—health care that's always there, health care that can never be taken away—and to do it in a way that is fair to the American people and that lowers, not cuts health care costs but lowers the rate at which it is increasing, so that it helps the economy as well as helps the health security of American families. And it is the key to dealing with so many of our other problems and to giving the American people the security they need to face the future. I hope we get to talk more about it.

Thank you.

### **Russia**

**Stan Atkinson.** Mr. President, while we are here tonight to address the matters of health care, the economy, and other domestic issues, we certainly can't ignore the events taking place today and tonight in Russia. It has been a bloody day there, with anti-Yeltsin forces fighting police and military units in the streets. Well-armed protestors won most of the battles, ramming trucks into government buildings, even launching rocket-propelled grenades. Russian President Yeltsin has issued a state of emergency, and military

reinforcements in the form of his crack best troops are en route to Moscow.

**Carol Bland.** And before we begin tonight, Mr. President, we're wondering whether or not you could update us on the situation in Russia, in particular this Government's response to it.

**The President.** Well, first of all, let me say what happened is that the opponents of reform, the people who don't want a new constitution, the people that don't want an election, basically in the person of Mr. Rutskoy and Mr. Khasbulatov, their supporters who basically started all this disorder and violence today—President Yeltsin has bent over backwards not to have the soldiers fire on anybody, not to promote any violence. And he may be thinking today he went too far in that, because they basically got up a head of steam, and the situation got out of control.

I believe that he will be successful in the end because the people support him. And I think the United States should support Yeltsin as long as he is the person who embodies a commitment to democracy and to letting the Russian people chart their own course. And he does. The people who have started this opposition are people who represent the old Communist system that Russia is trying so hard to move away from.

So I wish him success. I thank him for not trying to promote any unnecessary violence. And I hope that this will be as peaceful a resolution as possible, but it's going to be pretty tough for them for the next few days.

**Mr. Atkinson.** Thank you, Mr. President. Now on to our program. In addition to the audience here with you at KCRA in Sacramento, we're also going to hear from a lot of other people all over California, up and down the State, in fact. They're in cities tonight waiting to listen to you. For instance, may I do some introductions? Joining us by satellite from KRON television in San Francisco, reporter and news anchor Pete Wilson, along with a live studio audience. Moving south to Los Angeles, Paul Moyer is there with a group assembled at KNBC television. Welcome to all of you. And also, from southern California, Marty Levine. Marty and our fourth studio audience join us live from KNSD television in San Diego. And from

Sacramento and KCRA, I'm Stan Atkinson. Mr. President, my partner, Carol Bland.

### **Health Care Reform**

**Ms. Bland.** Thank you, Stan. Mr. President, I'd like you to meet Shelly Chase. Her son had leukemia, and he died 4 weeks ago. They wanted to have a bone marrow transplant for him, but their insurance company denied coverage. They raised the money anyway by borrowing it and now may need to sell their home. We're not sure about that yet. But Shelly has a question for you regarding experimental treatments.

[*Ms. Chase asked if the new health care plan will cover experimental procedures.*]

**The President.** The answer to the question is that in most cases the answer would be yes. And the reason I say most cases is that under our plan people will have coverage as they do in insurance today for certain conditions like leukemia. And when there is evidence that that is the best available treatment and a doctor for the child, in this case, for a child, or for an adult who wants to pursue that treatment, then the insurer will not take that option away. But there has to be—I don't want to mislead you, there has to be at least a doctor, there has to be some substantial evidence that the treatment might work—you never know if it will in experimental treatment—but that it might work.

So in the case of a bone marrow transplant where there is evidence that it often has been effective, it should cover that. And that's the way we tried to set it up. In other words, to be less restrictive than most insurance policies are today but still leave doctors with their considered medical judgment, some ground not to do things that don't make any sense at all.

**Mr. Atkinson.** Mr. President, if we could step back just a moment, let me call your attention to our screen, and we're going to see—that's a fellow whose name is Pete Wilson. Now, he's not the Governor Pete Wilson, he's the news anchor Pete Wilson from KRON television in San Francisco.

Pete.

**Pete Wilson.** Stan, the President and I have been over this a couple of times just in recent weeks, as a matter of fact.

**The President.** He always gives me that disclaimer. But I talk to Governor Wilson all the time. [Laughter]

**Public School System**

[Mr. Wilson introduced a participant who asked what the administration plans to do to improve the public school system.]

**The President.** Good question. Before I answer that, I want to thank that lady who just asked that question. It must take an awful lot of courage for her to come here within a month of losing her child, and I thank you.

Let's talk about the public schools. I have been working since I first became President to pass a new bill called Goals 2000, which will enable us to change the way we evaluate our schools and will give the schools the incentives and resources they need to perform at a much higher level.

Essentially, what we want to do is to set some national standards, not by Government employees but by educational experts, some national standards that, then, we can measure every school against every year so that parents and other interested people can tell how well the schools are doing. We want to emphasize the things that we know are important for the future, especially science, mathematics, creative thinking skills, the ability to use the language to reason through new problems, and to provide special resources for that.

The Secretary of Education has worked with the Governors of the country and educators all over the country. They're very excited about having the Government, instead of telling educators what kind of specific inputs they have, set some national standards, give the schools more flexibility over how they do it, and go forward.

The second thing we've done is to try to change the way we distribute Federal aid to education, which will be of immense benefit to California. A lot of the poorer school districts, or districts with a lot of poor kids, don't get their fair share of aid. The bill that we have in the legislature now, and the Congress passes, will be a big boon to California.

The third thing we've tried to do is to deal with the problem of the kids who don't go to 4-year colleges or don't graduate from

them. Well over half of our students don't graduate from 4-year colleges, but 100 percent of our students need both a high school diploma and at least 2 years of post-high school education. So we're setting up a system now which will integrate the public schools and the 2-year institutions, the community colleges, the vocational institutions, and others, starting in high school, to let people meld work and learning and begin to do that for a lifetime.

And the final thing that we've tried to do that I think is perhaps going to have the most profound effect over the long run is to be able to tell our young people while they're in junior high and high school that they won't have to worry about paying for a college education, because we've reformed the student loan system to lower the interest rates for the loans, to string out the repayment terms, to make college affordable to everyone, and to allow, starting next year 25,000, going up to hundreds of thousands of students to repay their loan through community service at the local level.

So, start with standards instead of inputs. I spent 12 years working on the public schools, and I can tell you, we need national standards, and then we need to focus how we can give resources to the schools to meet those standards instead of telling them how to run every minute of every day in the classroom. Take account of these other things, and I think you'll see some substantial improvements.

I also will tell you that our bill provides for, I think, a better option than the option that's on the ballot out here for choice. We give States incentives to allow more choice of schools within the public school system, and we give incentives for school systems to empower people to set up schools, license them, and run them according to high standards as a part of the public school system, like you could give a group of teachers permission to start their own school, but it would be part of a school system, and it would have to meet, then, the standards of that school system and give the students and their parents the choice to go there. I think that's a better way to go than the initiative that's on the ballot out here.

**Mr. Atkinson.** Mr. President, we're going to switch southward now to Los Angeles. And at the studios of KNBC, there's Paul Moyer.

### **Violence in Schools**

**Paul Moyer.** Stan, thank you. We're going to continue on the vein of education and schools, but this is a different aspect Mr. President. I would like to introduce you to a very, very brave young man. His name is Dion Brown, he's 15 years old, and he has seen, experienced something that hopefully none of us ever will. About 3 weeks ago he was in line at Dorsey High School here in Los Angeles with his brother, simply trying to register for class. And his brother was shot in the stomach, caught in gang cross-fire. His brother was supposed to be here. He's so afraid of retaliation, we couldn't find him. We're not going to show you Dion's face because he, too, is afraid. But Mr. President, he has a question for you. He's a little nervous, so bear with us.

*[Mr. Brown explained how his brother was shot and asked what the President is planning to do to prevent violence in schools.]*

**The President.** Thank you for coming tonight. And thank you for saying that. Let me say, first of all, the story you just heard unfortunately is becoming all too common, and not just in California and not just in big cities. And we ought to start with first things first.

This is the only country, the only advanced country in the world, the only country I know of where we would permit children access to weapons that make them better armed than police forces. So I'll tell you what we ought to do. I've asked the Congress to pass the Brady bill, which would give us a national system, a waiting period to check the backgrounds of people for age, criminal records, and mental health history before we sell weapons.

There are several bills before the Congress which would ban assault weapons, which have no purpose other than to kill. We ought to pass one. We ought to do it this year. States all over the country are looking at ownership laws which make it illegal for minors to have guns unless they're in the presence of their parents, either hunting or on a target range. And we ought to do that in every State. And we ought to look at the laws by

which we regulate gun sellers. We've got to get the guns out of the hands of the children. It is imperative.

Now, in addition to that, I do have a part of this education bill that I just spoke to, safe schools initiative, which would give schools the ability to have more security forces. And in the crime bill, which includes the Brady bill, the waiting period, there are funds which would help people all over the country, cities all over the country, hire another 50,000 police officers which would allow hard-strapped cities to deploy these police officers around schools and at the places of greatest need. It makes a 50 percent downpayment on my desire and commitment from the campaign to put another 100,000 police officers on the street over the next 4 years.

Now, let me just say one final thing. I also think—make them safe first. Make the schools safe, get the guns out of the hands of the kids, put more police on the beat. Start there. Then you have to take these young people who haven't had the family supports, the neighborhood supports, the community supports that a lot of us have had, that we've taken for granted, and realize they are the tip end of a generation of change. This has been going on for 30 years, getting worse every year. And we have got to find ways to give these kids a structure, an order, a hope to their lives.

We have 10 closed military bases today around the country where we've got an experimental program going with the National Guard, teaching high school dropouts to go back and go to school and going through boot camp-like exercises. These are kids that didn't commit crimes. And we've been flooded with kids who want it, because they have no structure in their lives.

We also have more boot camps in the crime bill for first-time offenders. You've got to give these kids something to say "yes" to instead of telling them "no" all the time. But first, there has to be a reestablishment of order and safety in the schools and on the streets. And I hope if you care about this—I know I'm going on a little long, but this is a big deal—the Congress should not drag its feet. They have been debating this for 2 years. It is time to pass a crime bill, it is time to pass the Brady bill, it is time to ban

assault weapons, get them out of the hands of kids so the police can do their jobs, and put more police on the street.

**Mr. Atkinson.** President Clinton, we're going to move even farther south. We're into San Diego now. Your audience awaits you at the studios of KNSD.

### **Immigration**

**Marty Levine.** Stan, thank you. Mr. President, our first question comes from Roberto Martinez, who is a migrant rights activist, and advocate, I should say as well, that deals with questions of policy and also questions of interchange between the Border Patrol and individual migrants over what Mr. Martinez sees as abuses by the Border Patrol.

[Mr. Martinez asked if the President supports blockades to control illegal immigration from Mexico.]

**The President.** Well, I think we should have more Border Patrol guards, and I think we should do more to restrict illegal immigration, I certainly do. I think the fact that we have so much illegal immigration and that half of all of the illegal immigrants in America are in California, a State with an unemployment rate 3 percentage points above the national average, is endangering the historic attitude of America that has been proimmigration. I mean, Los Angeles County has people from 150 different racial and ethnic groups alone. Immigrants made this country. But they did it, by and large, by operating within our laws. If we permit our laws to be regularly violated and flagrantly violated and impose those costs on a State that has the biggest economic problems, I think we run the risk of undermining support for immigration, which I think is a very important American value. So yes, I believe we should stiffen our efforts to control the border.

I don't think it undermines the NAFTA negotiations, that the President of Mexico has never asked me to do anything illegal, to continue what is the policy that is inconsistent with our law. And as a matter of fact, I hope we get a chance to talk about this later tonight. One of the reasons that I so strongly support this North American Free Trade Agreement is if you have more jobs on both sides of the border and incomes go

up in Mexico, that will dramatically reduce the pressure felt by Mexican working people to come here for jobs. Most immigrants, keep in mind, come here illegally not for the social services, most of them come here for the jobs. If they have jobs in Mexico and they pay decent wages, which this agreement will provide for, then they'll be more likely to stay there, and the immigrants who come here will be more likely to be a manageable number and legal in nature.

### **Health Care Reform**

**Mr. Atkinson.** We have a health care question for you now, President Clinton. And back in KCRA, Carol Bland.

[Ms. Bland introduced a participant who asked if she will be able to choose her doctor under the new health care plan.]

**The President.** Yes

**Q.** And will I have easy access to the specialists?

**The President.** Yes. The answer to your questions are, yes, you'll have freedom of choice; yes, you'll have easy access to specialists. And most Americans will have more choice than they have now. You heard what she said. She's on Medicare, and she's enrolled in PPO. That's a group of doctors who provide health care together so that you can get a general practitioner or a specialist. They work together.

**Q.** And I can go anyplace I want?

**The President.** And she can go anywhere she wants with any doctor who is enrolled in the PPO. And if she has an emergency, they can refer her out to a doctor.

I was just talking with a doctor in Las Vegas who helped to organize a PPO with 700 doctors now. Under our plan, first of all if you're on Medicare, nothing will change. Secondly, every State in the country will have the power to approve every existing HMO or PPO they want to, so that the people that are already enrolled in these kinds of plans and have high consumer satisfaction will basically not see a change in their health care.

However, you should know that for people who are working for a living and who are insured through their place of work, today only one-third of them have any choice at all. Most of them have no choice, they're just told, here's your plan, and here it is. We will

propose to give them at least two other choices so that everybody will have three choices. If they choose a more expensive one than their employer has chosen, they might have to pay a little more, but at least they'll have some choice. You won't be affected. And I think what you'll see is more and more doctors putting together these PPO's so the doctors, rather than insurance companies, will be deciding the quality of health care in America.

**Q.** Thank you.

**Mr. Atkinson.** President Clinton, we're going back to San Francisco now. KRON, Pete Wilson. Pete.

### **Gays in the Military**

**Mr. Wilson.** Yes, Stan. Mr. President, we have with us now a lieutenant in the Naval Reserve, and her life has been thrown into considerable turmoil in the last few months because she simply declared who she is. And she has a question for you.

*[The lieutenant asked why the President is not allowing the courts to make a decision on gays serving in the military.]*

**The President.** Well, the courts will decide the issue. And as you know, I don't agree with the policy of the ban, and I attempted to change it. And I did get some change, but not the change that I wanted. And there was a vote in the Senate last week, which I hope you noticed, which showed that only one-third of the Senate basically supported my position. And the reason we had to have a compromise is we didn't have the votes to get more done.

Part of getting the agreement to stop the investigations, to not automatically throw people out who said they were gay and at least give them a chance to demonstrate that they were complying with the code of military conduct, and not using people's associations against them to investigate them, in other words, creating a big zone of privacy for gays and lesbians in the military service, was the agreement to go forward with the lawsuit. The courts know what the arguments are. The Justice Department can't just drop it because there are too many other cases. In other words, there are other cases at the same level of court, and they've all gone against the service personnel. So they're

being appealed up anyway by people who lost them.

And so, it would only change the law, in other words if we changed it. It would only change the law for that circuit, that one Federal district. And if the court of appeals overturned it, it would only change the law for that one court of appeals district, and the act that Congress has enacted would still control it for everybody else. We have no reason to believe that the Supreme Court will uphold the ruling. If it does, of course, then the whole issue will be moot. I think everybody's better off in trying to get a legal resolution of it. And if we just stopped it, it would die right there with that one court. It would be nice for everybody there, but it wouldn't have national impact.

**Mr. Atkinson.** From Los Angeles again, Paul Moyer has another question.

### **Health Care Reform**

**Mr. Moyer.** Okay, Stan, thank you again. We're here with people from the West Valley area of Los Angeles. And allow me to kneel down just a little bit. They are with their twins who are 6 weeks old, very, very healthy. Everything's fine now, Mr. President, but it didn't start out that way. And they have a health question for you.

*[The couple explained their twins were born prematurely and had to stay in the hospital for several weeks. They asked if the new health care program will cover families who have very expensive medical costs.]*

**The President.** I want to answer your question, but first I want to make sure that all the people that are watching this understand exactly what question he asked. You know, some health insurance policies have very good coverage, but they have a limit to how much you can draw against the coverage. They have a lifetime cap, which, if you get a really serious illness, you could use up in one time. And your lifetime cap's gone, so even though you had a real good policy, you could never use it again. That's the question he was asking.

The answer is under this plan there would be no lifetime caps. You would pay whatever you would be required to pay. If you were self-employed, you'd pay what your premium is. If you were working in a business, you

would pay, if you don't have any coverage, up to 20 percent. If you have better coverage than that right now, if your employer pays everything, your employer can continue to pay everything, but there's a limit as to how much can be taken away from you under our plan.

The reason there's no need for a lifetime cap under our plan is that people will be insured in huge pools, community rating pools. You know, this is an expensive thing, but aren't you glad that they got it? They have these two beautiful children now. And so, sure, they put an extra cost on it, but instead of that cost being for, say, 200 or 300 or 400 people insured, there might be 200,000 or 300,000 people insured in the same pool, so that cost spread across a big group won't be that much. And there will be no caps. Our plan abolishes the lifetime caps to keep people from being financially destroyed.

**Mr. Atkinson.** We're going back to San Diego now. Marty Levine has someone with another question for you.

#### **NAFTA**

**Mr. Levine.** Mr. President, this is a small business man here in San Diego, but also is serving on a committee with the chamber of commerce, trying to see that the North American Free Trade Agreement will, in fact, be passed into law.

[The participant asked if the President could address the concern that NAFTA will cause unemployment in California.]

**The President.** Let me talk just a little about that because it is the big issue. First of all, let me tell you I was the Governor of a State that had plants shut down and jobs moved to Mexico, where people lost their jobs and their livelihoods whom I knew. And I worked very hard on stopping that and even wound up bringing one of those plants back. So I would never knowingly do anything that would put the American people's economic welfare at risk. I believe NAFTA will create jobs, not lose jobs. And I believe that the jobs we'll create will be better paying jobs. And let me explain why.

Most people who worry about NAFTA losing jobs know that there are a lot of plants that American companies own along the Mexican border with the United States in the

so-called *maquilladora* area. If an American company puts up a plant down there, they can produce products in Mexico and import them back into the United States duty free. So people think, well, that happened in the 1980's, so if this agreement breaks down barriers, maybe more of that will happen. Actually, less of that will happen. Here's why.

Under the NAFTA agreement, the cost of labor and the cost of environmental investments in Mexico will go up. Under the NAFTA agreement, Mexico agrees to stop requiring so many products sold in Mexico to be made in Mexico. So, for example, we'll go from selling 1,000 American cars to 60,000 American cars in Mexico the first year, according to the auto companies. And also under the NAFTA agreement, Mexican tariff barriers are further lowered and so are Americas. The problem is theirs are 2½ times as much as ours. So as they lower barriers, we'll get a bigger benefit out of it than if we lower barriers.

And finally, let me say this. Five years ago we had a \$5.5 billion trade deficit with Mexico. Now we have a \$5.7 billion trade surplus. Compare that with an \$18 billion trade deficit with China, a \$44 billion trade deficit with Japan. We will gain jobs out of this. We will gain incomes out of this. And finally, if we do this with Mexico, then you've got Chile, Argentina, and other countries who want the same deal. We'll make a lot of money out of it over the next 20 years if we do it.

I hope I can help you persuade the people in San Diego to support it. We're also going to get some more money for that terrible environmental problem you've got along the border there in San Diego to try to clean that up. And there will be less environmental problems and more investment of the kind you needed years ago there if we pass this agreement.

**Mr. Atkinson.** President Clinton, back here at KCRA, a good-looking young fellow has something he wants to ask you.

**The President.** Boy, he does look good.

#### **Youth Employment Opportunities**

**Ms. Bland.** Mr. President, he's only 13, if you can believe it, although he looks like he's nearing 20. Anyway, he's growing up on some pretty tough streets in Sacramento.

He's wondering about job opportunities for kids like him, kids who are really trying to find a way out.

[*The participant asked what can be done to prevent kids from selling drugs to make money.*]

**The President.** Give him a hand. [*Applause*] That took a lot of guts.

Let me say, we're working on a couple of things. First of all, this last summer we were able to have a couple hundred thousand more jobs in the country for young people in the summertime. I wanted a much bigger program that I tried to pass in the Congress, but I couldn't. What I think we need to do is two things, one I mentioned earlier. I want to try in every community in the country to bring school and work closer together, so that people can learn while they're working and so that young people who need to work can work and get an educational experience at the same time. In other countries, this is much more frequent, Germany, for example. We're trying to build up those kind of programs in this country. The second thing I want to try to do is to provide opportunities for young people who need it to work part-time, but year round. And we're working on that. I tried, as I said, I tried to pass a bill through the Congress earlier this year to get more summer jobs. I couldn't pass it. But I think there is a lot of support in the country for the idea that young people who live in economically difficult circumstances, want to work, have the chance to do it. We want to make it easier for the employers to hire them.

So we're working on that, and you've given us a little encouragement to do it.

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

### **Defense Conversion**

**Mr. Atkinson.** You've had a lively afternoon. That was quite a crowd that greeted you at McClellan, a couple of thousand people. They got you going, didn't they?

**The President.** They did, and I love seeing them.

**Mr. Atkinson.** It was a hard time stopping. Just barely made it in time to get on the air here.

**The President.** Well, they've done so much wonderful work at McClellan. They

showed me two of the electric cars that they're working with people in the area to do and some of the environmental work they've done. One of the things we're really trying to do to help California deal with all the military cuts is to emphasize the ability of the defense system, especially these bases, to develop dual-use technologies. And they showed me a lot—that is, things that can be used for defense and domestic purposes. At McClellan, they developed an electric car that goes from zero to 60 in 12 seconds, gets 80 miles per gallon at 55 miles an hour, and has a maximum speed of 100 miles an hour. And now all we've got to do is figure out how to make it economical for people to buy. [*Laughter*] But I think we'll be able to do it.

The Big Three automakers this week announced a pathbreaking research project with all of our Government and defense labs, and we're going to try to triple the mileage on cars by the end of the decade. And the auto companies have made a commitment; they're going to invest money. We're going to invest money. And it means a lot more jobs for Americans if we can do it.

**Mr. Atkinson.** Pretty slick.

Pete Wilson is standing by with your audience at KRON in San Francisco.

### **Job Training**

**Mr. Wilson.** Mr. President, you know—you've already touched on it several times tonight yourself—that one of the things bothering California virtually more than anything else is this third or fourth year of a recession, a very deep recession, unprecedented in this State. Among other things, it's cost an enormous number of Californians their jobs. And one of those is with us tonight. He has been out of work—high-tech Californian who has a question for you.

[*The participant asked if there will be any programs to retrain older professionals.*]

**The President.** You know, you're about the third person in the last 10 days that's asked me that question, and I have to tell you that we have not done anything or thought of what to do exactly that would emphasize only people above a certain age. I

will tell you what we have done. Did you work in a high-tech company before?

**Q.** I did, sir, yes.

**The President.** What kind of company did you work in?

**Q.** It was a nuclear weapons, actually.

**The President.** Yes, I think even you hope we don't have to do that anymore. But let me say what we are—first thing we've got to try to do is create some more jobs in the high-tech area, so let me emphasize that. Just this week we announced, with a lot of people from California there in Washington, that we were removing from any export limitations 70 percent of the computers made in this country, in recognition of the fact that the cold war is over. We still have to worry about proliferation of weapons, but we freed up \$30 billion worth of computer exports and \$7 billion worth of supercomputers and telecommunications exports. That will create a lot more jobs in California, and a lot of the companies in California have already issued statements saying it will create more jobs. So I hope there will be more jobs for you to take.

Now, let me tell you what we are trying to do which will benefit older people, because very often companies don't themselves retrain them. What we're trying to do is to set up a partnership with the private sector in which we change the unemployment system to a reemployment system. That is, you're a good example of—now, unfortunately, you're more usual than unusual. It used to be when people lost their jobs, there was a temporary downturn in the economy, and a few months later they get the same job back when their old company got new business, when the economy picked up.

Now, when people lose their jobs, most often because of what we call structural changes in the economy. That is, the jobs are lost to automation, or the demand for the jobs are no longer there, or some other country's kicked us out of the market, or we kick some other country out of the market. So the unemployment system needs to be totally changed to a reemployment system so that the minute someone is notified that they're going to lose their job, the Government kicks in with training funds, which can be used in partnership with the employer if

the employer wants to keep the person and try to train them for something new. Or we show people, here's where the jobs are growing in number, here are your training options, and you start right then. Instead of waiting for their unemployment to run out and then starting it, it should start immediately at the time a person knows they're going to be unemployed and hopefully even before.

When we were in Sunnyvale, California, the other day, not too far from here, they had already started such a system, and it had resulted in a dramatic shortening of the time people were unemployed. And so that is what I think we should do.

It may be that we should give employers some extra incentive to retrain older workers. I'll be honest with you, until people like you started asking me, I had never given it much thought. If you have any specific ideas, I hope you'll write me and give them to me because, believe it or not, I normally get them. Uncle Sam's doing a pretty good job of getting your mail to me.

**Mr. Atkinson.** We're going back to Los Angeles.

**The President.** Let me—one last thing. He is really the typical American of the future. The average person will change work seven times in a lifetime now, sometimes for the same employer, sometimes for a different employer. So we simply have to establish a lifetime learning system so that people feel the same obligation to retrain the 55-year-old worker that they do the 25-year-old worker. If we don't do it, we'll never get our economy straightened out, because you can't keep the same kind of work; the nature of work is changing too fast.

**Mr. Atkinson.** Back to Los Angeles now.

**Mr. Moyer.** Mr. President, I think we're on the right topic for southern California, and I'll tell you why. Because I talked to a lot of people about this program tonight, about what they wanted to ask you, and most of them said, "Ask him about the economy." We are hurting here in southern California. The American dream, we've awakened from it; it wasn't what it was before. Ten percent unemployment in Los Angeles County, and we're really, really concerned about that. And one of the people that is, is Joe Hernandez,

who is with the Mexican American Grocers Association, Mr. President, and he has a question for you.

[*Mr. Hernandez asked if the administration could help the association expand their training program, which has 400 people on its waiting list.*]

**The President.** Let me tell you what I want to do. Keep in mind, there are people like you all over America who may be doing different things. And the needs of every economy are different. I want to try to do two things. First of all, I think we need more funds for job training, so that the States can direct those funds in the way that they're best needed.

So in the case of California, most of the unemployed people are in the south, although the whole State has problems, but most of the unemployment is in southern California. And the people at the local level are best able to judge what programs are working. So you've got a wildly successful program; if your State had more job training funds, they could direct them to you. And that's part of what we're trying to get done in this whole reemployment system that I just described to you. And we'll be going up to Congress soon with a bill that tries to do that, to get more funds, with fewer strings attached, given to local communities for the programs that work.

The second thing that we need to do is to vigorously attempt to get more private investment into distressed inner-city areas. If you think about it, it is not rational for there not to be more locally owned businesses and more people working in these distressed inner-city areas, because most of the people who live there have jobs, make money, have checks, could spend it there, but there's no investment going into those areas. So we passed a bill earlier this year, which we're in the process of implementing, that will give big incentives for people to invest private dollars to create more jobs so that your training programs will be able to find work for people after they're trained. Those are the two things we're trying to do.

But when you see this training bill come up before the Congress in the next several weeks, I think you'll like it because it will

not only provide more money but it will be with fewer strings attached, so the communities can direct it to people like you who are making things happen.

It's real impressive, 400 jobs, isn't it? It's good.

**Mr. Atkinson.** We're back to San Diego again.

### **Violence and Drugs**

**Mr. Levine.** Mr. President, I'd like you to meet Stan Hay. He is a church-based community organizer, works out on the street with two things that seem to constitute one very large problem, crime and drugs.

[*Mr. Hay asked what the administration plans to do about the problems of violence and crime.*]

**The President.** Let me tell you, first of all, I'd like for you to have a chance to say maybe to me and to all these people what you think ought to be done. But let me begin by responding to your specific question. He is coming to see—Dr. Brown is, Lee Brown, who is the Director of Drug Policy for our country, the drug czar. He was formerly the police chief in New York, in Atlanta, and in Houston. He started a community policing program in New York. And believe it or not, New York City now, for 2 years in a row, according to the FBI statistics has had a decline in their crime rate in all seven major areas of crime.

So the first thing we've got to try to do is to make the police and the community work together better, with the proper allocation of resources with a view toward preventing crime from occurring as well as catching criminals quicker. That's why we need more police officers so cities can afford to deploy the resources that way. The second thing we've got to do, I'll say again, is to try to take the guns out of the hands of people who shouldn't have them. The third thing we're trying to do, as Dr. Brown will tell you, is we want to change the emphasis of the Federal Government's drug control efforts. And with regard to enforcement, we want to concentrate more on kingpins, really big dealers, to try to break the financial back of a lot of these networks, not just on how many arrests we can make of people in the middle but

really go after big people and money networks.

Then, with people who are actual users and who may commit crimes in the course of that, we're trying to have much more comprehensive alcohol and drug abuse treatment. One of the really important things about our health care plan that I would think you would support is that it includes substance abuse treatment for people who now don't have any insurance. So that will stop a lot of these long, long delays for adequate treatment. Drug treatment works in an extraordinary percentage of the cases, not in all the cases but in a lot of the cases, if it is there.

So those are that things that we're working on. But the other thing we want to do is to listen to people like you who have actually done things that work. We have not only Lee Brown. Janet Reno, the Attorney General, was a prosecutor in Miami, one of the toughest towns in America for drug problems. And Louis Freeh, the Director of the FBI, was a U.S. attorney, a Federal judge, and an FBI agent, working principally in drug cases. He broke big international drug cases as well as dealing with drugs on the street. So we've got these three crimefighters who basically came up from the grassroots. And it's the first time we ever had a team of grassroots crimefighters dealing with the drug issue. They want to hear from you and people like you all over the country about what would work for you.

**Mr. Atkinson.** Mr. President, while we have you and since you've asked, Mr. Hay does have a couple of suggestions.

**The President.** I want to know.

[*Mr. Hay explained that he felt education and treatment programs were more effective than increasing law enforcement.*]

**The President.** Let me say just, if you think what he said, plus what the young man said here who wanted the job for his friends, plus what the young man said whose brother got shot in school—it goes back to the bigger point: The problems you see that you're all horrified about today have been festering and developing over a generation in America.

There were poor communities in this country 30, 40, 50 years ago that had no dif-

ference in the crime rate, no difference in the drug abuse rate as the communities today. But they had locally owned businesses, coherent community organizations, and intact families, all of which you have going away today.

So if you want to do something fundamental, we have to give these kids people like him to relate to—like you, sir—people who can be almost the kind of role models you used to take it for granted that the parents would be, who can create their own kind of gang in a community organization. We all want to be in a gang, don't we? I mean, your church is a gang. Your basketball team is a gang. In other words, we have a need to be with people who are like us, who share our values, who make us feel important, who reinforce us. And there is no simple answer to this, but you've got to start with these children when they're very young, and you have to give them a way of belonging and a way of learning and a way of growing that is positive.

Let me say, I agree with you about the jails. You can build more jails and not make society safer. And we need to distinguish between people who need to be kept out of society for a very long time and others that we may be jailing we could do something else with.

There's a difference in police. More police won't necessarily make you safer, but if they relate well to the community, if their neighbors trust them, if they like them, if they're on the street, they can lower the crime rate by keeping crime from occurring, by deterring the thing from occurring. If you have the right kind of relationships, they can be an enormous weapon.

But I want you to talk to Dr. Brown. And you're absolutely right, and I thank you for giving your life to this. There is not any more important work in America today than what you are trying to do.

### **Health Care Reform**

**Mr. Atkinson.** I think we're going to switch gears. This is a Sacramento physician.

**Ms. Bland.** Exactly. He's our first doctor of the evening, as a matter of fact—

**The President.** Good for you.

**Ms. Bland.** He is a primary care internist, and he's concerned about the formation of physician groups, or alliances, I believe, as your health plan refers to them.

Doctor?

[*Ms. Bland introduced a doctor who asked if the new health care plan would help struggling physicians groups so they are able to provide the best care for their patients. He then asked if independent doctors would receive assistance under the new plan.*]

**The President.** Yes. First of all, let me say that there are things in this plan which will give much better access to data of all kinds to physicians, both business management data, health outcomes data, a whole lot of things you don't get now, particularly if you're in individual practice, and to help people to set up and operate things without losing money, without making business mistakes.

Also the plan would significantly simplify a lot of the money management and paper management problems you have today. For example, a community this size, I would imagine the average multidoctor practice would be just like a hospital, you have to deal with maybe 300 different insurance companies. And we're trying to simplify that. That will reduce the possibility of error.

Secondly, keep in mind, every person under our proposal who's not covered now would be offered the option of three different kinds of coverage, and one of which would be to keep choosing individual doctors on an individual basis. That, in the beginning, would be more expensive for the employee. But at least they'd have the choice. Today only one-third of the workers who are insured at work have multiple choices in their health plan. And what we think will happen, sir, is that a lot of independent doctors will be able to organize, but not in a HMO type thing, maybe even in a PPO thing, but at least to all say, we will serve our patients as they need it, but we'll be able to save a lot of money doing it because the administrative costs will be lower.

Let me say, in an attempt to satisfy just your concern, we did involve hundreds of doctors in this, including people that we trusted. I asked my own doctors to help us,

just from their point of view of their own practice. I figure they'd tell me the truth. They don't mind disagreeing with me or telling me I'm crazy or telling me I need to lose 10 pounds or whatever they say. [*Laughter*] So we used a lot of doctors in different specialties and family doctors, GP's, too. And we also have asked Dr. Koop, who was the Surgeon General, as you remember, a few years ago under President Reagan and did a marvelous job, to sort of be our moderator, if you will, with the physician community all over America, to try to get as much feedback as we can, so as we move forward with this plan in Congress, we address concerns just like yours and we make sure that the doctors feel very good about this when it's over.

Let me just say, as you pointed out, the independent practice is becoming rarer and rarer anyway because of the economic pressures. One of the reasons for that and one of the reasons a lot of doctors have urged us to do something, is that in 1980—just listen to this, you want to know what they're up against—in 1980, the average doctor took home about 75 percent of the money that came into a clinic. By 1992, that figure has dropped from 75 percent to 52 percent because of increased bureaucracy and paperwork and all the people they had to hire to keep up with all the things that are ballooning the cost of this system. So we're trying to simplify that and leave you the option to stay in independent practice and leave your patients the options to be covered by you.

Now, keep in mind, most of the patients you have today probably have their own health insurance. Those that are in plans now that do that, we're not going to change that. What we're trying to do is to help those who don't have coverage get some kind of coverage. But they would also be able to choose you in either a physician group or as an independent practitioner. Another thing that they can do is to enter a PPO, and you stay out of the PPO, but when they need to see you, they see you. And then the only thing they have to pay is the difference between the reimbursement schedule in the PPO and what you would charge, which in your line of work would probably not be dramatically different.

So there are going to be all kinds of options. It should lead to a bigger patient pool, not a smaller one, and it shouldn't radically force you to change your practice, but it would give you the opportunity to do it. And if you do it, you will get the information you need to avoid losing money, and you'll have a simpler system to deal with.

**Mr. Atkinson.** Four out of every five people in the Sacramento metro area are in a managed health care system. We understand that Sacramento was used as something of a model for you and the First Lady. Is that true?

**The President.** It was. We looked at the Sacramento area because of the high percentage of people in some sort of managed care and the relatively high level of satisfaction among consumers with it. And we looked at the California public employees system because they've done such a good job of not lowering their rates but lowering the rate of increase.

We also looked at a number of other things. The Mayo Clinic system, for example, most of the people would concede that the Mayo Clinic has pretty high quality health care. Their inflation in cost this year was 3.9 percent, about a third of what the medical inflation rate was nationwide.

So there are ways to lower cost without sacrificing quality. To be fair, though, there are a lot of other things. Doctors do need a lot of information that they don't have now to deal with the system they've got. And if you give it to them and we provide it, that will also enable them to do a better job.

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

### **Abortion**

**Mr. Wilson.** Once again this week, Mr. President, the abortion issue is coming to the headlines because of the Hyde amendment being turned down once again by the Senate, which means that Federal funding for abortion will stay where it is. That means that it does not exist in this country for abortion. And I want you to meet someone who has a question on that subject.

[A participant asked if the President had changed his position on abortion.]

**The President.** The answer to your question is no, it hasn't changed. And in fact, if you've been following any of my rallies, all the people that protested against me in the campaign are still protesting against me. So they don't think I've changed my position.

But let me say this. When I took office I abolished the gag rule. I abolished the ban on fetal tissue research. I appointed Ruth Bader Ginsburg to the Supreme Court, who has made a career of fighting for the rights of women and believes in the constitutional right to choose. I have gotten the United States back into the effort to control worldwide population growth, which is an important human issue, not through abortion but through basic contraceptives, something that the United States had walked away from before. So I think that my record on that is clear and unblemished.

The issue that you raise is this: Federal district court judges are appointed by the President but recommended to the President by Senators, if they are Senators of the President's own party, in the States. I didn't know anything about the issue you raised until I also read it in the press. Apparently some of the Senators, two of them, I think, recommended judges to me to be appointed who have questionable positions on that issue. But they are lower court judges; they have to follow the law. So before I appoint them I will have to be satisfied that they intend to faithfully carry out the law of the United States as it now exists, or I won't do it if I think they're going to do that. So you don't have to worry about that. But I don't think I should have the same standard, if you will, or have just sort of a litmus test for every judge on every last detailed issue that might come before the court under the abortion area. I mean, there are a thousand different questions.

I think that if this is a good judge, I ought to consider appointing the judge. But I wouldn't appoint someone that I thought would just flagrantly walk away from what is clearly the law of the land, which is that a woman, within the first two trimesters of pregnancy anyway, has a constitutional right to choose. That's what the law is. That's what I believe in. I don't think it should be changed. And the judges that I appoint will

have to be willing to uphold the law of the land if they want the job.

**Mr. Atkinson.** We're going to go back to Los Angeles, to our sister station, KNBC, and Paul Moyer.

### **Immigration and Border Control**

**Mr. Moyer.** Stan, thank you.

Mr. President, I don't have to tell you, I know you know that one of the very, very big issues here in southern California is that of undocumented workers, undocumented people. That comes under the purview of your INS. This person is from the Asian Legal Center, Mr. President, and she has a question for you.

[*The participant asked if the Immigration and Naturalization Service would be reorganized.*]

**The President.** Well, let me say this, the Vice President, in his reinventing Government report, had recommended that we look at whether the border functions of Customs and the border functions of Immigration should be integrated. That was the issue. And that is something, I think, that is worth debating. We've had some instances in which—we got reports when we began to look in how the Federal Government operated, that the Immigration people and the Customs people were actually not only not cooperating but almost getting in each other's way at some border crossings in the United States.

So that's all we looked at. We would not diminish the other part of Immigration's control—function, excuse me—or defund it or underfund it or any of the things that you might be concerned about. And in fact, no decision has been made yet about the organizational issues. It's just that we have been concerned, given the kind of immigration problems we have when we want to reduce the chance that, for example, terrorists could get into this country, we want to deal with some of the problems we had where people were almost sold into bondage to come to this country. And we don't want any kind of unnecessary overlap or conflict between Customs and Immigration. So that's what we're trying to work out, not to diminish the other functions of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which are very important.

**Mr. Atkinson.** Mr. President, I hope I'm not breaking the rules here, but a quick followup to that. You know that the Border Patrol says they don't have enough people.

**The President.** They don't.

**Mr. Atkinson.** They say that their equipment is falling apart. Senator Dianne Feinstein's proposed what she calls, I believe, a crossing fee of about a dollar a car to raise \$400 million for more agents and better equipment. Your INS nominee testified last week that she is not philosophically opposed to that. Can we assume then that that's the administration's stand on that issue?

**The President.** Well, let me give you two answers. First of all, I have not endorsed the Feinstein proposal, but I am not philosophically opposed to it either. It's just we've got to think through what it means and what others might do for our crossing and whether it has any implications that we don't understand.

The main point is that Senator Feinstein and Senator Boxer and others in the California delegation want us to hire 600 more Border Patrol agents, and want us to update and modernize their equipment, and they're right about that. We've got a bill in the Congress which will go a long way towards doing that, and I hope we can pass it and pass it soon. There are simply not enough Border Patrol agents, and the equipment that they've got is simply inadequate. And we must do better.

In terms of the fee, I wouldn't rule it out, but I just hate to embrace something before I understand all of the implications of it. But I agree with the INS Commissioner, Doris Meissner. Neither one of us are philosophically opposed to it, we just have to know what the implications of it are before we can embrace it.

But the bottom line is, what the California Senators want is results. They want more Border Patrol agents, they want modern equipment, they want them to be able to do their job, and they're right. And we're going to do our best to see that they can.

**Mr. Atkinson.** Appropriately enough, we're going to switch closer to the border now, to San Diego and to KNSD.

**Mr. Levine.** Mr. President, here is the regional director of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

[The participant asked what steps would be taken to ensure that the proposed national health security card would not infringe on an individual's privacy.]

**The President.** Well, it'll work just like a Social Security card does. It'll look something like this. This is our little mock-up that I held up on television. And you would have this, which would entitle you to health care wherever you got sick and whatever happened to you. And we have to have some sort of card like this so people can be identified. And so if, for example, if there is an emergency, their health information can be secured quickly if they're in an approved health facility or dealing with a doctor. But it will have the same sorts of protections that a Social Security card would, for example.

And if you'll remember, there was an attempt a couple of years ago to try to broaden the use of Social Security identification which was repelled, because the American people were worried about their Social Security card being used for anything other than to validate the fact that they were entitled to Social Security. So this is purely for the purposes of establishing that you belong to the health care system, that you are duly enrolled, you're properly a member, and it would function in much the same way as a Medicare card or a Social Security card.

If you have any specific suggestions, I'd be glad to have them. But I can tell you no one has ever anticipated that this would be used to sort of plunder the privacy rights of Americans, but to just increase their personal security.

**Q.** The concern that, as expressed, has to do with the type of information that might be magnetically made available as part of the information that that card contains and who will have access to the information that that magnetic strip would contain with regard to the individual's background.

**The President.** But the individual will have—the only thing you have to do is—so that the person is eligible, the person will be enrolled in a health alliance, and the alliance will know whether the person is eligible because he or she is self-employed, small business employee, a big business employee, or somebody on Medicaid. And then there will have to be some access to health data

for the appropriate health professionals. But I don't think that there's going to be a lot of information just floating out there.

In fact, people will not have access to information that they don't need or that they don't have a right to know. I mean, you can't just go in and plunder somebody's files. I think the protections for the people will be quite adequate, just as they are today again with Social Security and with Medicare.

Let me just say this. If you have a list of specific questions, if you will get them to me, I will get you a list of very specific answers. Because I realize that, on this question like that, the devil is always in the details. So I know that I haven't fully satisfied you, so you send me the specific questions, and I'll send you the specific answers. And then you can decide whether you agree or not.

**Mr. Atkinson.** Be assured that she will. We only have 15 minutes left. It's amazing. Time has gone very quickly. We're back in Sacramento, and Carol has a guest.

**Ms. Bland.** Certainly has gone by quickly. So we're going to try to get as many questions in as we can.

### **Teacher Shortage**

[At this point, a participant asked if the President will have a program to help deal with the shortage of teachers.]

**The President.** Yes. Two things I might mention. One is that you've probably noticed recently that the Congress passed and I signed the national service bill, which will, within 3 years, enable us to offer 100,000 young Americans a year the opportunity to serve their communities and either earn credit toward a college degree or, if they are teachers coming out of college, to go into teaching and teach off a significant portion of their college costs, so that the National Service Corps will have a teacher corps component.

We work with a program called Teach For America that you're probably familiar with. And a young woman named Wendy Kopp organized it to try to make sure we integrated that into the National Service Corps proposal. So young people in college today, for example, could take out loans under the National Service Corps concept and say, I'm going to be a teacher, in certain areas where

there's a shortage of teachers, for a couple of years, and they can wipe off a big portion of their loans.

In addition to that, we're making a real effort to try to encourage a lot of these wonderful people who are coming out of the military, as we downsize the military, to go into teaching, to try to encourage them to do it. And we need, I might say, more cooperation from a lot of the States in passing easier ways for them to become certified to go into the classroom. But if you think about it, the military has had a stunning amount of success in educating and training people on a continuing basis. If you go back to what the gentleman said, he was an older high-tech worker that lost his job, and that's the kind of thing that we need in a lot of our schools today.

So a lot of these military people are being encouraged to go into teaching and being given, through a special program passed by Congress, some incentives to do that. And I hope we can expand that program, because I'd really like to see it. A lot of those folks are still young, they've got the best years of their lives ahead of them, and they could make a major contribution to the classroom. And a lot of them come from previously disadvantaged backgrounds and from all different races and ethnic makeups. So they can make a major contribution to what we need to do in our schools and our cities. Thank you.

Let me just say this, you didn't ask that, but since we've got a lot of doctors here, there is also the National Health Service Corps, which helped a lot of doctors to get through med school but has been shrunk in the last 10 years, will be dramatically expanded if the health care program passes. So you have a lot of doctors in urban and rural underserved areas, too, with the same plan.

**Mr. Atkinson.** Okay, we're going to switch back to KRON in San Francisco. Pete.

### **Gun Control**

**Mr. Wilson.** Mr. President, I want you to meet this gentleman. About a month ago, in a story that became headlines here and has remained headlines here in the month following, his brother was murdered, a random shooting, typical of the kind of thing you've

already talked about tonight. But he has a question for you I think on a slightly different tack.

[*The participant asked what could be done to deter violent criminals who apparently do not fear punishment.*]

**The President.** Well, a lot of the younger ones, unfortunately, aren't afraid of anything because they have no sense of the future. They're not invested in their own lives. They're not invested in what they might be doing 2 or 3 or 5 years from now. We're raising a generation of young people for whom the future is what happens 30 minutes from now or what happens tomorrow. And that's a terrible problem.

Now, I believe we should have stronger gun control measures than the Brady bill. For example, let me say again what I think we should do. I think we should pass one of a number of good bills which are in the Congress which would ban assault weapons. There are a lot of them out there for the sole purpose of killing people, and they should be banned, either at the national level or in every State. We should follow the lead of the 17 States which have now made it illegal for young people to possess handguns, unless they are, I'll say again, with their parents, hunting or at some target range, some approved place. We should have much stiffer penalties against possessing these weapons illegally. Then every community in the country could then start doing major weapon sweeps and then destroying the weapons, not selling them.

Another thing you ought to look into in your area: If the murder weapon is ever recovered, which it may not be, it would be interesting to know where it comes from and what tracking is on it. Because one of the things that I learned when I got into this is that every State of any size has hundreds of gun dealers that may be licensed only by the Federal Government for a \$10 fee a year. And there are cities and States which may have other laws, but you can still be a gun dealer if you've got this little piddly Federal permit.

So another thing that ought to be done is that the price of getting into the business ought to be raised, and people ought to have

to comply with the local laws and not just the Federal permitting laws. All these things would help us to deal with the sheer volume of weapons that are out there in the hands of people that are totally disconnected from our society, while we try to deal with these deeper problems that we talked about earlier.

I feel terrible about what happened to you. We have to face the fact that this is the only advanced country in the world where anybody that wants to can get any kind of gun they want to, to do anything that they want to with it. It's crazy. It doesn't happen in other countries, and we better make up our minds to change it if we want to save more lives and not have to see more people like this person on television 5 years from now. Thank you, sir.

### **Social Security**

**Mr. Moyer.** Mr. President, say hello to this person. She's 66; she's from Irvine. She is on Social Security, and a short time ago she had a financial setback, and she was forced to go back to work. Because of that, her Social Security now has been cut, and I think she has a question for you.

**Q.** Good evening, Mr. President. You promised to eliminate the Social Security earnings limit. And I'd like to know, why hasn't anything been done about it?

**The President.** Because I haven't been able to pass it yet. Specifically, what I promised to do was to raise it and not to totally eliminate it. I think that—do you know what she's talking about? Do you all know what she's talking—once you start drawing Social Security, you can only earn so much money before they start to lower your Social Security check, even if you're totally vested and you're entitled to the whole thing. And a lot of older people are finding it necessary to go back to work today, or they want to go back to work. I mean, people are standing vigorous for much longer periods of time.

And in the campaign for President, I said that I thought the earnings limit was way too low and should be substantially raised, and I do. And I don't even think it would cost a lot of money because the people who earn money pay taxes on the money they earn. And also with the population not growing as

fast now, we need those older workers. And so, what I believe we should do is to raise the earning limit. We are negotiating now; we're talking about how much it can be raised, what we can pass through Congress, and what the costs will be.

One of the things that we've done is, in getting serious about the deficit, is to make sure before we pass anything, we have to know as precisely as we can exactly what the costs will be. I personally believe, as I told you and I said during the campaign, that it wouldn't cost much, if anything, to raise the earnings limit because the people who go to work will earn more money and pay more taxes.

But I still strongly support it. I think it should be raised, and I think it will be raised. It's just a question of how much and how quick I can get it passed in Congress. I am still committed to it, and I would like to urge you and anybody else watching this program who is in your situation to urge the Members of Congress from this State to vote to do that.

This is one of those issues that there aren't a lot of people against; it's just hard to raise it on the radar screen of the Congress. And to be fair to them—it's easy to bash Congress—they're working 40 percent more this year than last year. I'm proud of that, 40 percent more. I've put all this stuff there, and they're working hard now because of all the things we've put before them. But this has not been addressed, and you're right to bring it up. I haven't forgotten it, but I need your help in building the kind of public support we need to change it.

**Mr. Atkinson.** Mr. President, unfortunately we have to give way, I think, for a dolphin and "SeaQuest" here in a moment, but we wanted to save a little time for you. I think you have about a minute.

**The President.** Well, I wish I could take another question or two. Let me first of all thank all of you for coming. And thank you for your interest. Thank you for the very good questions you asked; I wish we could have done more. And let me urge you to keep up this level of involvement. We can get these changes made if the American people demand them. And you don't have to agree with every detail of my health care program, just demand that we pass one that has secu-

rity and savings and simplicity, that preserves the kind of choice and quality these doctors talked about tonight, and that asks all of us to be more responsible.

We can do this and we can also turn the California economy around if we'll take it one day at a time, one project at a time, and keep at these things until they're done. We can do it. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The town meeting began at 6:33 p.m. at KCRA television studio. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

**Remarks to the AFL-CIO  
Convention in San Francisco,  
California**

*October 4, 1993*

Thank you very much. President Kirkland, distinguished platform guests, and to the men and women of the American labor movement, let me tell you first I am glad to be here. I feel like I'm home, and I hope you feel like you have a home in Washington.

For most of the 20th century the union movement in America has represented the effort to make sure that people who worked hard and played by the rules were treated fairly, had a chance to become middle class citizens, raise middle class kids, and give their children a chance to have a better life than they did. You have worked for that. You have done that.

For too long, in the face of deep and profound problems engulfing all the world's advanced nations, you have been subjected to a political climate in which you were asked to bear the blame for forces you did not create, many times when you were trying to make the situation better. I became President in part because I wanted a new partnership for the labor movement in America.

Before I get into the remarks that I came here to make about all of our challenges at home and the economic challenges facing us, I have to make a few remarks this morning about developments in the world in the last 48 hours.

The labor movement has been active, particularly in the last few years with the end of the cold war, in the effort to promote democracy abroad, to guarantee the right of

people freely to join their own unions, and to work for freedom within their own countries. In that context most of you, I know, have strongly supported and looked with great favor on the movement toward democracy in Russia.

The United States continues to stand firm in its support of President Yeltsin because he is Russia's democratically elected leader. We very much regret the loss of life in Moscow, but it is clear that the opposition forces started the conflict and that President Yeltsin had no other alternative than to try to restore order. It appears as of this moment that that has been done. I have as of this moment absolutely no reason to doubt the personal commitment that Boris Yeltsin made to let the Russian people decide their own future, to secure a new Constitution with democratic values and democratic processes, to have a new legislative branch elected with democratic elections, and to subject himself, yet again, to a democratic vote of the people. That is all that we can ask.

I think also, most of you know that in a military action yesterday, the United States sustained the loss of some young American soldiers in Somalia. I deeply regret the loss of their lives. They are working to ensure that anarchy and starvation do not return to a nation in which over 300,000 people have lost their lives, many of them children, before the United States led the U.N. mission there, starting late last year. I want to offer my profound condolences to the families of the United States Army personnel who died there. They were acting in the best spirit of America.

As you know, the United States has long had plans to withdraw from Somalia and leave it to others in the United Nations to pursue the common objectives. I urged the United Nations and the Secretary-General in my speech at the United Nations a few days ago to start a political process so that the country could be turned back over to Somalis who would not permit the kind of horrible bloodshed and devastation to reoccur. And I hope and pray that that will happen. In the meanwhile, you may be sure that we will do whatever is necessary to protect our own

forces in Somalia and to complete our mission there.

From the struggle against communism in Eastern Europe to the struggle against apartheid in South Africa, the union movement in America has always answered the challenges of our time. It must be a source of great pride to you to see these elections unfold, to see the remarkable movement toward a genuine multiracial society within a democratic framework in South Africa. It must, likewise, be a source of continuing frustration to you to see that even as the ideas and the values that you have espoused now for decades are being embraced around the world, here in our country and in virtually every other wealthy country in the world, middle class workers are under assault from global economic forces that seem beyond the reach of virtually any government policy.

We now know that every wealthy country in the world is having trouble creating jobs. We now know that in the last several years, inequality of income got worse in every major country. We know that we had more growing inequality in America than anyplace else because we actually embraced it. I mean, the whole idea of trickle-down economics was to cut taxes on the wealthiest Americans, raise taxes on the middle class, let the deficit balloon, and hope that the investment from the wealthy would somehow expand opportunity to everybody else.

We know that didn't work, and it made the situation worse. It left us with a \$4 trillion debt. It left us with a deficit of over \$300 billion a year. It left us with a legacy of weakened opportunities for workers in the workplace, too little investment, a paralyzed budget, and no strategy to compete and win in the global economy, and more inequality in America than any of the other wealthy countries. But we also know that the same problems we have are now being found in Germany, in Japan, in all of Europe, in the other advanced nations.

So we have to face the honest fact that we are facing unprecedented challenges in our own midst to the very way of life that the labor movement has fought so hard to guarantee for others around the world for decades. And therefore, it is important that we think through these issues, that we take

positions on them, that we agree and that we disagree in the spirit of honest searching for what the real nature of this world is we're living in and where we are going.

The most important thing to me today is that you know that this administration shares your values and your hopes and your dreams and the interest of your children, and that together—[*applause*]*—*and that I believe together we can work our way through this very difficult and challenging time, recognizing that no one fully understands the dimensions of the age in which we live and exactly how we are going to recreate opportunity for all Americans who are willing to do what it takes to be worthy of it.

The labor movement, historically, has always been on the cutting edge of change and the drive to empower workers and give them more dignity on the job and in their lives. Almost a half a century ago, at the end of World War II, labor helped to change America and the world. At home and abroad, labor helped to create a generation of prosperity and to create the broad middle class that we all cherish so much today.

Now we have to do it again. We're at a time of change that I am convinced is as dramatic as the dawning of the Industrial Age. We can no longer tell our sons and daughters—we know this now—that they will enter a job at the age of 18 or 21, enjoy secure paychecks and health benefits and retirement benefits for the rest of their working lives and retire from the same job with the same company at the age of 65 or 62.

Our changing economy tells us now that the average 18-year-old will change work seven times in a lifetime even if they stay with the same company and certainly if they change; that when people lose their jobs now, they really aren't on unemployment, they're looking for reemployment; that most unemployment today is not like it used to be: When people got unemployed for decades, it was because there was a temporary downturn in the economy, and when the economy turned up again, most people who were unemployed were hired back by their old employer. Today, most people who are unemployed eventually get hired back usually by a different employer for a different job and unless we are very good at what we do for

them, often at lower wages and less benefits. So it is clear that what we need is not an unemployment system but a reemployment system in recognition of the way the world works today.

We know, too, that most American working people are working harder than they ever have in their lives; that the average work week is longer today than it was 20 years ago; that real hourly wages adjusted for inflation peaked in 1973, and so most people are working harder for the same or lower real wages than they were making 20 years ago.

We know that in the eighties there was a dramatic restructuring of manufacturing; that being followed in the nineties with a dramatic restructuring of the service industries. We know that for the last 12 years, in every single year, the Fortune 500 companies lowered employment in the United States in six figures, and that in the years where we have gained jobs, they've come primarily from starting new businesses and from companies with between, say, 500 and 1,000 workers expanding, as the whole nature of this economy changes.

We know that the cost of health care has increased so much that millions of American workers who kept their jobs never got a pay raise because all the increased money went to pay more for the same health care. We know that some of our most powerful industrial engines, especially in industries like autos and steel have shown breathtaking increases in productivity with deep changes in the work force supported by the labor movement, and still are having trouble competing in the world, in part, because their health costs may be as much as a dime on the dollar more than all of their competitors.

We know, as I said at the beginning, that all the wealthy countries in the world are now having trouble creating jobs. If you look at France, for example, in the late 1980's, they actually had an economy that grew more rapidly than Germany's, and yet their unemployment rate never went below 9.5 percent.

So what are we to do? It seems to me that we clearly have to make some changes in the way we look at the world and the way we approach the world. And in order to make those changes, we have to ask ourselves, what do we have to do to make the American peo-

ple secure enough to make the changes? One of the things that has really bothered me in the late, latter stages of this era that we're moving out of is that so few people have been so little concerned about rampant insecurity among ordinary American middle class citizens. It is impossible for people in their personal lives to make necessary changes if they are wildly insecure.

You think about that in your own life. You think about a personal challenge you faced, a challenge your family has faced. The same thing is true in the workplace. The same thing is true of a community. The same thing is true of a team. The same thing is true of our country. We have to struggle to redefine a new balance between security and change in this country because if we're not secure, we won't change, and if we don't change, we'll get more insecure, because the circumstances of the world will continue to grind us down.

And that's what makes this such a difficult time, because we have to rethink so many things at once. I ran for President because I was tired of 20 years of declining living standards, of 12 years of trickle-down economics and antiworker policies, and rhetoric that blamed people who are working harder for the problems that others did not respond to, and because I believe that we needed a new partnership in America, a new sense of community, not just business and labor and government but also people without regard to their color or their region or anything else. I thought we didn't have anybody to waste, and it looks to me like we were wasting a lot of people and that we needed to put together. I thought the country was going in the wrong direction, and we should turn it around. But I was then and am now under no illusions that we could do it overnight or that I could do it, unless we did it together.

The beginning of the security necessary to change, I think, is in having a Government that is plainly on the side of working Americans. I believe that any of your leaders who work with this administration will tell you that we are replacing a Government that for years worked labor over, with a Government that works with labor. We have a Secretary of Labor in Bob Reich who understands that, at a time when money and management can

travel across the globe in a microsecond, our prosperity depends more than anything else on the skills and the strengths of our working people. No one can take that away from us. And our people are still our most important asset, even more than they were 20 years ago.

We have nominated a Chair of the National Labor Relations Board in Bill Gould, and a new member, Peggy Browning, who believe in collective bargaining. We have a Director of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration in Joseph Dear who comes from the labor movement and believes that workers should be protected in the workplace. We have two people in executive positions in the Labor Department in Joyce Miller and Jack Otero who were on your executive council. We have two people in the SEIU in executive positions in Karen Nussbaum and Jerry Polas who are leading us to make progress.

This administration rescinded President Reagan's order banning all reemployment of PATCO workers forever. And we rescinded President Bush's orders with regard to Government-funded contracting and one-sided information given to workers in the workplace. And this week I will sign the Hatch Act Reform Act to give Government employees political rights they have been denied for too long.

One week ago yesterday, on a Sunday morning, I came in from my early morning run, and I turned to my right as I walked into the White House, and I saw a family standing there, a father, a mother, and three daughters, one of whom was in a wheelchair. And the person who was with them who worked for me said, "Mr. President, this little girl has got terminal cancer, and she was asked by the Make A Wish Foundation what she wanted to do, and she said she wanted to come to the White House and visit you. So we're giving her a special tour."

So I went over, and I shook hands with them and apologized for my condition and told them I'd get cleaned up and come back, and we'd take a picture. And a few minutes later I showed up, looking more like my job. And I visited with this wonderful child, desperately ill, for a while. And then I talked to her sisters, and then I talked to her mother. And I talked to her father. And as I turned

around to go off, the father grabbed me by the arm and he said, he said, "Let me tell you something. If you ever get to wondering whether it makes a difference who's the President," he said, "look at my child. She's probably not going to make it, and the weeks I've spent with her have been the most precious time of my life. And if you hadn't been elected, we wouldn't have had a family and medical leave law that made it possible for me to be with my child in this time."

Now, I believe, in short, that it ought to be possible to be a good parent and a good worker. I believe that it ought to be possible for people to make their own judgments about whether they want to be organized at work or not and how they're going to be—[*applause*]. And I believe if we're really going to preserve the American workplace as a model of global productivity, we have to let people who know how to do their jobs better than other people do have more empowerment to do those jobs and to make those changes in the workplace.

That's why, as we work on the Vice President's reinventing Government initiative, we work so closely with Federal employees and their unions. When the Vice President spoke with business leaders and workers who had changed their companies, they all said the same thing: You've got to have the workers; you have to have them do it, tell you how to do it, tell you how to make the companies more productive.

Now, that's why yesterday I signed an Executive order—on Friday—creating a National Partnership Council. For the next several months the leaders of Federal employee unions, including John Sturdivant, the president of the American Federation of Government Employees, who is here today, will work with the leaders of our administration to make our Government more effective, cost less, and more importantly, to make the jobs of the rank and file Federal employees more interesting, more stimulating, more customer-oriented, by doing things that they have been telling us they should be able to do, but that the system has not permitted them to do in the past. I applaud John and the other people in the unions representing Federal employees for what they have done.

This is an unprecedented partnership that I think will benefit every American.

We want to make worker empowerment and labor-management cooperation a way of life in this country, from the factory floor to the board room. We've created a commission on the future of labor and management relations, with leaders from labor, business, and the academy, chaired by former Labor Secretary John Dunlap. And I've asked Secretary Reich to create a commission to study and improve relationships in government workplaces at every level, at the State and county and local level, as well as at the Federal level.

I believe this is something that a person like Bob Reich is uniquely situated to do. And it's the kind of thing that we ought to be promoting because we have to use this opportunity we have to try to take what has worked for workers and their businesses and spread it around the country.

For the last 12 years we've had a lot of finger-pointing and blame-placing, and we've got these stirring examples of success that we could be trying to replicate. That's what we ought to be doing, taking what works. And it always is a workplace in which workers have more say. And we're going to do what we can to get that done.

Now, on the security issue, let me just mention some other things. In addition to the family leave act, the budget bill which passed by such a landslide in the Congress contained what may well be the most important piece of economic reform for working people in 20 years, by expanding the earned-income tax credit so that you can say to people, if you work 40 hours a week and you have children in your home, you will not be poor. We are bringing new hope and new dignity into the lives of 15 million working families that make \$27,000 a year or less. They'll no longer be taxed into poverty. There won't be a Government program to try to lift them out of poverty. Their own efforts will lift them out of poverty because the tax system will be changed to reward them. And there will never again be an incentive for people to be on welfare instead of work because the tax system will say, if you're willing to go to work and work 40 hours a week, no matter how tough it is, we will lift you out of poverty. That is the kind of

prowork, profamily policy this country ought to have.

Something else that was in that bill that most Americans don't even know about yet that will benefit many, many of you in this room and the people you represent is a dramatic reform of the student loan system that will eliminate waste, lower the interest rates on student loans, make the repayment terms easier so that young people can repay their loans no matter how much they borrow as a percentage of their income, limited so they can repay it. Even though we'll have tougher repayment terms, they'll be able to do it. We'll collect the money, but people will be able to borrow money and pay it back at lower interest rates, at better repayment terms. And therefore, no one will ever be denied access to a college education because of the cost.

When you put that with our Goals 2000 program, the education reform program for the public schools, and the work that the Education Secretary Dick Riley is doing with Secretary Reich to redo the worker training programs in the country, you have a commitment to raise standards in education and open opportunities to our young people.

We need higher standards in our public schools. Al Shanker has long been a voice for that. He now has allies in the NEA and other places in the country who are saying, "Let's have national standards and evaluate what our kids are learning and how our schools are doing."

I believe we need to give our young people more choices within the public school system, and I have advocated letting States try a lot of things within districts. Let kids choose which schools they attend. Let school districts decide how they want to set up and organize schools. I think that a lot of changes need to be made in a lot of school districts. But let me say that we don't want to throw out the baby with the bath water. There are also a lot of school districts that are doing a great job under difficult circumstances. There are a lot of schools within school districts that are performing well under difficult circumstances.

And if we've learned anything, we've learned that the best way to increase the quality of education is to find better prin-

cipals, get better leaders among the teachers, let them have more say over how school is run, and evaluate them based on their results rather than telling them how to do every last jot and tiddle of their job every day.

We have learned these things—and if I might, since we're in California, say a special word—therefore, I believe that having worked for 12 years for higher standards, more choices and greater changes in public education, I'm in a little bit of a position to say that if I were a citizen of the State of California, I would not vote for Proposition 174, The Private Voucher Initiative.

Now, and let me tell you why. Let me tell you why. First of all, keep in mind a lot of the schools out here are doing a good job. I can say this, you know, I never was part of the California education system. I have studied this system out here for more than a decade. They have undertaken a lot of very impressive reforms and many of their schools are doing a good job. I was interviewed last night by two people from a newspaper in Sacramento, and one of them just volunteered that he had two children in the public schools there, and they were getting a terrific education.

This bill would start by taking \$1.3 billion right off the top to send a check to people who already have their kids in private schools, and who didn't need any Government money to do it, and taking it right off the top away from a school system that doesn't have enough money to educate the kids it's got in it in the first place.

Second thing it would do is to impose no real standards on the quality of the programs which could be funded: who could set up a school; what standards they'd have to meet; what tests the kids would have to pass. Just take your voucher, and who cares whether a private school is a legitimate school or not. That is a significant issue. And all you have to do is to work in this field for a few years to understand that that is a significant issue.

Wouldn't it be ironic that at the very moment we're finally trying to find a way to measure the performance and raise the standards of the public schools, we turn around and start sending tax money to private schools that didn't have to meet any standards at all. When we're trying to get one

part of our business, we're going to make the other part worse.

And finally, let me just say, I have always supported the notion that American schools ought to have competition and the fact that we have a vibrant tradition of pluralistic education and private schools and religious private schools was a good thing, not a bad thing for America. But all the years when I grew up, and all the times I saw that, and for a couple years of my life when I was a little boy, when I went to a Catholic school, when my folks moved from one place to another, and we lived way out in the country and didn't know much about the schools in the new area where we were, no one ever thought that the church would want any money from the taxpayers to run their schools. In fact, they said just the opposite, "We don't want to be involved in that." That's what the First Amendment is all about.

So I think we have to really think through—I have spent 12 years before I became President overwhelmingly obsessed with reform of the public school system, wanting more choices in the system, wanting more accountability, wanting more flexibility about how schools were organized and established and operated. But I can tell you that this is not the way to get it done, and the people will regret this if they pass it. I hope the people of California don't do that.

Now, you can educate people all you want—and I wanted to say a little more about that. The Labor Secretary and I are working on trying to take all these 150 different Government training programs and give local communities and States the power to consolidate them, working with you, and just fund the things that work on a State-by-State basis, and to set up a system of lifetime education and training.

I don't know how many of you saw the television program I did last night in California, but one man, looked to be in his early fifties, saying, "We need a training program that gives my company some incentives to retrain me, not just people who are 25, but people who are 55." And we are trying to do that. We're trying to set up a lifetime education and training program that starts when young people are in high school, so if they

want to work and learn in high school they can work and learn in high school, so that we can have the kind of school-to-work transition that many of our competitors have for all those kids that won't go to college and won't get 4-year educations. We've got to do that.

But if you do all that, you still have to have someplace for people to work. We can educate and train people all we want, but we have to be able to create more jobs. How are we going to do that at a time when the Government is not directly funding the defense jobs that have kept America's job base up for so long?

Well, the first thing we've got to do is make up our mind we're going to be serious about defense conversion. Last year when I was a candidate for President—[*applause*—last year when I was a candidate for President, I went all over the country—and I wasn't in the Congress and didn't have a vote—pleading with the Congress to pass the defense conversion bill. They did it, and the previous administration absolutely refused to spend \$500 million to help convert from a defense to a high-tech domestic economy. So we have released the money. And we're going to try to get up to \$20 billion spent on defense conversion and reinvestment in the jobs of tomorrow over the next 5 years. It is very important.

We have got over 2,800 proposals in this country for technology-reinvestment initiatives, to match with what will soon be about a billion dollars in Government money that can create hundreds of thousands of jobs in America. People are brimming with ideas out there to create new jobs.

I was at McClellan Air Force Base yesterday, and the airbase is working with people in the local community and the local universities and with the Federal defense labs. They have made new electric cars. They have made new manufacturing component parts to try to come up with economical ways to do it and allow those parts to be made in America. And they are targeting things that are now made overseas and imported here. That's the sort of thing that we can use our high-tech defense base to do, and we should be doing it. It's going to make for more jobs for America.

They have developed a prototype car that gets 80 miles per gallon at 55 miles per hour on the highway, goes to 60 miles per hour in 12 seconds, has a maximum speed of 100 miles an hour. That's not bad. If we can just figure out how people can afford it, we can put people to work making them. But it's a good beginning.

We announced last week that groundbreaking project with the UAW and Ford, Chrysler, and General Motors are working with the defense labs and all the Government labs on a project to triple the average mileage of American autos within the next 10 years. If they do that, that will create untold numbers of new jobs here, and we'll be selling cars to people overseas who want that instead of the reverse.

And by the way, I want to compliment the UAW. You know, this year we have regained a lot of our market share in America. People are buying more American cars in America, and we should compliment them for it.

So we have to find ways to create these new jobs. Now, I want to talk a little about health care, but before I do, I want to mention something we disagree on in the context of the trade issue. And listen to this. Since 1986, a significant portion of America's net new jobs have come from trade growth. That's something we can all find from the figures. In California, where we now are, a lot of that has come from Asia, which is the fastest growing part of the world. Asia's growing faster than any other part of the world; Latin America the second fastest growing part of the world. Everybody knows that is true.

Now, that's why, when I went to Tokyo and met with the leaders of the G-7, the seven big industrial countries, we made an agreement that we should dramatically reduce tariffs on manufactured products around the world in ways that all analysts agree would generate a lot of new manufacturing jobs here in America. There was virtually no dispute about that, because we were largely in competition with other countries that were paying the same or higher wages with the same or better benefits, with high-tech and other manufacturing products that we wanted to sell everywhere. And we're

working like crazy to get that done between now and the end of the year.

What is the difference between that and the trade agreement with Mexico? And let's talk about that just a minute, because it's very important, not so you'll agree with me but so you will know what I want you to know, which is that I would never knowingly do anything to cost an American a job. That's not the business I'm in.

I was a Governor during the last 12 years, when the *maquilladora* system was in place. What did it do? It created a border zone on the other side of the border in Mexico in which people were free to set up plants, operate them by the standards that were enforced there—or not enforced, as the case may be—on labor and environmental issues, and then send their products back into this country, produced at much lower labor costs with no tariffs. That was the system set up to try to foster growth there.

But in the 1980's, because of all the economic problems we had, and because of the climate that was promoted in this country that the most important thing you could do was slash your labor costs and who cared about your working people anyway, you had the movement of hundreds of plants down there. And you didn't like it worth a flip. And you were right to be upset about what happened.

Now, I was a Governor of a State that lost plants to Mexico. And my State was so small that when people lost their jobs I was likely to know who they were. This was a big deal to me. I'm also proud of the fact we got one of them to come back before I left office. I'm proud of that, too. But I understand this.

Now, that is the system we have. You also saw this system, ironically, accelerating illegal immigration. Why? For the same reason that a lot of the Chinese boat people were coming over here after they moved to the coastal towns in China, got a job where they made a little more money than they did before, but didn't much like their life, but they got enough money to try to come here. That's what was happening along the *maquilladora* area. A lot of people would come up there, work for a while, then come on up here.

So I understand what the American working people don't like about the present sys-

tem. The real issue: Will the trade agreement make it worse or better? You think it will make it worse. I think it will make it better. And I'll tell you, I think you're entitled to know why I think that. Because there is no question that, no matter what you think about the adequacy of the side agreements, they will raise the cost of labor and environmental investments above the point where they are now. There is no question that the agreement lowers domestic content requirements in Mexico, so that we'll go from selling say 1,000 to 50,000 or 60,000 American cars down there next year. There's no question that their tariffs are 2½ times higher than ours. And there's no question that we have a trade surplus there, as compared with a \$49 billion trade deficit with Japan, an \$18 billion trade deficit with China, a \$9 billion trade deficit with Taiwan.

We've got a trade problem, all right. It is that the Asian economies are not as open to us as we are to them. That's our huge trade problem. And we're going to have to do better there, because that's where a lot of the money is. So my reasoning is that if their tariffs are higher than ours and their costs go up faster than they're otherwise going to go up, and they're already buying \$350-a-person worth of American goods, second only to Canada—replaced Japan as the number two purchaser of manufacturing products this year—and we got a \$5.8 billion trade surplus, it will get better, not worse.

Is it a perfect agreement? No. But I don't want to make the perfect the enemy of the better. I think it is better than the present.

There are two other points I want to make. If the deal is not made with the United States, and instead it's made with Germany or Japan, we could lose access to an 80-million person market and cost ourselves more jobs. And if the deal is made, it could lead to further similar agreements with the emerging market economies of Latin America. And no one believes that anybody's going to invest in Argentina, for example, to export back to the American market. So all barrier dropping the further you get away from here because of transportation costs will lead to more jobs in America through greater trade.

So that's why I think it makes it better, not worse. You're entitled to know that. I

don't ask you to agree, but I ask you to make the same arguments inside your own mind, because I would never knowingly do anything to cost America jobs. I'm trying to create jobs in this country.

Now, I'll tell you what I really think. What I really believe is that this is become the symbol of the legitimate grievances of the American working people about the way they've been worked over the last 12 years. That's what I think. And I think those grievances are legitimate. And I think that people are so insecure in their jobs, they're so uncertain that the people they work for really care about them, they're so uncertain about what their kids are looking at in the future, that people are reluctant to take any risks for change.

And so let me close with what I started with. I have got to lay a foundation of personal security for the working people of this country and their families in order to succeed as your President, and you have to help me do it. We have got to reform the job training system of this country, to make it a reemployment system, not an unemployment system, and to give it to kids starting when they're in high school.

We have got to have an investment strategy that will create jobs here. And that's why we removed all those export controls that were cold war relics on computers and supercomputers and telecommunications equipment, opening just this month \$37 billion worth of American products to exports. That is important.

That's why I want to pass a crime bill to put 50,000 more police officers on the street, pass the Brady bill and take those automatic weapons out of the hands of the teenagers that are vandalizing and brutalizing our children in this country. And, my fellow Americans, that is why we have got to pass a comprehensive health care bill to provide security to all Americans. And we've got to do it now.

How many Americans do you know who lost their health insurance because they lost their jobs? Who never got a pay increase because of the rising cost of their health care? Who can never change jobs because they have a sick child? Millions of them. How many companies are represented in this

room who could be selling more everywhere across the board, more abroad and more at home, if their health care costs were no greater than their competitors around the world?

Let's face it folks, we're spending over 14 percent of our income on health care. Canada's at 10. Germany and Japan are under nine. The Germans went up toward 9 percent of their income on health care, they had a national outbreak of hysteria about how they were losing control of their health care system. And yet they all cover everybody and no one loses their health insurance. And when I say we can do that and we can do it without a broad-based tax increase, people look at me like I have slipped a gear. [*Laughter*]

But I have spent over 3 years studying this system. And the First Lady and her task force have mobilized thousands of experts in the most intense effort to examine social reform in my lifetime. And they have recommended that we adopt a system which, first of all, builds on the system that you enjoy: an employer-based system where the employer contributes and, in some cases, the employee does and some not; a system that is focused on keeping what is good about American health care—doctors, and nurses, and medical research and technology—and fixing what is wrong—not covering everybody, kicking them off after they have a serious illness, not letting people move their jobs, having some people in such tiny groups of insurance that 40 percent of their premium goes to profit and administrative costs, and spending a dime on the dollar, a dime on every dollar in a \$90 billion system goes to paperwork that wouldn't go in any other system in the world—\$90 billion a year on that alone. Never mind the fraud and the abuse, and the incentives in this system to churn it, to perform unnecessary procedures just because the more you do the more you earn.

We can do better than that. So I want to just say, this system will be a good one. Everybody will get a health care security card like this. I feel like that guy in the ad. I'm supposed to say, "Don't leave home without it," when I pull it out. [*Laughter*] But I want everybody to have a health care security card like this. Just like a Social Security card. And

I want people to have their health care access whether they're working or unemployed, whether they work for a little business or a big one.

Under the system we have proposed, if you've got a better deal now, you can keep it. If your employer pays 100 percent of benefits now, you can keep it. And we don't propose to tax any benefits that are above the minimum package. We told those who wanted that to give us 10 years before we put that provision in because within 10 years we'll have the minimum benefit package we start with, plus full dental benefits and full mental-health benefits and full preventive-care benefits, so it will be as good or better than any package now offered by any employer in America. Then, if somebody wants to buy something over and above that, we can talk about it. But we are not going to take anything away from you, you have.

What we are going to do is two things for you if you have a good policy. We're going to make it easier for your employer to keep these benefits you have now by slowing the rate of health care cost inflation, not by cutting health care spending, by slowing the rate of inflation in health care cost, and by removing the enormous burden of retiree benefits from our most productive companies. That will stabilize the health care benefits of working people and good plans.

The other thing we're going to do for you is to limit what can be taken away from you which is worth something. So by saying that for people who don't have any insurance now, their employer will pay 80 percent and the employees will pay 20, we are saying that no matter what happens to you, there's a limit to what can be taken away from you. So it will be easy for you to keep, easier for your employer to keep what you've got, and for you, and there will be a limit to what can be taken away.

Is it fair to ask all those employers and employees who don't have any coverage now to contribute something? You bet it is. Why? Because your premium's higher than it otherwise would be because you're paying for them now.

Can we do that without bankrupting small business? Of course, we can. We have a plan that gives a significant discount to smaller

new businesses, and to smaller established businesses with lower wage employees that are operating on narrow margins.

How are we going to pay for this? Two-thirds of it will be paid for by employers and employees contributing into the system that they get a free ride in now. One-sixth of it will be paid for with a cigarette tax and with a fee on very large companies who opt out of the system so they can pay for the cost of insuring the poor and the discounts to small business, and most important, for the health education and research that makes us all richer because we are going to pay for that and for expanded public health clinics. And one-sixth of it will come from slowing the rate of growth. When you hear people say, "Oh, Clinton wants to cut Medicare and Medicaid, let me tell you something folks, we're cutting defense. We've held all domestic investment that's discretionary flat, which means if I want to spend more money on job training, on defense conversion, or on Head Start, I have to go cut something else dollar for dollar for the next 5 years. That's what we've done. We've cut defense as much as we possibly can right at the edge, held everything else flat.

You know what Medicare and Medicaid are doing? They're going up at 3 times the rate of inflation. What have I proposed to do? Let them go up at twice the rate of inflation. They say in Washington I can't do it. I don't talk to a single doctor who understands what we're going to do who doesn't think we can achieve those savings without hurting the quality of health care. If we can't get down to twice the rate of inflation from 3 times the rate of inflation, there's something wrong somewhere.

Now, that's how we propose to finance this. And I am pleading with you to help me pass this bill. No matter how good your health care plan is now, don't you believe for a minute you could never lose it, or at least get locked into your present job. And I am pleading with you to do it so that we can give to the rest of America, as well as to you and your families, the kind of personal security we have got to have to face the bewildering array of challenges that are out there before us.

You know as well as I do that we are hurtling toward the 21st century into a world that none of us can fully perceive. But we have to imagine what we want it to be like. We want it to be a world in which the old rules that you grew up believing in apply in a new and more exciting age, in which, if you don't have job security, you at least have employment security; in which the Government puts the people first, and in which people have security in their homes, on their streets, in their education benefits, in their health care benefits so that they are capable of seizing these changes and making life richer and more different and more exciting than it has ever been.

That is the great challenge before us. And if we don't adopt the health care reform, we won't get there. If we do, it will open the way to the most incredible unleashing of American energy that we have seen in more than a generation. Together we can do it, and I need your help.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. in the Grand Ballroom of the San Francisco Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Albert Shanker, president, American Federation of Teachers.

## Exchange With Reporters in San Francisco

October 4, 1993

### Russia

**Q.** Did Yeltsin have a choice in using force in Moscow?

**The President.** I doubt it. Once they were armed, they were using their arms, they were hurting people. I just don't see that they had anyplace—he had those police officers instructed not to use force, and in fact, deployed in such a way that they couldn't effectively use force, and they were routed. I don't see that he had any choice at all.

**Q.** Does this taint the move toward democracy in Russia?

**The President.** No. I think, first of all, as I said today in my remarks, clearly, he bent over backwards to avoid doing this. And I think he may even wonder whether he let it go too far. But I think as long as his com-

mitment is clear, to get a new constitution, to have new legislative elections, and have a new election for the Presidency, so he puts himself on the election block again, I don't think it does taint it.

### Somalia

**Q.** [Inaudible]

**The President.** The only thing that I have authorized so far—and I want to say I'll be doing a lot more work on this today, later today, when I've got some time set aside to go back to work on it—the only thing I have done so far is to authorize the rangers that are there who are wounded or exhausted or done more than their fair share to be replaced, to roll over that group and then to send some more people there with some armored support so that we can have some more protection on the ground for our people. None of this happened when we had 28,000 people there. And even though there are lots of U.N. forces there, not all of them are able to do what our forces did before. So I'm just not satisfied that the folks that are there now have the protection they need. So all I've authorized is a modest increase to provide armored support, to provide greater protection for the people over there trying to do their job.

This is not to signify some huge new commitment or offensive at this time, but I'm just not satisfied that the American soldiers that are there have the protection they need under present circumstances. So I've authorized, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, a modest increase to get some more armored protection for them.

**Q.** Were any American soldiers taken hostage or taken captive by Aideed's forces?

**The President.** It is possible, and if it happened, we want there to be a very clear warning that those young soldiers who are there legally under international law, on behalf of the United Nations, and they are to be treated according to the rules of international law, which means not only no torture and no beating, but they're to have food and shelter and medical attention. They're to be treated in a proper way. And the United States will take a very firm view of anything that happens

to the contrary. It is a very big issue. We'll probably have more to say about that later in the day.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 12:34 p.m. at the San Francisco Hilton. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

### **Remarks to the Community and an Exchange With Reporters in San Francisco**

*October 4, 1993*

**The President.** Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. It's wonderful to see all of you here. I thank you for coming. I want to apologize for our lateness, but I have, as you might imagine, had to spend a little extra time this morning on events around the world which have required me to be on the phone, and it pushed our schedule back a little bit. I thank you all for waiting.

I'd like to particularly acknowledge in the crowd today, once again, at the beginning, the Secretary of Energy, Hazel O'Leary, who has done a lot of work on the project that we're here to announce. I see Congresswoman Pelosi, Congresswoman Anna Eshoo, Congressman Tom Lantos here. The Mayor of Oakland, Elihu Harris, and I know Speaker Brown was here. He may have had to leave. Is he still here?

I want to thank, too, some Members of Congress who are not here who worked very hard on this issue: Senator Boxer and Senator Feinstein and Congressman Dellums and Congressman Stark. The president of Stanford is here, Gerhard Caspar; the slide director, Burt Richter; and the Stanford chairman of the board of trustees, John Freidenrich. And the Cypress Freeway area council member, Natalie Baten, is here. And there are others here, but I wanted to acknowledge them because they will be affected by some or all of what I have to say today.

I spent a lot of time in California during the Presidential campaign, and I said, if elected, I would come back and that I would remember what I saw and what I learned. This is my sixth trip to California as President, and around those visits many members of my administration have come here. Today,

along with the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Labor, Bob Reich, is also here.

We have tried to work together in what has been an unprecedented effort, coordinated by the Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown, to develop a strategy to revitalize the California economy. We have tried to continue to study what the problems are and what the opportunities are, given the difficulties of the Federal budget. We can't underestimate the problems of this State. Its unemployment rate is about 3 percent above the national average. About 25 percent of the total unemployed people in America are in this State, even though the State only has 12 percent of the Nation's population.

Many of the people who are out of work in California are people who helped to build the economic engine of America, people who worked in high-tech industries, people who worked in defense industries, people with very high levels of skills and major contributions to make to our future.

It is clear to me that the economy of this Nation cannot recover unless the economy of this State recovers. And it is also clear to me that if what we are doing here works, it will really change the nature of what a President's job is, because it is perfectly clear that as we move into the 21st century, the sweeping global economic changes which will affect our country will over time affect one area more than another, inevitably. That has clearly been the case for the last 15 years. So that what we try to do today for California is what we may be doing tomorrow for the New England region, or for the South where I grew up, or for the Midwest. We are going to have to focus on the fact that not every set of economic changes will affect every part of this country equally.

And that is what we have tried to do. Just in the last 7 months, we've worked on getting more infrastructure money to southern California. The biggest infrastructure announcement that has been made so far in this administration was around \$1 billion for a project in the Los Angeles area.

We have worked very hard on trying to change the tax laws in the way that will benefit all of America but will especially benefit

the high-tech industry here: increasing of research and development tax credit; having a capital gains tax for people who invest their money in new businesses, especially in high-tech areas; changing some of the real estate tax rules in ways that will revitalize the incredible depression that California, as well as south Florida and New England have had in their real estate industry. A lot of these things have been targeted to have a significant long-term impact on this State.

I have to say that as hard as we are working, I think that all of you know that these problems did not occur overnight, and they cannot be turned around overnight. And there is no way that there is going to be a single Government spending program that will do it. We should have strategies that target the investment of our Government in ways that are likely to produce other investments and create other jobs and other opportunities.

That's why I am particularly hopeful that the empowerment zone legislation that was adopted by the Congress in the economic program will lead to the selection of one or more sites in California that will prove that we can get private investment capital back into distressed areas in this country, both urban and rural. There is not enough Government money, with the kind of debt we've run up in the last 12 years, to solve all these problems, but they cannot be solved without Government initiative and new and different kinds of partnerships like the ones we're here to announce today. We can't be, in other words, hands off, and we can't do it all on our own.

Let me tell you the things I want to focus on today. And I want to tie them to some things that we've announced in the last week or so that will affect this economy. It's been said that you can't create genius, all you can do is nurture it. Among the many blessings this State has is a scientific and engineering genius and a high-tech infrastructure to support it. Instead of nurturing it for the last several years, we have been denurturing it because you've seen all these defense cuts since 1987 with no offsetting conversion strategy.

When I became President, I found a law on the books that the Congress passed in

1992 with my strong support as a Presidential candidate to allocate \$500 million, finally, 5 years too late, but finally, to defense conversion. Not a penny of it had been spent because of the ideological opposition of the previous administration. We are releasing the money for defense conversion. That's important; it has to be done. We have to find ways for all the people who won the cold war to help to win the aftermath. And we have waited too long to begin.

There is a lot of that genius in California that is being inadequately used today. If nurtured, it will help to bring about not only an economic turnaround for California but for the entire Nation.

Now, that is the background to what leads to the first announcement. Today the Secretary of Energy, Hazel O'Leary, who is here, and my Science Adviser, Jack Gibbons, have given me their recommendation for the site of a major science project known by the deceptively simple name of the B-Factory. It doesn't have anything to do with honey. *[Laughter]* The importance of the B-Factory, however, is literally universal. It may give us critical answers on how the stars, the planets, and the heavens came to be. After much study and serious comparison of all the proposals, the Secretary and Mr. Gibbons have recommended that the B-Factory go to the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center.

There was strong competition for this project by scientists who have worked in this area for literally years, people whose contributions have, and will continue to be, outstanding. The B-Factory is a \$240 million international project to create an electron/positron collider. Can you say that? *[Laughter]* Sounds good—for studying the underpinning of all science, the relationship of matter and antimatter. It will involve hundreds of scientists and build on decades of previous research at the Stanford facility.

In that same spirit of encouraging innovation as a path to prosperity, we are also moving forward with the administration's technology reinvestment project. This is a part of our general effort to convert from a defense to a domestic economy. The program is designed to support defense conversion by taking proposals and providing matching

public funds to private funds from all over America.

When we put out the proposals we had an overwhelming response, over 2,800 projects with about \$8 billion worth of proposed investments. One-quarter of them came from the State of California, the State with one-quarter of the unemployed people in America. An interesting parallel.

Soon we will be announcing the winners of the first round of technology reinvestment proposals for about \$500 million. I'm happy to say that not long ago we reached agreement with the Congress to add to next year's projects another \$300 million, which will mean that next year we'll have even more money for these projects than this year.

The Silicon Valley has been like a cradle for dual-use technology. For example, the Trimble Navigation Company developed a technology used to navigate our tanks in the Gulf war, and now it's adapted to navigate ambulances. This month when we announce the matching grants, you will see that many of the leading contenders are in California, on the merits, companies that need to have the opportunity to move from where we were as an economy to where we have to go.

I'm also pleased to be able to announce today some help for California on another front, an area we must target for further action, urban development. The Department of Housing and Urban Development today is announcing the awarding of grants totaling more than \$100 million to California, here in the bay area and in southern California. About a fifth of the money is aimed for Los Angeles County. These funds will go towards housing subsidies for the working poor, housing for the elderly, the disabled, and for public housing.

This country has not had a housing policy in a dozen years, and that's one reason in the last dozen years we have seen an explosion of homelessness. So this is part of our effort not only to encourage more investment but also to restore the fabric of community in every city in this country. It is part of economic recovery. It's also a part of redefining who we are as a people.

I want to pay a special word of compliment to the HUD Secretary, Henry Cisneros, in his absence here today. We are desperately

trying to find some solutions to the very complex problem of homelessness, and we are also trying to use our Nation's Capital to prove that we can not only find ways to move people off the streets but to move them from the permanent population of the homeless that has grown at such an alarming rate in our Nation over the last few years.

The severity of the economic problems here is very significant, but I hope all of you still believe that it's not as significant as the potential for renewed greatness. We have to help California rebuild in ways that are mental and ways that are physical. Today I've asked Congress, in addition to the things I mentioned above, to provide an additional \$315 million to the Department of Transportation to complete repairs to the Cypress Freeway which was destroyed by the earthquake in 1989. This request clears the way for Congress to allocate money California needs and, in my view, is entitled to, to restore this vital link to the east bay. And it is the kind of thing that we need to be focusing on. You can't rebuild unless you have the materials to rebuild.

Finally, let me say that in trying to help the California economy we've also targeted increasing trade opportunities. When we can no longer count on the cold war to increase high-wage jobs, we know that we can count on increased trade to do it. A significant percentage of the net new jobs coming into the American economy in the last 5 years have come from increasing trade, increasing trade to the Pacific region, increasing trade in Latin America, increasing trade in other parts of the world. That's why I believe we should have a new General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which lowers the tariffs especially that all the advanced countries apply on manufacturing products and why I have fought so hard to persuade the Congress to adopt the North America Free Trade Agreement.

I just had an interesting encounter with my friends at the AFL-CIO, who, as you know, have an opposite position, in which I made the following argument, which I will make again. The objections to NAFTA are basically objections to the system that has existed for the last 12 years, of being able to go down just across the border, set up a plant, have lower wages, lower environmental costs,

export back into America with no tariffs. The question the American people should be asking is, if we adopt this trade agreement, will it make it better or worse? It will plainly make it better.

We will raise environmental and labor costs across the border. We will lower requirements to produce things sold in Mexico in Mexico. We will lower their tariffs, which are 2½ times as high as ours. They are already the second biggest purchasers of American goods. And California will be the biggest beneficiary of increased trade both to the Pacific and to Mexico and to the rest of Latin America, with the possible exception of Texas to the Mexican case. You must be first or second in any economic scenario.

So my argument is we ought to adopt this deal because it will make the problems better than they are, and it will create vast new opportunities. And it also opens the door to expanded trade on similar terms with the whole rest of Latin America, the second fastest growing part of the world, where no one expects investment will lead, to renewed trade back to America and the loss of American jobs. This is a job winner and an economic opportunity for America.

But there are other things we can do as well, and I want to emphasize them if I might. Last week I announced two projects which I think could really help this State. The first is an effort by the automakers and the UAW and all the Government labs to triple the fuel efficiency of American cars by the end of the decade. That could create hundreds of thousands of new environmentally based jobs.

The second is the most sweeping revision of our export control laws in my lifetime. We have swept away limitations on the export of American computers, supercomputers, and telecommunications equipment, comprising 70 percent of all that equipment produced in America, a potential of \$37 billion worth of production now eligible for export all over the world, without increasing the dangers of proliferation. This will have an incredible impact in the State of California. It needed to be done before, but we finally got it done.

Every single high-tech executive with whom I have talked, and we developed this policy in cooperation with a lot of people

from your State, including people in this room today, and every one of them believes this means a huge economic boost for this State, a huge economic boost for our country, and more jobs, the kind of good jobs that we desperately need. Companies like Hewlett-Packard and Sun Microsystems and Silicon Graphics have all said, explicitly, this policy means more jobs for California and, therefore, a better American economy.

So this summarizes where we are. Are we done? No. Have miracles occurred? No. Are we making progress? You bet we are. Is there any precedent for this kind of effort directed toward a single State or a single region? No, but I want this to set a precedent for my Presidency and other Presidents to do the same thing when other regions are troubled. We have got to bring this national economy back. Bringing down the deficit, keeping interest rates low, adopting sensible policies that help everybody, that's important. But we also have to focus on the real problems. Whether they're in California or Florida or New England or the Midwest or the South, we have to do it. And that is what today is all about.

I wish you well with the B-Factory. I want you to fix the roads, but most important, I want you to create new jobs with the economic opportunities we are committed to providing. Thank you. Good luck. And let's keep working.

Thank you. Thank you. You all wait for me, okay? I want to come out and shake hands and meet the children. You all stand right there. But I have to take a couple of questions from the press because of all the events that are unfolding today. So just—you all will get to watch a mini press conference here. We'll do it. Go ahead.

### **Somalia**

**Q.** Mr. President, What more have you learned about American GI's who may have been taken captive in Somalia? Has there been any contact at all with their captors? Are you ensured of their safety? And do the incidents over the past couple of days give just still more ammunition to those in Congress who want to pull U.S. troops out of Somalia?

**The President.** Well, you asked me about four questions. Let me try to answer them.

First, we do have some troops who are missing, a small number. One or more may have been captured. We have issued the sternest possible warning that American troops captured in the course of doing their duty under international law for the United Nations are entitled to be treated with all the respect accorded to such troops under international law, which means not only no physical abuse but adequate medicine, food, housing, and access to personal contact by international inspectors. We are pursuing all of that even as I speak.

We have also issued the sternest warning that if anything happens to them inconsistent with that, the United States, not the United Nations, the United States, will view this matter very gravely and take appropriate action.

Now, let me go on to the second question. I think it has become clear that our forces have been subject to greater risk in the last several weeks by the coincidence of two developments. One is the drawdown of American forces. We used to have nearly 30,000 troops in Somalia. We're now down to 4,000 in part of the agreement we made with the United Nations to terminate our involvement. We have been replaced by the forces of other countries who are, I think, doing their best under the circumstances to man their various positions but are not as able to be part of a coordinated effort to protect our forces that are still the front line of defense of the policy of the United Nations.

The second is I think, ironically, the fact that the U.N. mission largely succeeded in stopping the hunger and the starvation and the death from disease and the total chaos, so that the hospitals and the schools were open and people could sleep in peace at night. And that created a circumstance in which people, forgetting how bad it was before, could be stirred up for some political activity, at least in one part of Mogadishu. So those two things have happened.

What we have done our best to do is to actually enforce the law against people who committed murder and try to continue our timetable to withdraw and get other forces in without doing anything that would let the

country revert to the system of anarchy and chaos that existed before we got there.

I have no reason to believe that a majority of the Somalis really want to go back to the way it was. In fact, all the evidence we have is just to the contrary. So I can't give you any other answer than that today. I do not want to do anything which would imperil the fundamental success of one of the most successful humanitarian missions we've seen in a long time.

All I have done today is to, first of all, authorize the replacement of those people who are entitled to come home, who have done more than their fair share of the Somali peacekeeping, and to authorize a few more troops with armored capacity so that we can do a better job of protecting the people who are there while they're there as long as they are there. That is very important to me. I am not satisfied that we are doing everything we can to protect the young Americans that are putting their lives on the line so that hundreds of thousands, literally hundreds of thousands Somalis can stay alive who would not otherwise be alive, as part of the U.N. mission.

I will have more to say about this in the next few days. I am going, as soon as I leave here, immediately to Los Angeles, where I will spend a few more hours working on this during the day. And then tomorrow when I get back to Washington, we're going to spend several more hours on it. So I will have more to say about this in the next 48 hours, but I think that's all I should say at this time.

### **Russia**

**Q.** Mr. President, on Russia, can you tell us, given that fact the President Yeltsin had to use force to put this down, are you concerned that you may have embraced him a little more tightly than you wished?

**The President.** Absolutely not. Absolutely not. What choice did he have? The truth is he bent over backwards to avoid using force, and as a result, as the only person who has ever been elected to anything by all the people of Russia, he and his forces were abused very badly. And if you look at what happened, they broke through a police line that was not as well armed as the opponents and not as willing to use force as the opponents, and

things got out of hand. And I don't see that he had any choice once the circumstances deteriorated to the point that they did.

The government did not start the rioting or the shooting or the violence. If such a thing happened in the United States, you would expect me to take tough action against it, as the only person who has been elected by the people of this country. And he did that. As long as he goes forward with a new constitution, genuinely democratic elections for the Parliament, genuinely democratic elections for the President, then he is doing what he said he would do. I am still convinced the United States did the right thing.

**Q.** Well, if you dismissed the Congress, as Yeltsin did, I think it would be a quite different situation in the United States, even though it's a different kind of Congress and a different kind of law. The question I have, Mr. President, is Senator Sam Nunn yesterday on television said that the United States and the IMF may have been partly responsible for the economic situation developing in Russia, that is, the privatization may create unemployment 20 to 30 percent if the shock treatment of the—[inaudible]—government is opposed by the Russian people. And what I wanted to know from you is what is the economic solution which is driving people in Russia to feel that their problems are not being resolved by the introduction of the market economy?

**The President.** Well, the United States—all Sam Nunn said was what we've said several times, which is we don't always agree that the IMF's policies are good for a country like Russia. That's been the United States position. We pushed IMF quite vigorously about it.

But all of these old command and control economies are having trouble making the transition. Even East Germany, that had the phenomenal good fortune to be integrated with the German economy and to get literally untold billions of dollars not available to Russia, not available to Poland, not available to Hungary, not available to any of these countries, is having difficulty. And they're going to have to sort through exactly how they want to do it and what they want to do. Meanwhile, we're doing what we can to support programs and policies that will reduce unem-

ployment in Russia, not increase it, and that will give us the opportunity to help them develop their resources in ways that will put people to work.

But what Senator Nunn said about the IMF is no more than I have said on several occasions. We don't tell these people exactly what they should do or how they should do it. And we don't think the IMF is always right in trying to apply very strict standards to them that they may make their economic problems worse.

But, after all, there is no real precedent for this. We've got all these ex-Communist countries that are doing their best trying to make it as democracies and trying to develop some sort of modified market economy, and we're going to do our best to help them. And I think it's still a whole lot better and the world's a whole lot better off today that we're worrying about this problem instead of whether the Soviet Union will drop a nuclear weapon somewhere or cause some international crisis somewhere.

After all, there are always problems in the world and there will be as long as we are on this planet. I'd rather have this set of problems than the problems we might have had if the Berlin Wall hadn't fallen.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:55 p.m. at the San Francisco Hilton.

### **Statement on Rebuilding the Cypress Freeway in California**

*October 4, 1993*

Most Americans will never forget the picture of the Cypress Freeway collapsed upon itself after the Loma Prieta earthquake. As repairs continue, I want the people of California to know that we will be there to get the job done. Communities around our Nation have always been able to count on the Federal Government to assume the cost of repairing Federal-aid highways hit by natural disasters. That is a commitment that we are helping to fulfill today.

NOTE: The President's statement was included in a White House statement announcing the President's request to Congress for funds to rebuild the Cypress Freeway.

**Proclamation 6602—Child Health Day, 1993**

*October 4, 1993*

*By the President of the United States of America*

**A Proclamation**

Our children are our future. Therefore, making sure that our children are healthy must be a national concern. For 65 years, Presidents of the United States have proclaimed one day every year as "Child Health Day," a time to focus on the health and well-being of our Nation's children.

Over the years, we have recognized again and again that it is better to try to guarantee the health of our children than to attempt to restore their health once it has been jeopardized. A healthy childhood charts a path for a healthy adult life. Prevention is, therefore, primary. Through preventive measures, we help children avoid the pain and suffering of disease and disability; we stop unnecessary spending; and we decrease the number of childhood deaths.

We possess the ability to prevent many childhood diseases and injuries, and we must use this ability. Every child needs access to primary health care. The necessary immunizations against nine different contagious diseases must be given to children at the recommended ages. Injuries, the greatest threat to our children's well-being, can be reduced by introducing into our daily routines various safety measures. For example, the use of car seats, seat belts, and bicycle helmets helps to guard against hazards to which children are especially vulnerable. There are dangers in the home, as well, such as careless storage of poisons and unlocked staircase gates. Paying attention to our children and to potential risks to their safety can help to safeguard them in our homes.

We can prevent our children from making unhealthy choices, both by the rules we set for them and by the rules we follow our-

selves. Many of the behaviors that will affect their health—choices about what to eat; the dangers of smoking, drinking, using illegal drugs, or irresponsible sexual behavior; how to handle their feelings and the pressure of their peers—will be learned from the models they see around them. We have an opportunity, as well as a responsibility, to shape the future for our children. In our personal lives, that responsibility extends to those whose lives we touch in our families and in our communities.

The Congress, by joint resolution approved May 18, 1928, as amended (36 U.S.C. 143), has called for the designation of the first Monday in October as "Child Health Day" and has requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this day.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Monday, October 4, 1993, as Child Health Day. On that day and every day throughout the year, I urge all Americans to renew their commitment to protecting and developing our most valuable asset—our children.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this fourth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:44 a.m., October 5, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 7.

**Memorandum on the Freedom of Information Act**

*October 4, 1993*

*Memorandum for Heads of Departments and Agencies*

*Subject: The Freedom of Information Act*

I am writing to call your attention to a subject that is of great importance to the American public and to all Federal departments

and agencies—the administration of the Freedom of Information Act, as amended (the “Act”). The Act is a vital part of the participatory system of government. I am committed to enhancing its effectiveness in my Administration.

For more than a quarter century now, the Freedom of Information Act has played a unique role in strengthening our democratic form of government. The statute was enacted based upon the fundamental principle that an informed citizenry is essential to the democratic process and that the more the American people know about their government the better they will be governed. Openness in government is essential to accountability and the Act has become an integral part of that process.

The Freedom of Information Act, moreover, has been one of the primary means by which members of the public inform themselves about their government. As Vice President Gore made clear in the National Performance Review, the American people are the Federal Government’s customers. Federal departments and agencies should handle requests for information in a customer-friendly manner. The use of the Act by ordinary citizens is not complicated, nor should it be. The existence of unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles has no place in its implementation.

I therefore call upon all Federal departments and agencies to renew their commitment to the Freedom of Information Act, to its underlying principles of government openness, and to its sound administration. This is an appropriate time for all agencies to take a fresh look at their administration of the Act, to reduce backlogs of Freedom of Information Act requests, and to conform agency practice to the new litigation guidance issued by the Attorney General, which is attached.

Further, I remind agencies that our commitment to openness requires more than merely responding to requests from the public. Each agency has a responsibility to distribute information on its own initiative, and to enhance public access through the use of electronic information systems. Taking these

steps will ensure compliance with both the letter and spirit of the Act.

**William J. Clinton**

### **Message to the Congress on Whaling Activities of Norway**

*October 4, 1993*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

On August 5, 1993, the Secretary of Commerce certified that Norway’s resumption of commercial harvesting of minke whales has diminished the effectiveness of the International Whaling Commission (IWC). The IWC acted to continue the moratorium on all commercial whaling at its most recent meeting last spring. Despite this action, Norway has recommenced commercial whaling of the Northeastern Atlantic minke, noting that it has lodged an objection to the moratorium. This letter constitutes my report to the Congress pursuant to section 8(b) of the Fishermen’s Protective Act of 1967, as amended (Pelly Amendment) (22 U.S.C. 1978(a)).

The United States is deeply opposed to commercial whaling: the United States does not engage in commercial whaling, and the United States does not allow the import of whale meat or whale products. While some native Alaskans engage in narrowly circumscribed subsistence whaling, this is approved by the IWC through a quota for “aboriginal whaling.” The United States also firmly supports the proposed whale sanctuary in the Antarctic.

The United States has an equally strong commitment to science-based international solutions to global conservation problems. The United States recognizes that not every country agrees with our position against commercial whaling. The issue at hand is the absence of a credible, agreed management and monitoring regime that would ensure that commercial whaling is kept within a science-based limit.

I believe that Norway’s action is serious enough to justify sanctions as authorized by the Pelly Amendment. Therefore, I have directed that a list of potential sanctions, in-

cluding a list of Norwegian seafood products that could be the subject of import prohibitions, be developed. Because the primary interest of the United States in this matter is protecting the integrity of the IWC and its conservation regime, I believe our objectives can best be achieved by delaying the implementation of sanctions until we have exhausted all good faith efforts to persuade Norway to follow agreed conservation measures. It is my sincere hope that Norway will agree to and comply with such measures so that sanctions become unnecessary.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
October 4, 1993.

### **Statement Announcing the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe**

*October 4, 1993*

I am pleased to announce that I have nominated and NATO has appointed Gen. George A. Joulwan, U.S. Army, to succeed Gen. John Shalikashvili as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe. I also intend to send forward to Congress General Joulwan's nomination to serve as commander in chief, U.S. European Command.

General Joulwan has had a long and highly distinguished career spanning more than three decades, with Europe as the centerpiece of his service. He has served for 14 years in Europe, beginning as a platoon commander and rising to Commanding General of the V Corps, U.S. Army Europe and 7th Army. In these postings, as well as in his current role as commander in chief of the U.S. Southern Command, Panama, he has demonstrated both the military expertise and political acumen needed to fill one of our most sensitive security postings. He has also displayed superb talents as a manager of resources and personnel and is known throughout the military as a "soldier's soldier."

General Joulwan assumes the post of Supreme Allied Commander at an important time of change for Europe and for NATO as we seek to adapt the role of NATO to the needs of post-cold-war mutual security. I will look to General Joulwan to continue

the outstanding work of General Shalikashvili as SACEUR faces up to the challenge of helping guide NATO through this important period of transition. I have the utmost trust and confidence in his ability to do so.

### **Nomination of Three Defense Department Officials**

*October 4, 1993*

The President announced his intention today to nominate public health expert Stephen C. Joseph to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs; former Pentagon official Richard Danzig to be Under Secretary of the Navy; and economic policy specialist Joshua Gotbaum to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Economic Security.

"The people who we are adding to our Pentagon team today are recognized experts in their fields and dedicated public servants," said President Clinton. "I welcome their service at the Department of Defense."

NOTE: The President also announced the appointment of 18 people to senior Defense Department posts not requiring confirmation by the Senate. They are:

Cliff Bernath, Deputy Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Operations;

Joel Resnick, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Reserve Affairs/Strategic Plans and Analysis;

Helen Forbeck, Senior Professional, Defense Reinvestment Assistance Task Force;

John Rogers, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs/Plans & Operations;

Mark Wagner, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Economic Security;

John Goodman, Special Adviser for Defense Conversion and Technology;

Sheila Cheston, Deputy General Counsel of the Air Force;

Dr. Larry Caviaiola, Deputy Under Secretary/Acquisition Operations;

Audrey Sheppard, Chief of Protocol;

Steven Preston, Deputy General Counsel;

Sheila Helm, Special Assistant to the Secretary/Personnel;

Dr. Kenneth Flamm, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Acquisition (Dual Use Technology and International Programs);

Joseph Berger, Director, Peacekeeping/Peace Enforcement/Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy (Democracy and Peacekeeping);

Robert Bayer, Deputy Assistant Secretary/Economic Reinvestment and Base Realignment and Closure;

Carolyn Becraft, Deputy Assistant Secretary/Personnel & Readiness (Personnel Support, Families & Education);

Mary Ellen Harvey, Assistant Deputy Under Secretary/Logistics Systems Development;

Roy Willis, Principal Assistant Deputy Under Secretary/Logistics;

Amy Hickox, Director of Outreach America/Office of the Assistant Secretary (Reserve Affairs);

Biographies of the nominees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

### **Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With the AARP on Health Care in Culver City, California**

*October 5, 1993*

**The President.** Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you all for coming today. I want to thank Judy Brown and the other board members of the AARP up here and the AARP nationwide for their wonderful cooperation and work with the First Lady and our health care effort over the last several months.

There is no organization in America that better represents the needs and desires of older Americans than the AARP. I've been working with them for nearly 20 years now, and it won't be long until I'll be old enough to be a member. [*Laughter*] So I have a vested interest in your lobbying on the health care plan.

I want to thank especially Mayor Mike Balkman and the people here in Culver City for their warm welcome to all of us today. I thank the Mayor. I'd also like to say a special word of thanks to your Representative in the United States Congress who's here with me, and a great Congressman, and a great ally in this fight for health care security, Congressman Julian Dixon. Congressman.

There are some people here from Congressman Waxman's district. I told him yesterday that since he had a longtime standing interest in health care I would mention today that the reason he's not here is that he's back in Washington having the next hearing on health care. So he took a redeye back last night to do the work that we have to do.

Ladies and gentlemen, as all of you know by now, we have launched a major national debate on health care, with a proposal designed to achieve a disarmingly simple but exceedingly complicated task: to provide health security for all Americans, health care that can never be taken away, that's always there, for the first time in our history and to do it by trying to fix what is wrong with our system while keeping and indeed enhancing what is right with our system.

The first and foremost thing is we have to have more health care security. There is an article today on the front page of many of the papers of the United States saying that last year there were more Americans living in poverty than at any time since 1962; that 37.4 million Americans have no health insurance; about 2 million Americans a month lose it, about 100,000 of them permanently because the system we have is coming unraveled. It is the most expensive system in the world and yet the only advanced nation which doesn't provide basic coverage to all Americans.

We have gotten 700,000 letters to date, and we're getting about 10,000 more every week at the White House from people describing their personal experience and frustrations in problems with America's health care system, not only American health care consumers from parents with sick children to senior citizens who can't afford their medicine but also from doctors and nurses who can't do what they hired out to do, keep people well and treat them when they're sick, from all the bureaucracy and paperwork that's in our system.

I have personally met many older Americans who are literally choosing every month between buying food and buying medicine. And I know that many of these people are actually, in the end, adding to the cost of the health care system because eventually they wind up having to get expensive hospital

care for lack of proper medication in managing whatever health condition they have.

We received a letter and then I had a chance to meet a man named Jim Heffernan from Venice, Florida, who came to the Rose Garden a couple of weeks ago. He volunteers at a local hospice trying to help people understand the tangle of forms they have to fill out just in order to get the health care they're entitled to. And he wrote the following thing to me: "I can recall one patient who was in tears and shaking because the hospital in her hometown had placed the balance of her medical charges in the hands of a collection agency and wrote that she might be sent to jail for failure to pay her hospital bill. This kind of senseless action on an elderly, terminal widow is unforgivable."

Stories like this need to be told over and over again in the halls of the Nation's Capitol until, finally, we get action. Our plan will improve what is great about our health care system: the quality of our doctors and nurses; the depth of our research and our technological advance. Those things will not be interrupted. We will strengthen them. This plan has a lot of aspects which actually strengthen the quality of the American health care system, strengthen the stream of funds going to medical research to deal with the whole range of problems that now confront us, everything from AIDS to Alzheimer's to various kinds of cancer.

We are committed to keeping what is best about this system. Indeed, more and more doctors and nurses who have had a chance to study this system say that we'll have more quality, because they'll have more time to practice their professions, they'll be able to spend less time filling out forms and hassling insurance companies.

I also want to say one thing—[applause]—there's one frustrated doctor starting the applause out there. [Laughter] There's also one thing I want to say over and over again to the AARP membership of this Nation, and that is that our plan maintains the Medicare program. It will protect your freedom to choose your doctors.

Let's face it, Medicare is one thing the Government has gotten right, it has worked. And its own administrative costs for the Government are pretty modest. There are a lot

of problems with Medicare in terms of how doctors and hospitals and others have to deal with it, in light of the complexities of the health care system as a whole. But I think, on balance, the plan works well.

However, if you don't like some parts of your Medicare program today, I can say this: This plan will increase your options. It will give you a chance to pick from any of the health plans offered where you live, some of which may offer plans that are more comprehensive and less expensive than what you receive today.

Second, this health care security plan will give you the help you deserve in paying for prescription drugs. This plan, for the first time, will make people, on Medicare who are not poor enough to be on Medicaid, eligible for help with their prescription drugs. It also will cover prescription drug benefits for working families. We believe this is important, and if coupled with a reasonable effort to hold prices down and to stop practices that we have in America today, where some, not experimental drugs, but well-established drugs made in America cost 3 times as much in America as they do in Europe, that needs to be changed. If we can change that we can afford this benefit and still do what needs to be done.

The third thing that I want to emphasize is that this plan greatly expands your options for finding long-term care services in the home, in the community, in the hospital, not simply in a nursing home. We're not going to be able to do all of this at once. We have to work in the system and make sure we have the funding before we undertake programs we can't pay for. And so we phase in the long-term care benefit between 1996 and the year 2000, and we start the drug benefit right away.

But in the end, we have to have a comprehensive set of long-term care services. And again I will say, if we do it right it will save money. It is ridiculous for the only kind of long-term care to be reimbursed by the Government, that which is most expensive and which pushes people toward institutional care at a time when the fastest growing group of Americans are people over 80 and more and more people are more active longer. I think here in California there's probably as

much support for an active independent approach to long-term care as anywhere in the United States. And I want you to stay after it, and make sure we maintain the commitment to long-term care and to choice in long-term care.

Let me make one last comment that I think is very important. This program also provides for coverage for early retirees. A lot of AARP members are people between the ages of 55 and 65 who have retired early and who don't have access to adequate health care now. Under our program, those people with incomes will have to pay up to 20 percent of their coverage, just like they would if they were in the workplace and uncovered, but at least they will have access to comprehensive services, with 80 percent contributions by the Federal Government. I hope that you will all support that.

Let me say, finally, that we are interested in passing a program that meets the basic criteria that I laid down in my address to Congress. I have searched this country, and the hundreds of people working with us who searched this country for better ideas: How can we continue to simplify this plan? How can we make it even easier to administer? But we must meet certain basic principles. The first one is security. We owe it to the American people, finally, to say that America will join the ranks of the other advanced nations and give every American health care that's always there, that can't be taken away.

We have to simplify this system in order to pay for it. You live in the only country in the world that's spending at least 10 cents on the dollar—now that's a dime on a \$900 billion health care bill—on every dollar, that's \$90 billion a year being spent on paperwork that no other country finds it necessary to have: Hospitals hiring clerical workers at 4 times the rate of direct health care providers; doctors seeing their income from the money that comes into the clinic go from 75 percent of what comes in down to 52 percent in 10 years, the rest of it being taken away in a vast wash of paperwork and unnecessary bureaucracy. I tell you we can do better than that. And we have to do it.

We have to maintain quality. I've already addressed that. We have to maintain choice of physicians and other health care providers.

I have addressed that. We will have to ask every American to be more responsible. And those that have no health insurance today, who aren't paying anything into the system, but who can afford to pay, should be asked to pay because the rest of you are paying for those.

There are people who say—and I want to emphasize this—people say, this will be terrible for small business. Folks, most small business people have health insurance. And I met a small business man yesterday in San Francisco with 12 employees whose premiums went up 40 percent this year, and he had no claims. Now, I'm worried about those small business people. They're going to go broke or have to dump their employees and make the situation worse. Those people are trying to do their part by asking everyone to do something in giving discounts to small businesses with low-wage workers, we stop the sort of irresponsible shifting of costs onto the rest of you. We also stop the practice of people getting health care when it's too late, too expensive, and when things don't work right and shift back to preventive and primary care services so people can stay well, instead of just being cared for when they get sick.

Finally, let me say this: We have to achieve some savings, and that's been one of the most controversial parts of this proposal. People say, "Oh, you can't get any savings out of Medicare and Medicaid." I hope we can talk more about this, but let me just tell you how this program is paid for. Two-thirds of the cost of this program will be paid for by contributions from employers and employees who pay nothing to this system today but still get to use it when they get sick, two-thirds of it. One-sixth of the money will come from a tax on tobacco and from asking big companies that will still have the right to self-insure, because many of them have their costs under control and have adequate benefits, they'll be able to continue to do that, but they will be asked, since their costs will go down, too, to pay a modest fee to pay for medical research and technology and to keep the public health clinics of this country open to do the work that they will have to do. And then one-sixth of it will come from what we call savings.

But I want you to understand what's happening. Today, Medicaid and Medicare are going up at 3 times the rate of inflation. We propose to let it go up at 2 times the rate of inflation. That is not a Medicare or Medicaid cut. And we have kept private sector increases so that they won't go up as much. So only in Washington do people believe that no one can get by on twice the rate of inflation. So when you hear all this business about cuts, let me caution you that that is not what is going on. We are going to have increases in Medicare and Medicaid, and a reduction in the rate of growth will be more than overtaken by the new investments we're going to make in drugs and long-term care. We think it's a good system. We hope you'll support it.

Let me just acknowledge two other people I just saw in the audience I didn't know were here. First, Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard. Thank you for being here. Are there any other Members of the California Congressional Delegation here? Congressman Martinez, stand up there. It's good to see you. I'm sorry. And I want to thank your insurance commissioner, John Garamendi, for all of the work he did to try to show us what's been done in California that we put into our plan.

Thank you very much.

*[At this point, Ms. Brown thanked the President and introduced the chair of the Health Care Committee of AARP's National Legislative Council, Anne Jackson. Ms. Jackson then discussed the health care proposal that AARP submitted to the President for review and invited participants to ask questions.]*

**Q.** *[Inaudible]*

**The President.** He said much of the program is funded with cuts in Medicare; do I really think it won't affect the recipients? Absolutely.

Let me just tell you. We just adopted a budget in Washington which cuts defense deeply, just as much as we can, and we shouldn't do a dollar more. But we have cut it dramatically. And that's one of the reasons the California unemployment rate is up, right, because defense has been cut since 1987. But there's a limit to how much it can be cut. It's cut, absolutely. It freezes all do-

mestic discretionary spending. That is, if I want to put more money into defense conversion in California, or Head Start, or public health clinics, the Congress and the Members here will tell you, they have to find for the next 5 years a dollar in cuts somewhere else for every dollar we want to spend in some new program.

The only thing we're increasing, except for the cost of living in retirement programs, is Medicare and Medicaid. Everything else is declining or frozen. And Medicare and Medicaid, under this budget that they just adopted, with an inflation rate of under 4 percent, Medicaid is projected to grow at between 16 percent and 11 percent a year, and Medicare at between 11 percent and 9 percent a year. In other words, over the next 5 year period, both will grow at more than 3 times the rate of inflation. What we propose to do is to let them grow at twice the rate of inflation, too. I think we can live with twice the rate of inflation. Yes, I do. Why? Because the rate of reimbursement increases to doctors and hospitals need not go up so fast in Medicare, because we're going to close the gap between Medicare in the private sector and what doctors and hospitals get. And they will actually save money because we're going to dramatically cut their administrative costs. So they will be getting a raise through reduced administrative expenses that they won't have to get through greater outlays of taxpayer money. And we're going to turn right around and invest that money and more into the drug benefit in the long-term care.

I don't know anybody who has really looked at this thing closely who doesn't think we can get it. Now, there may be people who try to stop us from getting it, but if we can't get a Government health care program down to the point where it can run on twice the rate of inflation, we're in deep trouble. I believe we can, and the program explicitly provides that none of the benefits can be cut.

**Ms. Brown.** The issue of prescription drugs will be led by Jo Barbano, who is the national chair of the AARP Legislative Council.

[Ms. Barbano asked what the rate of inflation on prescription drug prices would be without health care reform.]

**The President.** Without it?

**Ms. Barbano.** Without it. Are there any questions out in the audience?

**The President.** On the drug issue. We want specifically questions on—

**Ms. Barbano.** On prescription drugs.

[A participant asked if the new health care plan would control the rising cost of prescription drugs.]

**The President.** Yes. We have sought and received assurances from many of the drug companies that for nonexperimental or nonnewly developed drugs, which do—it costs a fortune to develop a new drug and bring it to market. And we all know they have to be priced at very high levels early on.

The thing that has bothered me is that other countries have cost controls on their drugs, and so we have companies from America selling drugs made in America in other countries with incomes as high as our elderly people have, for prices one-third of what they're charging Americans. It's just not right. So we're trying to work through that. But a number of the drug companies, to be fair to them, have come forward and said, while you're implementing this program, we'll keep our cost increases to inflation. Then, when we get into the program, the drug services, like every other part of it, will be subject to significant pressures to stay within the rate of inflation or pretty close to it. But what the drug companies will get out of this program, they'll win big, because they will have people able to purchase drugs who never were able to do it before.

So what they give up on the rate of increase they will make back in the volume of sales, if you see what I mean. So they're not going to lose on this deal, they're just going to have to stop increasing the same drugs more and stop charging people so much more for the same health care, but they'll be able to increase their volume.

I saw one person being critical of our health care program the other night on one of these C-SPAN forums that I watched. And he said, "Well," he said, "you know in Germany, the President's always talking

about Germany, and they only spend 8.8 percent of their income on health care, and we spend 14.5 percent, but they rely so much more on medicine." Yes, they do, as a result of which they don't have to go to the hospital as much.

So the way our system will work, let me just briefly say, is that the drug benefit itself for elderly people will have a \$250 deductible and a co-pay, but no matter how serious the drug needs are, no one can be required to pay more than \$1,000 a year. And obviously, income needs will be taken into account. But we will also have the same benefit for people under 65 as for people over 65. To get the drug benefit, the Part B premium will go up modestly, but it will really help to provide that service to people.

I think it's going to make a huge difference in the quality of life to millions of elderly people. And I think it's going to reduce their need for more extensive care by giving them a maintenance schedule with the most modern medicines. And it will be good for the drug company. It will be a good swap for them to let their regular prices go up less but to be able to sell more.

**Q.** You were asking for information and those 25,000 older Americans that I just visited and were asking me these questions gave me a report to give to you today. Could I give that to your staff?

**The President.** Absolutely.

**Q.** Thank you.

**Ms. Brown.** Thank you very much. Now we're going to talk about long-term care, which is something that is near and dear to our heart, Mr. President. We've asked Mildred McCauley, a member of our national board of directors, to discuss that with you.

[Ms. McCauley discussed the high cost of care in nursing homes. A participant then asked the President about his commitment to increase funding for the prevention and treatment of Alzheimer's disease and if home and community-based long-term care will be covered in the new plan.]

**The President.** Yes. Let me first say what was said here is absolutely right. As all of you know who have ever had a family member affected by this, if you're older and you

go to a hospital, you can get care covered by your policies or by Medicare. If you go to a nursing home, you basically have to spend yourself into abject poverty to get any benefits. And as a result of that, we've got a lot of folks in this country who are in trouble.

Also, the least expensive and best way to care for people might be in some community-based setting or at home, and there are relatively limited coverages available for long-term care services. And Alzheimer's is a particular example of this because a lot of people want to care for their loved ones at home, or want them to be able to stay at home for as long as possible, but can't get any help in that regard. I'll come back to the research issue in a moment.

The way this program will work, the long-term care program, is that we will permit home and community-based care to be reimbursed just like nursing home care number one. Number two, the programs will not be means-tested. That is, if people have the ability to pay something, they'll be asked to pay, but they won't be cut out of the program because their income is above a certain amount. So that solves the whole Medicare-Medicaid differential issue. Number three, in order to be eligible for Medicaid nursing home care today you have to have—there's a spend down limit of \$2,000. You can only have \$2,000 in assets to be eligible for 100 percent coverage under Medicaid. We're going to raise that to \$12,000. And people who are in Medicaid funding in nursing homes—funded nursing homes—only get \$30 a month in spending money, \$30 a month. In 1977, when I entered public life and because an advocate for people in nursing homes, they got \$25 a month. You can imagine—so in other words, in effect, people are getting less than half as much as they did per month in 1977. We propose to raise that to \$100 which will take it back about to its 1972 levels.

So I think these things will work if we also provide better regulation and some tax preference for private long-term care insurance to supplement whatever people want or get from our Government program. But this long-term care issue is a very big issue. Keep in mind, again, elderly people are the fastest

growing group of our population. Most people will prefer not to be in an institutional setting if they can be cared for at home or in a community setting.

And again, I will say to you, this is another example where sometimes we strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. Yes, it will cost more money to start this program, but over the long run, 20 years from now our health care system in the aggregate will be cheaper because we provide a wider range of care options and we don't shove everybody into the most expensive option to get any help at all. So that's how that will work.

Now, on the Alzheimer's question in particular, the way this system of funding works, we are going to develop a stream of funding that will increase our investment in medical research of all kinds, including research in the care and treatment of Alzheimer's. So you'll get more medical research. I will say again, we have been driven here not to mess up what is right with American medicine and American health care, we want to enhance what is right and only focus on what is wrong in trying to deal with it.

**Q.** Thank you for that response, Mr. President. I'm sure that you recognize that the issue of long-term care is one that is so very, very important to us and that we will be reminding you about it. You can be sure of that.

**The President.** You don't have to remind me, you've got to remind Congress. Because there will be people who say, well, now, wait a minute. And that's why I really thank the three Members from California who are here today. They're going to have some tough decisions to make. You know, there will be a lot of people who won't want to go through some of these changes that we're recommending, and there will be a lot of people who say, well, let's just play it safe and take the—we know the least expensive course. There will be those who say, let's take these reductions in Medicare and Medicaid increases, these savings from projected increases, and put them into paying for the regular package that the President has proposed, and think about long-term care and medicine some other day.

So we need you guys to show up and be heard in the Capitol to support the Members

of Congress who want to see this as a critical element of the ultimate resolution of our health care crisis.

**Ms. Brown.** You can be sure that we will do that, every opportunity we get.

I've now asked Marie Smith, who is the chair of the economics committee of the national legislative council to lead the discussion on cost containment.

[*Ms. Smith addressed the issue of cost containment. A participant then asked the President which provisions were being put into the health care plan to prevent the cost of health care from rising.*]

**The President.** Thank you. First of all, as all of you know, we have runaway costs now, both in the system as a whole and for individuals who are paying into it. To keep down individual cost increases as well as systematic cost increases, we seek to do three things that we've factored in. There are a lot of things we are doing, I want to try to emphasize this; we think we'll get more cost containment than we have budgeted for, and I want to explain why.

Number one, if you simplify the system so that essentially every patient, every doctor, every insurer is dealing with a single uniform form, one for each category of people in the system, you will drastically cut the administrative cost of this health care system. We were at the Children's Hospital in Washington the other day; one hospital in one city in America estimates that they spend \$2 million a year and enough time for their doctors to see another 10,000 children a year on paperwork that has nothing to do with the care of the kids or keeping up with their records necessary to monitor the care of the kids. That's the first thing.

Number two, if you cover everybody and require everybody to make some contribution to the system, that will stop a lot of the cost shifting. Keep in mind, a lot of your costs keep going up every year more and more and more because you are paying into the system, either through Medicare or through private insurance, and you pay for everybody else because the hospitals shift their uncompensated care bills to you or to insurance companies who turn around and raise the price or the Government who comes around and

raises the price. So through simple administrative simplification and stopping cost shifting, you're going to have some savings.

Number three, as a backup, we also propose a cap, a limit on how much the cost of the system can increase in any given year, moving down towards inflation plus population growth over a period of years. But still, I will tell you, that we still believe—this budget is very modest. We still project over the next 5—between now and the year 2000, the American health care system will go from spending 14.5 percent of our income on health care to about 18 percent, picking up the drugs and the long-term care. If we don't do anything, we'll have no drugs, no long-term care, and be spending over 19 percent of our income on health care.

But those are very modest. Now, that means that we are calculating no savings from putting all the people in the country in these large buyer groups so that they can compete for lower prices. Look what happened to the California public employees plan. Look how little their inflation was this year. The Mayo Clinic managed care plan—most people believe Mayo Clinic provides pretty good health care—you know what their inflation was this year? 3.9 percent, and their prices before they started were lower than the national average.

We don't calculate any of those savings in our budget, the things that will come from better organizing and delivering health care and giving consumer groups the right to bargain to keep their prices lower. We have an initiative to eliminate fraud and abuse, which is significant in this system. We calculate none of those savings into our budget.

So we believe we will easily make the budget because a lot of the things we're going to do that will save money we don't even try to claim credit for to try to bend over backward to be realistic. So I think we'll get there. But you're right, you've got to have cost control.

Let me just say one other thing. There's one other thing we need to help the AARP on. There are a lot of people in the Congress who say that limitations on the rate of increases amount to some sort of price controls, and we shouldn't have them. But look

what we've had so far. If you have a third-party pay system, where the people who are working the system can get a check every time they send a bill, there are no normal market forces. You have to have some sort of discipline on the system. Now, I know the AARP favors that. And again, I want you to help us get that when this bill goes to the Congress. We believe we will more than meet the cap that we've set. We don't think we can ever necessarily even meet that cap, but we better have it in the law so people will have to know they're going to have to manage their business better, they can't keep breaking the bank.

**Ms. Brown.** Well, Mr. President, the time has passed so quickly. I believe it's now time, if you have some closing remarks.

**The President.** Let me say, first of all, I think when I leave, Mr. Magaziner is going to come up here. Ira Magaziner who has been the sort of leading light of our health care efforts in the First Lady's group on health care and who knows the answers to questions you haven't even thought of yet—at least questions I haven't thought of yet—is going to come up here and spend up to another hour answering any questions you have about the specifics of our plan. So I hope that those of you here who are interested will stay and continue to ask questions. He and some others who have come all the way to California with me, who are working in our health care effort, are going to stay. So we want to encourage all Americans to ask questions and to give us our ideas—their ideas. We don't pretend to have all the answers.

I just want to make two points in closing. Number one, I am not interested in having this become a partisan, political issue. I am profoundly grateful to the distinguished Republican Senator from Vermont, Jim Jeffords, for announcing that he intends to be a cosponsor of our initiative. That's the kind of thing we need more of, working together.

Number two, we've got to keep working on making this better, the evidence of other countries is, but you have to keep working every year. But that's why we've built this in a phased-in fashion, so that the more we learn, the more we can make adjustments and the more we can make improvements.

The point I want to make, the two of you have already made out here in these questions, is if we do nothing, it will be more costly and less satisfactory than if we take steps. And finally, let me say, we have to overcome the disbelief in America. A lot of folks don't think we can do this, but that's what they said when Social Security came in. People said we couldn't do it, but we did it.

I hold this health security card up all the time, but you just think, if everybody had a Social Security card and a health security card, what a better country this would be and how much better life would be for all the American people.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:50 a.m. at Dr. Paul Carlson Memorial Park. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

### **Proclamation 6603—Mental Illness Awareness Week, 1993**

*October 5, 1993*

*By the President of the United States of America*

#### **A Proclamation**

Almost 50 million Americans have serious emotional disorders or illnesses. The economic and human costs of these disorders are staggering. Treatment expenses and lost productivity cost the United States over one hundred billion dollars a year. The pain and suffering caused by mental illness are immeasurable for the individuals afflicted and their families.

The consequences of untreated mental illnesses and emotional disturbances are clear. Suicide is 30 times more common among people who are clinically depressed than among the general population. Persons with mental illness often live in poverty and are at risk for homelessness and disease. The mentally ill may find themselves in jail or prison, not for any criminal act, but rather because no other facilities are available to respond to psychiatric emergencies.

Research has led to major advances, not only in the development of treatments for mental illnesses, but also in the understanding of the needs of the individuals who live with mental illnesses. With appropriate care and support, many people who have these disorders can live productive and fulfilling lives. Unfortunately, less than one-third of all individuals in need of mental health services actually receive appropriate care. Children, probably the most vulnerable among the mentally ill population, are the least likely to receive care, with less than one-fifth of those in need of services receiving them. The barriers to effective treatment are numerous. Individuals may be unaware that treatment can help them or may be hesitant to seek help for fear of discrimination or ridicule. In many instances, individuals actually lack access to appropriate services. We must work to remove the stigma of mental illness and to educate the public about the availability and effectiveness of mental health treatment.

The Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS), a component of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration in the Department of Health and Human Services, was created in 1992 to provide vigorous Federal leadership in the development and delivery of mental health services. CMHS plays a unique role in working with other Federal agencies and departments whose programs and policies affect the lives of the mentally ill, their families, and their communities. CMHS also works closely with State and local governments and the private sector to guarantee continuity, integration of services, and access to comprehensive systems of care. CMHS supports policy studies, evaluations, and assessments on service delivery issues that are critical for Federal, State, and local policymakers as they organize and finance systems of care.

In recognition of the importance of improving the delivery of mental health services and of educating the American public about the needs of individuals with mental illness, the Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 61, has designated the week of October 3 through October 9, 1993, as Mental Illness Awareness Week.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America,

do hereby proclaim the week beginning October 3, 1993, as Mental Illness Awareness Week. I call upon all citizens of the United States to observe this week with ceremonies and activities to increase the Nation's understanding and acceptance of people with mental illness and to encourage recognition of their need for a broad array of treatment services.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this fifth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:31 a.m., October 6, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 7.

### **Proclamation 6604—German-American Day, 1993**

*October 5, 1993*

*By the President of the United States of America*

#### **A Proclamation**

The makeup of the United States of America is a diverse one, a rich tapestry of different cultures and ethnic origins, stronger and more vibrant because of its variety. The German culture contributes a substantial piece to the American mosaic, and German-Americans have given much to our Nation in the arts, the sciences, the business world, academia, and government. It is fitting that we celebrate these innumerable contributions to our great Nation by marking October 6 as "German-American Day."

The first German settlers arrived in America 310 years ago—harbingers of the more than seven million to follow. German immigrants have thrived in America, finding our Nation's political and economic culture fertile ground for securing the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for themselves and for their children. Today,

citizens of German ancestry comprise the largest ethnic group in the United States.

German-Americans today look with pride to a free and unified Germany as the living symbol of the best in their heritage. Americans look with satisfaction at the enduring friendship between the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States of America. This friendship is rooted in a long line of immigrants and was replanted in the ashes of the Second World War and nurtured through the storms of national division and Cold War confrontation. Warmed by the benefits of peaceful commerce and strengthened by the myriad personal relationships between the German and American peoples, the friendship has flourished.

The United States and the Federal Republic of Germany face formidable challenges in the post-Cold War era, challenges that we approach with greater confidence because we stand together, united in common democratic values.

The Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 121, has designated October 6, 1993, as "German-American Day" and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of that day.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 6, 1993, as German-American Day. I urge all Americans to learn more about the contributions of German immigrants to the United States in all fields of human endeavor and to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this fifth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:57 a.m., October 6, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 7.

## **Statement on the Arts and Humanities Awards Recipients**

*October 5, 1993*

These extraordinary individuals have made a gift to American cultural life that is beyond measure. Through these awards we celebrate their impressive achievements and extend our deepest thanks for efforts that nourish our creative and intellectual spirit.

NOTE: The President's statement was included in a White House statement announcing the National Medal of Arts and the Charles Frankel Prize awards ceremony scheduled for October 7. The President's remarks at the ceremony are also published in this issue.

## **Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's Telephone Conversation With President Boris Yeltsin of Russia**

*October 5, 1993*

The President called President Yeltsin today from Air Force One to discuss the situation in Moscow. The two leaders spoke for 20 minutes. The President's purpose in calling was to express the continued, strong support of the United States for President Yeltsin and the Russian Government in the wake of the political crisis in Russia.

President Yeltsin thanked the President for his support during the crisis and described the events of the last few days. He reported that order had been restored to Moscow. In response to a question from the President, he also reaffirmed his intention to hold free and fair elections on December 12 and to proceed resolutely on political and economic reform in general.

The two leaders pledged to work together to continue to build close relations between the United States and Russia. The President noted in this respect his intention to implement rapidly the \$2.5 billion in economic assistance funds approved by the Congress last week for Russia and the other new states. The President added that the visits to Russia this autumn of several American Cabinet of-

ficers, including Secretary of State Christopher later this month, will help to move the relationship forward.

### **Statement by the Press Secretary on Nuclear Testing by China**

*October 5, 1993*

Last night, China conducted an underground nuclear test at the Lop Nur test site in northwest China, despite the urging of more than 20 nations, including the United States, not to do so.

The United States deeply regrets this action. We urge China to refrain from further nuclear tests and to join the other nuclear powers in a global moratorium. Such a moratorium will contribute to the achievement of the administration's goal of completing a Comprehensive Test Ban by 1996, to which the administration is committed.

The President has today directed the Department of Energy to take such actions as are needed to put the U.S. in a position to be able to conduct nuclear tests next year, provided the notification and review conditions of the Hatfield-Exon-Mitchell amendment are met in the spring of 1994.

The President's ultimate decision on whether to test will be based on fundamental U.S. national security interests, taking into account:

- the contribution further tests would make to improving the safety and reliability of the U.S. arsenal in preparation for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTB);
- the extent to which China and others have responded to the U.S. appeal for a global moratorium on testing;
- progress in the CTB negotiations;
- the implications of further U.S. nuclear tests on our broader nonproliferation objectives.

Administration officials will begin consultations at once with Congress and our allies on these issues.

### **Remarks on Signing the Hatch Act Reform Amendments of 1993**

*October 6, 1993*

Thank you. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. This is a very happy day for me. I've had lots of discussions with Senator Glenn about this bill. Bill Clay is happy as a lark. This has put 30 years on his life today. And the Vice President and I had occasion to talk about this quite a lot during the reinventing Government effort. I have some remarks I want to make, but I hope you will forgive me if, just for a moment, since this is my opportunity to speak to the national press and to the American people as well as to speak to you, I make a brief statement about Somalia.

Today I have had two serious meetings with my national security advisers, along with the meeting we had last night, to discuss the future course of the United States in Somalia.

Our forces went there last year under the previous administration on an extraordinary human mission: 350,000 Somalis had starved because anarchy and famine and disease had prevailed. Today we are completing the job of establishing security in Somalia that will not only permit those who are now living to enjoy the immediate fruits of our common efforts with our allies in the United Nations but also to prevent that terrible crisis from occurring as soon as we are gone. It is essential that we conclude our mission in Somalia but that we do it with firmness and steadiness of purpose.

I want to emphasize that tomorrow I will be consulting with congressional leaders in both parties and with others, and then I will report to you and to the American people. But this much I want to say today. Our men and women in Somalia, including any held captive, deserve our full support. They went there to do something almost unique in human history. We are anxious to conclude our role there honorably, but we do not want to see a reversion to the absolute chaos and the terrible misery which existed before.

I think the American people, and I hope the Congress will be satisfied that we have assessed our position accurately and that we have a good policy to pursue. I will discuss that with them tomorrow, as I said, and then

I will be back to the American people and to the press as soon as that is done.

Let me say this is something of special importance to me today. When I was a 32-year-old freshman Governor, in my first year, one of the first bills I sponsored in my legislature was a bill repealing restrictions on political activities by State employees in my State. A bill that, very much like the Hatch Act, had stayed on in its present form because it was needed in a former time when, I'm a little embarrassed to say, State employees decades ago would mysteriously turn up with increases in welfare checks right before the election. Well, that hasn't happened in a long time in my State, or in any other. And so we changed the law. And I can honestly say in all the years since, not a single solitary soul ever lodged a single solitary complaint against any of our public employees for being good citizens.

Today, we put an end to a vexing contradiction in America's public life with a solution, I hasten to add, looking at the Members of Congress who are here, that is neither Democratic nor Republican but American in nature. And I thank the members of both parties who supported this important reform.

We've been supporting democracy throughout the world. We've been standing up for Boris Yeltsin in the tight he's been in and cheering when he prevailed and cheering when he reaffirmed his determination to have elections. But here in our own country, millions of our own citizens have been denied one of the most basic democratic rights, the right to participate in the political process, because of conditions that haven't existed for a very long time.

The original purpose of the Hatch Act was to protect Federal employees and other citizens from coming under improper political pressure. But now our Federal work force is the product of merit system, not patronage. We have laws to protect our citizens against coercion and intimidation. We have guarantees that the administration of Federal laws must be fair and impartial. We have an exceedingly vigilant press and people more than eager to talk to them whenever they have been abused or think they have. The conditions which once gave rise to the Hatch Act as it was before this reform bill passed

are no longer present, and they cannot justify the continued muzzling of millions of American citizens.

The Federal Employees Political Activities Act, which I'm about to sign, will permit Federal employees and postal workers on their own time to manage campaigns, raise funds, to hold positions within political parties. Still, there will be some reasonable restrictions. They wouldn't be able to run for partisan political office themselves, for example, and there will be some new responsibilities, which I applaud the Federal employees' unions for embracing and supporting.

While we restore political rights to these millions of citizens, we also hold them to high standards. The Federal workplace, where the business of our Nation is done will still be strictly off limits to partisan political activity. Workers on the job won't even be allowed to wear political campaign buttons. At the same time, the reforms will maintain restrictions on the activities of workers in the most sensitive positions, in law enforcement and national security.

Because we regard good ethics as the basis of good government, this reform strengthens criminal penalties for anyone convicted of abusing his or her position. And because we want our Federal workers to be responsible, to display an integrity worthy of the public service they perform, this reform includes a provision that allows the garnishment of Federal pay to repay private debt. That's been done in the private sector for many years. And just as we now treat Federal employees like private citizens in their political activities, there's no reason Federal workers should get special protection for privately unpaid bills and obligations.

Ultimately, I believe, as Senator Glenn said, that this reform of the Hatch Act will mean more responsible, more satisfied, happier, and more productive Federal workers. When we extend the political rights of any group of Americans, we extend the political rights of all Americans. And we deepen the meaning of our own democracy.

Congress has done a lot of work on that just in the last 8 months since I've been President. We've passed the motor voter bill, which expands the franchise to people who have difficulty registering to vote. Thanks to

the Vice President, we have a plan that will radically change the way Government operates. It will give rank-and-file Federal employees more meaningful jobs, more say over their work, and enable us to do more with less and increase the confidence taxpayers have in the work we do around here.

Serious proposals on campaign finance reform and on lobbying reform have already passed the United States Senate and are now being acted on in the House of Representatives. There is a serious commitment in this Congress to try to deal with the continuing imperfections in our democracy. And I applaud them for it.

Aristotle once said that, "liberty and equality are best attained when all persons alike share in the Government to the utmost." Working together, we're closing in on that goal. And now, when I sign this bill, 3 million more Americans will have a chance to share in their beloved Government to the utmost.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Missouri Representative William Clay. H.R. 20, approved October 6, was assigned Public Law No. 103-94.

### **Statement on Signing the Hatch Act Reform Amendments of 1993**

*October 6, 1993*

Today I am pleased to sign into law H.R. 20, the "Hatch Act Reform Amendments of 1993."

For too long, the rights of Federal and postal workers to express themselves and fully participate in our political process have been curtailed. Federal law currently penalizes public servants by limiting their political participation outside the Federal workplace. People who devote their lives to public service should not be denied the right to participate more fully in the democratic process. This law moves us in a more sensible direction.

The passage of H.R. 20 is primarily due to the steadfast efforts of many Members of Congress and the Federal and postal employees and their representatives. The Hatch Act reforms in this bill will provide Federal and

postal employees the opportunity to exercise their citizenship more fully and freely for the first time in over 50 years.

At the same time, this Act spells out the rights and responsibilities of Federal and postal workers. While employees will now be allowed to volunteer on their own time for the candidate of their choice, all political activity in the Federal workplace will be prohibited, including the wearing of campaign buttons.

Further, not only does H.R. 20 continue prohibitions against soliciting political contributions from the general public and subordinate employees, but it also strengthens the criminal penalties for those convicted of abusing their official position. This balanced measure will ensure Americans fair and impartial administration of Federal laws, while providing Federal and postal employees the rights that are essential to their independent exercise of personal choice.

H.R. 20 also includes a likewise overdue provision for the garnishment of Federal pay to repay private debt. We already have the authority to offset the salaries of Federal employees for Federal debt, and we use it. In presenting his National Performance Review report, Vice President Gore expressed his faith in the quality and integrity of Government employees. He and I share that faith. This new provision of law will ensure that those few Federal workers who fail to pay their private debts will no longer be able to hide behind their Federal employment to escape their personnel financial responsibilities.

As a candidate, I strongly supported the much needed reforms contained in H.R. 20. It gives me great pleasure to sign this bill into law. I look forward to the infusion of Federal and postal employee energy, expertise, and dedication into our political system that this bill makes possible.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
October 6, 1993.

NOTE: H.R. 20, approved October 6, was assigned Public Law No. 103-94.

## **Remarks Honoring White House Fellows**

*October 6, 1993*

Thank you very much. Mr. Vice President and my longtime friend Nancy Bekavac, ladies and gentlemen. I want to welcome the White House fellows, their families and friends and the White House Fellowship Commission here.

This program has been largely a secret to the American people for a long time, and yet it has been one of the most important things that has been done to enrich and diversify the work of administrations for decades now.

We have a remarkable array of White House fellows this year. We have an American Indian poet and legal scholar working at the Interior Department, a basketball star and a tax expert at State, an AIDS specialist at Commerce, two doctors at the Pentagon. Several fellows work here at the White House, including an astronomer tackling environmental issues at the National Security Council, a Bronx preacher reviewing domestic policy—sometimes I think we do better praying over these problems than what we do anyway—an author and an illustrator helping to build our national service corps, and we have two heroes of the Persian Gulf war, one working for the Vice President and one for Mack McLarty, my Chief of Staff.

I am very grateful to all the people here behind me and all those who have served on the Fellowship Commission, including our birthday girl, Pauline Gore.

With all of your responsibilities, it's a credit to you that you understand the importance of this program, that you've been willing to give your time, your attention, your energies to it. I hope that you will always be very, very proud of this.

You know, Colin Powell was a White House fellow. Henry Cisneros was a White House fellow. Tim Wirth, our Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs, was a White House fellow. We don't have any idea what these young people here behind me will be doing in 5 or 10 or 15 years. But one thing is for sure, whatever it is they wind up doing, they'll do a better job of it because those of you on this Commission gave them an op-

portunity to serve. And I will certainly be a better President because you gave them an opportunity to serve.

This has been a truly astonishing month. A lot of incredible things have happened in the world and in our country. And all these people have been a part of that remarkable change. We're committed to continuing to do that.

I told a dinner last night there's something to be said just for showing up for work every day. Sooner or later you can make some good things happen. But it's a lot easier when you've got people with the richness, the diversity, the gifts and the commitment of the White House fellows.

So to all of you, I say thank you, and I give you my renewed commitment to this program and to honoring your service and your efforts.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:57 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Nancy Bekavac, president, Scripps College, Claremont, CA.

## **Proclamation 6605—National Disability Employment Awareness Month, 1993**

*October 6, 1993*

*By the President of the United States of America*

### **A Proclamation**

The United States has long been a champion of the civil rights of individuals, and it is only natural that we now serve in the forefront of efforts to ensure equal opportunity for persons with disabilities. Inspired by the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) on July 26, 1990, other nations have begun to reexamine the challenges faced by their citizens with disabilities. The ADA, which prohibits discrimination in employment, public accommodations, government services, transportation, and communications, provides a practical model for people everywhere to ensure that individuals with disabilities will not be excluded from

the social, cultural, and economic mainstream.

Together we have begun shifting disability policy in America from exclusion to inclusion; from dependence to independence; from paternalism to empowerment. And we have made a firm commitment—a national pledge of civil rights for people with disabilities—to enforce the Americans with Disabilities Act. We cannot be satisfied until all citizens with disabilities receive equal treatment under the law, whether in the workplace, in schools, in government, or in the courts. We will not be satisfied as a Nation until we have fully implemented the laws that offer equal opportunity for Americans with disabilities, including the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

We do not have a single person to waste. Citizens with disabilities want to lead full, independent, and productive lives. They want to work; they want to pay their fair share of taxes; they want to be self-supporting citizens. America must enable the 43 million talented Americans with disabilities to contribute by offering them the individualized training and education we offer everyone else.

Our Nation can ill afford to waste this vast and only partially tapped source of knowledge, skills, and talent. In addition to being costly—over \$300 billion is expended annually at the Federal, State, and local levels to financially support potentially independent individuals—this waste of human ability cannot be reconciled with our tradition of individual dignity, self-reliance, and empowerment. As we work to achieve thorough and harmonious implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act, we will open the doors of opportunity for millions of people, thereby expanding, not only the ranks of the employed, but also the ranks of consumers. These individuals and their families will thus be able to pursue the real American Dream.

I congratulate the small business and industry leaders, labor leaders, and community leaders from all walks of life who are working together to implement the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act, and I commit the resources and cooperation of the Federal Government toward that effort. Our ongoing progress at-

tests to the fundamental vitality and openness of our free enterprise system and to our abiding commitment to civil rights for all. Every American needs a chance to contribute. Our work is far from finished. America needs the continued leadership of every citizen to fulfill the promise of the Americans with Disabilities Act and related laws.

The Congress, by joint resolution approved August 11, 1945, as amended (36 U.S.C. 155) has called for the designation of October of each year as “National Disability Employment Awareness Month.” This month is a special time for all Americans to recognize the tremendous potential of citizens with disabilities and to renew our commitment to full inclusion and equal opportunity for them, as for every citizen.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 1993 as National Disability Employment Awareness Month. I call on all Americans to observe this month with appropriate programs and activities that affirm our determination to fulfill both the letter and the spirit of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this sixth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:29 p.m., October 6, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 8.

**Message to the Congress  
Transmitting the Report of the  
National Institute of Building  
Sciences**

*October 6, 1993*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the requirements of section 809 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701j-2(j)), I transmit herewith the

16th annual report of the National Institute of Building Sciences for fiscal year 1992.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
October 6, 1993.

**Message to the Congress  
Transmitting the Report of the  
National Corporation for Housing  
Partnerships**

*October 6, 1993*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith the twenty-fourth annual report of the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships and the National Housing Partnership for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1992, as required by section 3938(a)(1) of title 42 of the United States Code.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
October 6, 1993.

**Statement on the Retirement of  
Michael Jordan From the Chicago  
Bulls**

*October 6, 1993*

As a sports fan who has had the great pleasure of watching Michael Jordan play basketball since the early 1980's, I was saddened to hear his announcement today that he was retiring from the game. But, I think we can all understand his wish to take his leave and devote himself to more private concerns.

We will miss him, here and all around America, in every small-town backyard and paved city lot where kids play one-on-one and dream of being like Mike.

His gift to us all has been in giving everything he had game after game, year in and year out. It has been our privilege for the last decade to see him gracing the hardwood, lighting up our TV screens, and brightening the lives of the young at heart all around the world.

I want to wish Michael and his family the very best. I know that the past several months have been difficult ones, and I hope that he can enjoy the peace of mind that he richly deserves.

**Statement by the Press Secretary on  
the President's Meeting With NATO  
Secretary General Manfred Woerner**

*October 6, 1993*

The President met today with NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner in the Oval Office. The President and Secretary Woerner discussed developments in Bosnia and exchanged ideas about preparations for the January 1994 NATO summit. They expressed their common commitment to taking advantage of this historic opportunity to chart NATO's course in the post-cold-war Europe.

The President and the Secretary General agreed that the NATO summit should reaffirm the strength of the transatlantic security partnership and advance the process of adapting NATO to Europe's new security environment. They discussed how to deepen NATO's engagement in Europe's east and further the development of a "European pillar" within the alliance.

**Nomination for the Director of the  
United States Arms Control and  
Disarmament Agency**

*October 6, 1993*

The President announced today that he intends to nominate John D. Holum to be the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

"My administration has placed the highest importance on arms control and combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction," said the President. "A revitalized Arms Control and Disarmament Agency will play an important role in achieving new arms control agreements and fighting weapons proliferation. I can think of no finer and more

dedicated person to lead ACDA than John Holum, whom I have known for 20 years and who has close working relationships with many senior officials at the State and Defense Departments, the NSC, and throughout my administration. John will be a strong voice for arms control and nonproliferation policies within the councils of Government.”

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

### **Nomination for a Special Counsel at the Justice Department**

*October 6, 1993*

The President announced today that he has nominated Gerald Stern, an experienced corporate attorney and former Justice Department civil rights attorney, to be the Special Counsel for Financial Institutions Fraud at the Department of Justice.

“To preserve our people’s trust in their financial institutions, it is imperative that we aggressively enforce the laws governing them,” said the President. “Gerald Stern has the business experience and prosecutorial skill to make sure that we do just that.”

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

### **Remarks on Presenting Arts and Humanities Awards**

*October 7, 1993*

Thank you very much. To our distinguished honorees and all of you in the audience. I want to say a special word of thanks to Jane Alexander and to Dr. Sheldon Hackney for their leadership of our administration’s efforts in the arts and humanities.

As a person who at various times in his life has been a frustrated writer and a frustrated musician, this is an extremely humbling event for me today. [Laughter] But I’ve been getting a lot of training in humility lately. I have a Vice President who humbles me all the time by all the things he teaches me about things great and insignificant and who unlike me actually got to go on David Letterman to prove how funny he was.

[Laughter] And I have a wife who swept the television ratings last week talking about the arcana of health care with a passion and an eloquence. As if that weren’t bad enough, USA Today had the bad grace to go out and poll the American people, and 40 percent of them said she was smarter than I am. [Laughter] To which I reply, “Of course, what kind of dummy do you think I am. How else would I have gotten elected President.”

And just to drive this humility home—this is the actual true part of this wonderful story—I went to southern California last week, or the first of this week, and I was looking forward to staying in the Beverly Hilton. It seemed like an exotic sort of place. And I showed up, and Merv Griffin, who owns it, shook hands with me and took me up to the floor where I was staying. There is only one person who is a permanent resident of the floor where I stayed in the Beverly Hilton, Rodney Dangerfield, who said they had put me there because we seem to belong together—[laughter]—and gave me 12 roses with “a little respect” on a gift card.

I am delighted to be here to honor this year’s winners of the National Medal of the Arts and the Charles Frankel Prize, men and women whose achievements represent the enduring power of the arts and humanities and, in a larger sense, of the creative spirit in all of our lives.

Throughout history, the arts and humanities have been the cultural signature of this great Nation. They have enabled Americans of all backgrounds and walks of life to gain a deeper appreciation of who they are as individuals and who we all are as a society, stirring our minds and our senses, stimulating learning and collective discourse, the arts and humanities teach us in ways that nothing else can about the vastness and the depth of human experience. They are our great equalizers. We inherit them, and we can all participate in them.

Whether or not one plays an instrument, reads poetry, learns to pirouette, or spends hours alone in a local art gallery, we all have the capacity to be moved by a song, a poem, a story, a dance, a painting. We can feel our

spirit soar when we see an intriguing film or the sudden illumination of a new idea or an old idea put in a new way.

At a time when our society faces new and profound challenges, at a time when we are losing so many of our children, at a time when so many of our people feel insecure in the face of change, the arts and humanities must remain a vital part of our lives as individuals and as a Nation.

For 200 years, the freedom of our artistic and intellectual imagination has contributed to the quality of our civic life. It has helped to shape American ideas of democracy, of pluralism, of tolerance. Three decades ago, President Kennedy said this: There's a connection, hard to explain logically but easy to feel, between achievement in public life and progress in the arts. The Jeffersonian era gave birth not only to the Declaration of Independence but also to beautiful Monticello. The age of Lincoln produced the Emancipation Proclamation, along with the Hudson River school of painting and the writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, and Harriet Beecher Stowe. The first half of this century gave us universal suffrage and the empowerment of American workers, as well as Charlie Chaplin, Frank Lloyd Wright, William Faulkner, Marian Anderson, and Duke Ellington. The same unbridled energy and potent imagination that took Americans to the moon inspired rock and roll, Motown, modern dance, and a new emphasis on civil and human rights.

Those of you gathered with us today are reminders that the human imagination is still the most powerful tool we have in moving forward as a civilization. You provoke our minds, you enliven our senses, endow our souls, help us to give our lives meaning. That's why public support for the arts and humanities remains essential today and for the generations to come.

Today, we are indeed fortunate to have inspiring new leaders working in Government to expand our artistic and humanistic endeavors, to carry on our heritage to future generations. I'm very proud of the work and the life that Sheldon Hackney and that Jane Alexander have lived before they came to this work. I thank them for their work here. And I tell you that we welcome all of you to give

us your ideas, your suggestions, and your energy as we try to move forward together. Now it is a privilege to call forward the following recipients of the National Medal of Arts.

First, the contributions of Walter and Leonore Annenberg to American culture can literally not be overstated. The Annenbergs have enriched our appreciation of the arts through public service, publishing, and as board members of major arts institutions. They have given generously of their time and their money. And they provided among other things the magnificent portrait of Benjamin Franklin, which hangs in the Green Room at the White House, one of the most prized possessions of this, your American home.

*[At this point, the President congratulated Mr. and Mrs. Annenberg, and Hillary Clinton presented the medal.]*

The legendary vocalist and bandleader, Cab Calloway, has had indeed a remarkable career, one of the originators of American jazz. An enduring figure in popular music, Cab Calloway added "Hi-dee-ho" and the "scat" sound to our musical vocabulary. And for those of us who have lived a while, we can enjoy seeing the brightness of his smile in our memories going back for decades. He is an American original, and I am deeply honored that he's here with us today.

*[The President congratulated Mr. Calloway. Hillary Clinton presented the medal, and Mr. Calloway made brief remarks.]*

Literally for decades, Ray Charles has been one of America's favorite singers. From his roots in Georgia, he became one of the first great truly American singers, one of the first to combine the dynamic energy of gospel music with rhythm and blues. His songs are indelibly etched in the hearts of millions of Americans.

I can tell you that it's a particular honor for me to give him this award today, because I suppose no singer ever had a bigger impact on my musical life than Ray Charles. I still remember over there in Constitution Hall a concert I attended on June the 24th, 1967. I was notable for being one of a few members of my race in the audience. And Ray Charles electrified that crowd so much that that night, I literally could not go to sleep until

5 a.m. in the morning. I went out and ran 3 miles to get the energy out. And I still remember to this day the date of the concert. That is testament to the enduring impact of this phenomenal American original.

*[The President congratulated Ray Charles, and Hillary Clinton presented the medal.]*

Our next honoree, I believe, is part of the only brother-sister team ever to receive this great award. Bess Lomax Hawes has played a major role in the American folk movement since the 1940's as a singer, a teacher, a composer, an author of articles and books that help bring the folk arts into the lives of countless Americans. At a time when our native folk arts are largely lost to millions of our younger people, she has performed an invaluable service to our Nation in helping us to remember who we are and how we got here.

*[The President congratulated Ms. Lomax Hawes, and Hillary Clinton presented the medal.]*

You know what she said? She said, "I wish all the beautiful artists I've recorded and seen across the years in this country were here to receive this award for me. They were the inspiration for what I did." Thank you.

Poet and educator, Stanley Kunitz has spent a life opening America's eyes and ears to poetry. He makes the ordinary become extraordinary, the everyday become timeless and significant. He was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for Poetry in 1959, and his works grace us still.

Welcome, Stanley Kunitz.

*[The President congratulated Mr. Kunitz, and Hillary Clinton presented the medal.]*

Robert Merrill has been acclaimed by critics as one of the great natural baritones of the century. He's appeared in 787 performances at the Metropolitan Opera over a 31-year operatic career. He's also sung on Broadway and many solo recitals and on television. And all of us who have ever heard him sing wish, as I tried to persuade him to do today, that this would be the 787th performance. He turned me down, but I still think we should give him the medal. Mr. Robert Merrill.

*[The President congratulated Mr. Merrill, and Hillary Clinton presented the medal.]*

Arthur Miller has given our Nation some of the finest plays of this century. His character, Willy Loman in "Death of a Salesman," caught the public's imagination by conveying the tension and drama of a common man's life. In "The Crucible," he focused on issues of conscience by probing the Salem witch trials of the late 17th century. He won the Pulitzer Prize for Drama in 1949. The thing that has always impressed me about him was the continuing energy he has brought to his work over such a long period of time, seeming forever young with something always new to say. Please welcome Arthur Miller.

*[The President congratulated Mr. Miller, and Hillary Clinton presented the medal.]*

Robert Rauschenberg is one of America's most innovative artists whose remarkable works have been displayed in museums and galleries around the world, and who has really helped to transform our notions of contemporary art. Modern art is often inaccessible to a lot of people who don't go to art galleries and often don't understand it. I have personally been impressed by how many people I know who don't count themselves as connoisseurs, who have seen and been moved by the works of our next honoree, Robert Rauschenberg.

*[The President congratulated Mr. Rauschenberg, and Hillary Clinton presented the medal.]*

He's also a pretty good comic. I said, "It's great to see you here today." He said, "Oh, I'll show up for this anytime." *[Laughter]*

Lloyd Richards has devoted his career to promoting theater in America. As dean of the Yale school of drama and artistic director of the Yale Repertory Theater, he has trained some of our Nation's finest young talents, many of whom have turned into our finest, not so young talents, helping to make for him a remarkable legacy for which we are all grateful. Lloyd Richards.

*[The President congratulated Mr. Richards, and Hillary Clinton presented the medal.]*

Well, I got another little lesson in humility back there. He said, "You both have said some nice things today." And then he looked at me and he said, "And you did something for stand-up comedy also." And then he said, "Well, at least you didn't set it back." [*Laughter*]

William Styron's haunting works, including "Lie Down in Darkness," "The Confessions of Nat Turner," and "Sophie's Choice" capture our history and character with a passion and insight few others have ever achieved. His compelling prose as a fiction writer and essayist has won him readers around the world, those of us who anxiously await each new word.

I can tell you that as a young southerner, the impact of "The Confessions of Nat Turner" on me was truly stunning. And I can say that for a whole generation of us who had never quite found words to give expression to many of the things we had imagined until we read the works of William Styron.

[*The President congratulated Mr. Styron, and Hillary Clinton presented the medal.*]

Paul Taylor has been one of our Nation's preeminent dancers and choreographers for more than three decades. And I might say, he looks as if he could outdance most of us in this country still today. His more than 80 works explore the richness, the complexity of the American character, and graphically demonstrate the deep undercurrents of human relations in a way few other choreographers have ever been able to do. Please join me in welcoming Paul Taylor. tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

[*The President congratulated Mr. Taylor, and Hillary Clinton presented the medal.*]

Since coming to this country in the 1930's, Billy Wilder has helped to transform the American motion picture industry. As a writer, director, and producer, his name attached to many classics of American film. He's won six Academy Awards and millions of fans. And perhaps most important, he's given us a lot of moving movie moments. If you've never laughed at a funny Billy Wilder picture, you have never laughed. Mr. Billy Wilder.

[*The President congratulated Mr. Wilder, and Hillary Clinton presented the medal.*]

Now, it is my great honor to introduce the winners of the Charles Frankel Prize. Ricardo E. Alegria is an historian and anthropologist who has dedicated his career to the study and public appreciation of Caribbean culture. I'm glad to see so many of his supporters from his native Puerto Rico today, and I thank him for coming this long way to be with us. Mr. Alegria.

[*The President congratulated Mr. Alegria, and Hillary Clinton presented the award.*]

In a 50-year career as a writer and a teacher, historian John Hope Franklin has been a leading scholar of African-American studies and an active voice in the social transformation of America. He's won nearly 100 honorary degrees. He's served on the National Council of Humanities. His writings have illuminated his subject for a whole generation after generation of young readers. I was once one of them—a reader, and young—reading John Hope Franklin. And I'd like to say that one of the great moments of our 1992 campaign was when John Hope Franklin came on one of our bus trips with us; and Al Gore and Tipper and Hillary and I sat and had a chance to visit with him and really learn something from a man who has mastered the mystery of America. John Hope Franklin.

[*The President congratulated Mr. Franklin, and Hillary Clinton presented the award.*]

Hanna Holborn Gray has had a truly remarkable career. She served for 15 years as president of the University of Chicago, where she became a highly visible and widely acclaimed advocate for higher education. She has been honored for her scholarship, her words, and her work in many ways, especially in receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom, our country's highest civilian award. She deserves greatly the award she receives today. Hanna Gray.

[*The President congratulated Ms. Gray, and Hillary Clinton presented the award.*]

After a distinguished career as chairman and chief executive officer of Time Incorporated, Andrew Heiskell was appointed

founding chairman of the President's Committee on Arts and Humanities in 1982. As a leader in promoting the arts and humanities, he energetically, and I echo energetically, persuaded cultural leaders and business executives to support cultural activities and institutions. He filled a void in American life at a time when we needed him. And today we thank him for that. Andrew Heiskell.

*[The President congratulated Mr. Heiskell, and Hillary Clinton presented the award.]*

There are a lot of funny people. He said "All this and dinner, too?" *[Laughter]*

Historian Laurel T. Ulrich has introduced both scholarly and public audiences to the lives of ordinary people in New England's past. Her recent book "A Midwife's Tale: The Life of Martha Ballard, based on her diary," won the 1991 Pulitzer Prize for History, among other honors.

Now that I have become President, perhaps I can say this with greater authority than would otherwise be the case: We oftentimes tend to see our history too much through the lives and works of the famous and not enough through the remarkable lives of the people who are not famous. She has made a truly significant contribution to our understanding of our roots. And for that we thank her.

*[The President congratulated Ms. Ulrich, and Hillary Clinton presented the award.]*

And now I have one last special honor, and that is to present to Congressman Sidney Yates the Presidential Citizens Medal for his exemplary deeds of service in the area of arts and humanities. The last time Congressman Yates was here for an occasion at the White House, it happened to be on the day he and his wife were celebrating their 58th wedding anniversary. And today, we honor him for that many years and more of dedication to our common cause. Congressman Yates, please come forward.

*[The President congratulated Mr. Yates, and Hillary Clinton presented the medal.]*

Again, let me thank the honorees for being here today, thank all of you in the audience who have come to support them and to support the arts.

Before we go, I just can't resist saying this. Just before I came out here, I learned today that a great American writer and a friend of Hillary's and mine, Toni Morrison, was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature today. I hope that in the years and struggles ahead we will work hard together to keep the arts and humanities alive and flourishing, not just here in the Nation's Capital or in the cultural capitals of this great land but in every community and in every neighborhood.

Remember, all the people we honor today were once in an ordinary community in an ordinary neighborhood living only with the imagination they had that brought them to this day and this honor. We have to find that imagination and fire it in the children all over America.

Thank you all, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:46 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Merv Griffin, former talk show host, and comedian Rodney Dangerfield. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

## Address to the Nation on Somalia

October 7, 1993

Today I want to talk with you about our Nation's military involvement in Somalia. A year ago, we all watched with horror as Somali children and their families lay dying by the tens of thousands, dying the slow, agonizing death of starvation, a starvation brought on not only by drought, but also by the anarchy that then prevailed in that country.

This past weekend we all reacted with anger and horror as an armed Somali gang desecrated the bodies of our American soldiers and displayed a captured American pilot, all of them soldiers who were taking part in an international effort to end the starvation of the Somali people themselves. These tragic events raise hard questions about our effort in Somalia. Why are we still there? What are we trying to accomplish? How did a humanitarian mission turn violent? And when will our people come home?

These questions deserve straight answers. Let's start by remembering why our troops

went into Somalia in the first place. We went because only the United States could help stop one of the great human tragedies of this time. A third of a million people had died of starvation and disease. Twice that many more were at risk of dying. Meanwhile, tons of relief supplies piled up in the capital of Mogadishu because a small number of Somalis stopped food from reaching their own countrymen.

Our consciences said, enough. In our Nation's best tradition, we took action with bipartisan support. President Bush sent in 28,000 American troops as part of a United Nations humanitarian mission. Our troops created a secure environment so that food and medicine could get through. We saved close to one million lives. And throughout most of Somalia, everywhere but in Mogadishu, life began returning to normal. Crops are growing. Markets are reopening. So are schools and hospitals.

Nearly a million Somalis still depend completely on relief supplies, but at least the starvation is gone. And none of this would have happened without American leadership and America's troops.

Until June, things went well, with little violence. The United States reduced our troop presence from 28,000 down to less than 5,000, with other nations picking up where we left off. But then in June, the people who caused much of the problem in the beginning started attacking American, Pakistani, and other troops who were there just to keep the peace.

Rather than participate in building the peace with others, these people sought to fight and to disrupt, even if it means returning Somalia to anarchy and mass famine. And make no mistake about it, if we were to leave Somalia tomorrow, other nations would leave, too. Chaos would resume. The relief effort would stop, and starvation soon would return.

That knowledge has led us to continue our mission. It is not our job to rebuild Somalia's society or even to create a political process that can allow Somalia's clans to live and work in peace. The Somalis must do that for themselves. The United Nations and many African states are more than willing to help. But we, in the United States must decide

whether we will give them enough time to have a reasonable chance to succeed.

We started this mission for the right reasons, and we're going to finish it in the right way. In a sense, we came to Somalia to rescue innocent people in a burning house. We've nearly put the fire out, but some smoldering embers remain. If we leave them now, those embers will reignite into flames, and people will die again. If we stay a short while longer and do the right things, we've got a reasonable chance of cooling off the embers and getting other firefighters to take our place.

We also have to recognize that we cannot leave now and still have all our troops present and accounted for. And I want you to know that I am determined to work for the security of those Americans missing or held captive. Anyone holding an American right now should understand, above all else, that we will hold them strictly responsible for our soldiers' well-being. We expected them to be well-treated, and we expect them to be released.

So now we face a choice. Do we leave when the job gets tough, or when the job is well done? Do we invite a return of mass suffering, or do we leave in a way that gives the Somalis a decent chance to survive?

Recently, General Colin Powell said this about our choices in Somalia. "Because things get difficult, you don't cut and run. You work the problem and try to find a correct solution." I want to bring our troops home from Somalia. Before the events of this week, as I said, we had already reduced the number of our troops there from 28,000 to less than 5,000. We must complete that withdrawal soon, and I will. But we must also leave on our terms. We must do it right. And here is what I intend to do.

This past week's events make it clear that even as we prepare to withdraw from Somalia, we need more strength there. We need more armor, more air power, to ensure that our people are safe and that we can do our job. Today, I have ordered 1,700 additional Army troops and 104 additional armored vehicles to Somalia to protect our troops and to complete our mission. I've also ordered an aircraft carrier and two amphibious groups with 3,600 combat Marines to be sta-

tioned offshore. These forces will be under American command.

Their mission, what I am asking these young Americans to do, is the following:

First, they are there to protect our troops and our bases. We did not go to Somalia with a military purpose. We never wanted to kill anyone. But those who attack our soldiers must know they will pay a very heavy price.

Second, they are there to keep open and secure the roads, the port, and the lines of communication that are essential for the United Nations and the relief workers to keep the flow of food and supplies and people moving freely throughout the country so that starvation and anarchy do not return.

Third, they are there to keep the pressure on those who cut off relief supplies and attacked our people, not to personalize the conflict but to prevent a return to anarchy.

Fourth, through their pressure and their presence, our troops will help to make it possible for the Somali people, working with others, to reach agreements among themselves so that they can solve their problems and survive when we leave. That is our mission.

I am proposing this plan because it will let us finish leaving Somalia on our own terms and without destroying all that two administrations have accomplished there. For, if we were to leave today, we know what would happen. Within months, Somali children again would be dying in the streets. Our own credibility with friends and allies would be severely damaged. Our leadership in world affairs would be undermined at the very time when people are looking to America to help promote peace and freedom in the post-cold-war world. And all around the world, aggressors, thugs, and terrorists will conclude that the best way to get us to change our policies is to kill our people. It would be open season on Americans.

That is why I am committed to getting this job done in Somalia, not only quickly but also effectively. To do that, I am taking steps to ensure troops from other nations are ready to take the place of our own soldiers. We've already withdrawn some 20,000 troops, and more than that number have replaced them from over two dozen other nations. Now we will intensify efforts to have other countries

deploy more troops to Somalia to assure that security will remain when we're gone.

And we'll complete the replacement of U.S. military logistics personnel with civilian contractors who can provide the same support to the United Nations. While we're taking military steps to protect our own people and to help the U.N. maintain a secure environment, we must pursue new diplomatic efforts to help the Somalis find a political solution to their problems. That is the only kind of outcome that can endure.

For fundamentally, the solution to Somalia's problems is not a military one, it is political. Leaders of the neighboring African states, such as Ethiopia and Eritrea, have offered to take the lead in efforts to build a settlement among the Somali people that can preserve order and security. I have directed my representatives to pursue such efforts vigorously. And I've asked Ambassador Bob Oakley, who served effectively in two administrations as our representative in Somalia, to travel again to the region immediately to advance this process.

Obviously, even then there is no guarantee that Somalia will rid itself of violence and suffering. But at least we will have given Somalia a reasonable chance. This week some 15,000 Somalis took to the streets to express sympathy for our losses, to thank us for our effort. Most Somalis are not hostile to us but grateful. And they want to use this opportunity to rebuild their country.

It is my judgment and that of my military advisers that we may need up to 6 months to complete these steps and to conduct an orderly withdrawal. We'll do what we can to complete the mission before then. All American troops will be out of Somalia no later than March the 31st, except for a few hundred support personnel in noncombat roles.

If we take these steps, if we take the time to do the job right, I am convinced we will have lived up to the responsibilities of American leadership in the world. And we will have proved that we are committed to addressing the new problems of a new era.

When our troops in Somalia came under fire this last weekend, we witnessed a dramatic example of the heroic ethic of our American military. When the first Black Hawk helicopter was downed this weekend,

the other American troops didn't retreat although they could have. Some 90 of them formed a perimeter around the helicopter, and they held that ground under intensely heavy fire. They stayed with their comrades. That's the kind of soldiers they are. That's the kind of people we are.

So let us finish the work we set out to do. Let us demonstrate to the world, as generations of Americans have done before us, that when Americans take on a challenge, they do the job right.

Let me express my thanks and my gratitude and my profound sympathy to the families of the young Americans who were killed in Somalia. My message to you is, your country is grateful, and so is the rest of the world, and so are the vast majority of the Somali people. Our mission from this day forward is to increase our strength, do our job, bring our soldiers out, and bring them home.

Thank you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:02 p.m. from the Oval Office at the White House.

### **Remarks at a White House Dinner Honoring Arts and Humanities Award Recipients**

*October 7, 1993*

Ladies and gentlemen, let me welcome you all to the White House and thank you for coming and for each of your contributions to the rich cultural life of our great Nation. I want to say a special word of appreciation again to the honorees from this afternoon. I had a wonderful time with all of you this afternoon. So many of you have forgiven my ad-lib jokes, I might ask you back again next week. [Laughter] I may have you tell my daughter I'm funny after all.

I want you to know, that to all of you who have been honored and to all of the distinguished artists who are here as our guests tonight who didn't join us this afternoon, we are all very much in your debt. You have, each in your own way, enriched our lives and helped us to learn more and feel more deeply and to become more of the people God meant for us to be. We applaud your work. We honor your contributions, and I ask you now that all of us together raise our glasses

in toast to the artists, the writers, the humanitarians who have made America the place it is today.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 8:30 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House.

### **Message to the Congress on Naval Petroleum Reserves**

*October 7, 1993*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with section 201(3) of the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 (10 U.S.C. 7422(c)(2)), I am informing you of my decision to extend the period of maximum efficient rate production of the naval petroleum reserves for 3 years from April 5, 1994, the expiration date of the currently authorized production period.

The report investigating the necessity of continued production of the reserves as required by section 201(3)(c)(2)(B) of the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 is attached. Based on the report's findings, I hereby certify that continued production from the naval petroleum reserves is in the national interest.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
October 7, 1993.

### **Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's Meeting With Syrian Foreign Minister Farouk al-Shara**

*October 7, 1993*

The President met with Syrian Foreign Minister Farouk al-Shara this afternoon. They had a constructive discussion about recent developments in the Middle East peace process and next steps in that process.

President Clinton expressed his commitment to achieving a comprehensive peace between Israel and all its Arab neighbors. He

reiterated his belief that the recent agreement between Israel and the Palestinians could serve as a catalyst for process on the other tracks.

The Syrian Foreign Minister expressed President Assad's commitment to the peace progress and Syria's desire to make progress toward a comprehensive settlement with Israel.

The meeting lasted about 20 minutes.

### **Proclamation 6606—Country Music Month, 1993**

*October 7, 1993*

*By the President of the United States of America*

#### **A Proclamation**

Country music is one of America's unique musical forms. Our immigrant ancestors from Great Britain and Ireland brought their tunes and melodies with them, and those songs were reshaped by life and landscape in our new Nation. In Appalachia, the Piedmonts, the Ozarks, the Mississippi Delta, and the Pine Barrens, those songs and ballads were forged from the spirit of working men and women, farmers and field laborers, miners and railroad workers, and pioneers crossing the Great Plains.

They blended with songs of African Americans, Mexican Americans, and Cajuns. Out of this wellspring came Western swing, honky-tonk, blues, gospel, and shape note music, creating a family of many musical cousins. Country music is not one voice, but many, irresistible to the ear and to any heart that likes to sing. The instruments that accompany the songs are also from our ancestors of many lands—the dulcimer from Germany, the fiddle from all of Europe, the banjo from Africa.

Country music is about the American story. It fuses the traditions of many cultures and celebrates what makes us Americans. Country lyrics tell tales of life and love, joy and heartbreak, toil and celebration. From early folk singers like Woody Guthrie to such legends as Roy Acuff, Hank Williams, and Patsy Cline to today's bright stars—the singers all let loose the soulful music inside their

hearts. In its rhythms and words, we can hear the lonesome sound, as well as the festive spirit, of our beloved land.

The Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 102, has designated the month of October as "Country Music Month." I urge all Americans to join me in recognizing the role that country music has played in shaping our cultural heritage.

Country Music Month is a time to recognize the contributions of singers, songwriters, musicians, and all in the industry who work to bring us the very best of country music and dance. Throughout the month of October, let us celebrate country music in our homes and towns across the United States.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 1993 as Country Music Month.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this seventh day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:54 p.m., October 8, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 8, and it will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 13.

### **Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Breakfast**

*October 8, 1993*

Thank you. Thank you very much for that wonderful welcome. This is the first time we've all been together since the day after the Inauguration at the White House. What a happy day that was. But this is a happy day, too. And in some ways a more meaningful one because, thanks to you and with your help, we have begun to fulfill the promise of the long campaign of 1992 and the commitment of our party to change America for the better.

I want to say a special word of thanks to my longtime friend David Wilhelm for all the work that he has done, even if he didn't have a top 10 list for me. After Al Gore went on David Letterman I had a top 10 list for him. I said, "The top 10 reasons I'm glad Al Gore is Vice President: No. 10 is that he has educated me in enormous detail on matters of great importance and matters entirely trivial." [Laughter] "And reasons nine through one are that he has a vote in the United States Senate." I told the Vice President that without blinking an eye, and he looked at me and he said, "Yeah, and every time I vote I'm on the winning side." [Laughter]

I want to—just think about that for a while—I want to thank Lottie Shackelford who has been my friend, as all of you know, for many years; your Vice Chair, Jim Brady, who when I was running for President was head of the State Chair's Association; my neighbor and friend, Kathy Vick, also from Louisiana. There is probably some monopoly rule they're violating, but they voted right in 1992. I want to thank my friend Roy Furman for agreeing to become the national finance chair of this party. He is doing a wonderful job, and he is wearing me out, which I guess is the test of a good job. Congressman Bob Matsui, our treasurer, is not here today, but I do want to mention him because he's been such a good friend to me and is such a good man.

And I also want to thank my good friend, Congressman Bill Richardson, who helped me to carry New Mexico and organized Hispanic voters all across America and now is one of the great leaders in the United States House. And I want to say this, people always talk about all these tough fights we're in, well, I didn't get hired to do easy things. And so if you do hard things, they're going to be tough. But the National Journal, or one of these Washington periodicals, did a survey a couple of weeks ago which said that so far our first year success rate in Congress was second in the last 40 years only to the first year of Dwight Eisenhower's Presidency, and we've got a chance to top it if we can pass the crime bill and campaign reform before the end of the year, thanks to Bill Richardson and others like him. And I thank him.

I thank Martha Love and I thank Debra DeLee, Bob Reich's favorite DNC officer. That was really funny what she said. You know, if you stay in this job long enough you get to appreciate every little bit of humor you can squeeze out of the day.

Yesterday we had a group of people in who won arts and humanities award, and I told them a story that they thought was apocryphal, but it was actually true. After I was sort of humbled anyway last week by first of all having Al Gore go on at David Letterman and become sort of, you know, a slick magazine model again. And then Hillary became, you know, justifiably the rage of the country with her wonderful performance on health care before all those committees. Then USA Today had the bad taste to do a poll and ask people whether they thought she was smarter than me, and 40 percent said yes. [Laughter] And of course, they were right, which is what made it really hurt.

So I went to California, as I always do when I need a real boost, because California has been so wonderful to me, and they've got so many problems now, and they're struggling so bravely to overcome them, and we're working very hard to help them. And so I thought, this is going to be great. So I get there, I went to Sacramento and San Francisco and had a wonderful time with the AFL-CIO there, and then I came down to L.A. And I stayed at the Beverly Hilton because we were going to have a couple of events there. And I thought this is an exciting hotel. It's got a little, you know, glamour to it, and Merv Griffin owns it, and I used to watch him on TV when I was a boy. And when I walked into the hotel and there was Merv Griffin to welcome me, and I was beginning to feel like a President again, you know. [Laughter] I was getting over the fact that Gore was on television and Hillary was smarter than me, and I was just about to get over it. And then they took me up to the floor, and I noticed it was a high floor, which made me feel more important. We were going up, and they said, "You know, we put you on this floor because there is one person in California who is a permanent resident of that floor, and we thought this is the floor you ought to be on." So I get off the elevator

and standing there to greet me is Rodney Dangerfield who had given me a dozen jungle roses and written "a little respect" on it. "A little respect."

So, let me say to all of you, this has been a remarkable time. If you look at what has been accomplished just in the last few months, we passed the largest deficit-reduction program in history, and long-term interest rates are still below 6 percent. Today's economic report indicates that this economy, even though it has been slower than we thought it would be, has been creating new jobs at a rate of about 152,000 jobs a month, which means that as of last month, there has now been more private sector job creation in the first portion of this year, the first 9 months, than in the previous 4 years.

The budget package also contained a sweeping reform of college loans, which lowered the interest rates for college loans and let people pay them back on easier terms of a percentage of their income, as well as stiffening measures for collection, something that will open the doors of college education to all Americans. There will never be an incentive not to borrow money for college now, because you can get it if you need it at a lower interest rate, and you can pay it back as a percentage of your income no matter how much you borrow. It's a dramatic change.

That budget reconciliation package had the most significant piece of reform in 20 years for lower income working families. Families with incomes of under \$27,000 with children in the home will get tax relief from that bill. And we will now be able to say because of the way the earned-income tax credit was expanded in this bill, that if you work 40 hours a week in America and you have a child in the home, you will no longer be in poverty. It is a dramatic advance to the values that the Democratic Party holds dear: work and family.

We passed the family leave bill, the motor voter bill. We've got a major initiative for reform in defense conversion. We're about to announce the first winners of our technology reinvestment project, where we put up \$500 million this year, and we'll put up a little more than that next year. We've already gotten 2,800 proposals from people who have

ideas to convert defense technologies to domestic uses, to build the economy of the 21st century. We announced last week that we were removing \$37 billion worth of high-tech computer, supercomputer, and telecommunications equipment from cold war trade restrictions, which will create many, many new jobs in our country.

We announced a proposal with the UAW and the auto companies and all the defense labs and all the other research labs of the Federal Government to try to triple the car mileage that our automobiles get by the end of the decade. If we do that we'll have sweeping gains in international markets for American produced automobiles.

We have reversed the environmental policies of the previous 12 years in ways that will be good for the economy, as well as good for the environment. We have appointed unprecedented numbers of women and members of different racial minorities to high positions in the National Government. This administration is in the process of changing this country, and you have made a profound difference.

You know, I've been a Democratic Party activist for a long time now, and I know that one of the things that gets us all into this is that we like elections, and we want to win. And one of the things that burns a lot of us out of it is that we sometimes think it's only about elections. And you can't keep doing elections after so many years unless you really believe there are some consequences to it.

So I wanted to say this to you today, to remind you that there are consequences to all the work you did and to the election that we won. And in addition to that litany I just gave you, maybe I could just tell you one story that would illustrate it better.

A couple of Sundays ago I came in from my morning run. I was on the ground floor at the White House, and I looked over down the hall, and there was a family there taking a tour of the White House, which is quite unusual on Sunday morning. But I noticed one of my staff members there had this family, and I went over to shake hands with them. It was a father and a mother and three daughters. The middle daughter was in a wheelchair. And my staff member said, "Mr.

President, this is one of those Make-A-Wish families, and this little girl is desperately ill. And her wish was to come to the White House, take a tour, and meet the President.”

So I went over and shook hands with the little girl and her family, and we talked a while. And I apologized for being in my running clothes. I went upstairs to change, came back down, and—looking more like my job—I then had a proper picture with them. And again, a nice visit with the wonderful child.

And as I was walking off, her father grabbed me by the arm, and I turned around and he said, “You know, my daughter is probably not going to make it. And because of that these last weeks I’ve spent with her are the most important times of my whole life. And because of that family leave bill I didn’t have to lose my job to spend that time. But if you hadn’t passed that law and signed it, I literally would have had to choose between losing my job and spending this time, or supporting my family and giving up what was the most important time of my life. Don’t you ever think it doesn’t make a difference who wins elections and what they do.”

As you know, I believe, have believed and preached throughout the campaign of 1992 that most of the problems of America are rooted in our inability to adjust to the sweeping changes of this age. We now know that this is the 20th year—1993—since real hourly wages peaked for wage earners and that for 20 years most Americans have been working harder for less money to pay more for health care, education, housing, the basics of life. We know that that has been true through times when the economy was growing and times when it was in recession.

But there have been profound structural changes at work in this economy which have put enormous pressures on the great American middle class which was built in the 20th century and which exploded at the end of World War II and which helped to keep the American dream, that each generation could do better than their parents if they work hard and played by the rules, alive.

When you put that with the fact that we have also seen great internal changes in the structure of our society, enormous movements from one place to another—the average in America is about 20 percent of our

people move every year or so now, from one place to another, extraordinary mobility—dramatic changes in the family unit, alarming pockets of profound depression where investment is not made, huge increases in the number of children born to one parent only, often to children themselves, a dramatic, breathtaking increase in arbitrary violence among young people, when you put that together with these internationally compelling economic changes, you see that if we just keep on doing what we’re doing, we’re in for deep trouble. Then if you look outside our borders you see also sweeping changes, many good, some troubling: the end of the cold war; the emergence of new great economic powers—China now growing at 10 to 14 percent per year; the emergence of a whole range of new democracies, and most of them hoping that they can have better relationships with us and trade with us and do business with us; the continuing difficulty of other rich countries, not just the United States, in creating jobs—Europe doing not as well as we are in creating new jobs; Japan now having trouble, even with its closed economy, creating new jobs.

And then we now know at the end of the cold war it certainly didn’t mean the end of troubles and misery in the world. We’ve done our best to support democracy in Russia and to stick by President Yeltsin. Because I believe it’s important that we have freedom and democracy in Russia, that we continue to denuclearize the world, and work hard on helping Russia to do what they’re trying to do and the other republics of the former Soviet Union.

We see that there is still an enormous amount of chaos. And once the cold war was over and the communist empire collapsed, it sort of stripped the veneer off long-simmering ethnic and religious hatreds and tensions in Bosnia and Georgia and lots of other places in the world. We know that there are countries in Africa which are not only embroiled in war but which are suffering mass famine, in Somalia where we are trying to conclude our mission and leave those people a fighting chance not to go back to times when hundreds of thousands of children died like flies in the streets. But we know that there are also troubles in other nations there.

In Angola there have been as many children have their legs blown off by land mines arbitrarily planted as in any war in history that we know of.

So this is both a troubled and hopeful world. And the old rules we had for looking at the world beyond our borders were pretty simple. There was a cold war, our policy was to contain communism, our policy was to promote countries within our sphere of influence. We preferred democracy, but as long as they were anti-Communist, we'd normally stick with somebody anyway. And even if they were pro-Communist and democratic, we'd normally shy away from them. The necessity of surviving in a bipolar world gave an organizing principle to what we did and didn't do. To be sure, we had troubles and difficulties, but we knew how to do that. Now we're having to define our purposes in the world and our leadership in the world in terms of more partnership with other nations in promoting democracy and freedom and market opportunities for people that we have here, we want elsewhere. It's not easy there.

But the thing I have tried to say, with all the time that I have spent on foreign policy and military policy and trade policy, that I must say it's an absolutely fascinating time to be President, and a great honor, actually, to be President in this difficult time, to try to construct the framework for the post-cold-war world.

I spend an enormous amount of time on that, but I usually talk about what we're doing in this country because I believe you cannot be strong abroad unless you are strong at home. It is difficult to promote a concept of national security that has nothing to do with the economic strength of our Nation. That is what permits us to pay for not only defense but the other things which make us more secure.

And when we think of all these changes we need to cope with, the first thing I think we have to say, that I've been trying to hammer home and in clear, explicit terms ever since the health care speech, is that there has to be a level of security accorded to Americans if they're going to be able to change. If you think about your own life, those of you who have the privilege of raising children—on most days it's a privilege—you

can watch in individual lives how difficult it is for people to change their habits, even when they know they should, if they are insecure personally.

The same is true of a family or a community or a nation. If you spend all your time waiting for the other shoe to drop, expecting something bad to happen, not expecting something good to happen, feeling that what you now have can be taken away from you by some arbitrary force, it is very difficult to have the space, the mental space and the emotional space, to think about the changes that are bearing in and what initiatives you should take.

And so an enormous part of my job as your President is not only to keep pushing this agenda of change—and getting you to help me do it, as you have so well—but to be able to explain to the American people what it is we have to change and why and then to be able to advocate those things that will give people more personal and family and community and national security so that we can have the courage and the space to change.

And if we don't do that, even our incremental progress will not satisfy people because they will be disoriented. I'm really proud of the fact that we've been creating more than 150,000 jobs a month in a tough time and that there are more new jobs now, since January, than there were in the previous 4 years. And when I say "we" I don't mean the Government. I mean "we" the American people working together, although we have played a role in it in drastically bringing the deficit down and keeping the interest rates down and targeting some investment. I'm proud of the fact that cars are selling at their highest rates since '89, and business investment is expanding at its fastest rate since '84, and all of those things. I'm proud of that.

But unless people understand this in a bigger framework, there will always be places that are behind and places that are ahead. Ten years ago, my part of the country was behind, and we had an unemployment rate 3 points higher than the national average. Today California is behind. They have 3 points higher than the national average, the center of a lot of our high-tech base, 12 percent of our population, 25 percent of our un-

employed people. This is a big problem for the rest of us.

So we have to understand these things. How does it all fit together? What kind of changes do we have to make? What kind of security do we have to have? How does the change in the student loan program or passing national service and giving all these kids a chance to earn money for college by rebuilding this country at the grassroots level, or going to Tokyo and working with the Japanese and the Europeans and the Canadians to open markets, how does that all fit together? What difference will it make if we reform the welfare system early next year? How does this work?

My goal is to make individuals in this country and families in this country secure enough and strong enough to be able to face and make the changes that we must make in order to do what David Wilhelm said I talked to him about so long ago: give every American a chance to live up to his or her God-given capacity.

To do it we simply have to be able to rebuild the great middle class in this country. We can't continue to have a few people doing very well, and the bottom dropping out not just from people who are unemployed but from people who are employed. There are a lot of changes we have to make. We've begun to make some, and some I've talked about.

First of all, we've got to make a lot of economic changes. We have got to face the fact that the basis of our prosperity can no longer be an insular economy, where we don't have foreign competition, and can no longer be at least buoyed by very high levels of defense spending in high-tech because of the end of the cold war.

So what do we have to do? First of all, we have to have an investment strategy. That's why when we changed the Tax Code this year we provided for a new venture capital gains tax, which will give people a 50-percent break if they invest for 5 years, not a year but 5 years, in new businesses or smaller businesses that are growing jobs. We provided more incentives for research and development. We provided more incentives to lift off the depressed real estate market in the country. We had a theory about that, an

investment theory, because there will never be enough Government money to get this country going again alone.

Secondly, we need to recognize that there are some places in this country that are profoundly depressed, and we have to do more there. So we passed some empowerment zone legislation to see whether or not with extreme incentives we could revitalize some of the really distressed areas of the country. We have a community development bank bill moving through the Congress which will set up banks that are designed to loan money to people to start self-employed businesses or very small businesses, loan money to people who live in places who ordinarily wouldn't be able to get it. We know from our experience at home, and from the South Shore Bank in Chicago, that banks can make money loaning to poor folks if they know what they're doing. And they can make money loaning in low income areas if they know what they're doing.

These are structural changes we have to make. We have to change the entire unemployment system. You know, when I was a kid and somebody lost their job, they lost their job for 4 weeks, 5 weeks, 6 weeks, in an economic downturn. They would get hired back at the same job. That's the system that the unemployment system was designed to support, what are so-called cyclical unemployment. So you've got unemployment payments for a period of months and then you got your job back. Today most unemployment is structural. For example, we continue to lose manufacturing jobs when the economy is growing like crazy. Why? Because manufacturing productivity is going up so fast, and because we haven't gotten into enough new manufacturing areas. So we have either one of two things we have to do. We either have to train people that are manufacturing workers to do nonmanufacturing work, or we've got to make a whole lot of different things if we want to keep the employment up, because there will be an almost unlimited trend to be able to produce more with fewer people of whatever particular product you're talking about.

What does that mean? That means that instead of an unemployment system we now need a reemployment system, because peo-

ple need different jobs because they're not going to get the old job back, by and large. It means that the day somebody goes on unemployment, and even before if they know they're going to go, they should know what jobs will be available within driving distance of their home. They should be able to match their skills for those jobs and where the deficiencies are they should be able to choose a training program that goes right along with that unemployment check. And it should commence immediately, so that you shorten the time in which people are unemployed.

We have to look more to a lot of other problems in our economy. We cannot avoid the responsibility to be responsible stewards of this country and this planet; so we're going to have to become more environmentally sensitive. But we have to do it in a way that creates jobs and doesn't just cost jobs. We can do that, but we have to be very creative. That requires change. We have to change the way we operate the Government. If we invest too much money in doing things in the same old way in the Government, then we don't have the money left to invest in education and training and the future. That's why the Vice President's report on reinventing Government is so important.

And Democrats have to prove they can do that. You know, if we don't hate Government, we ought to have the courage to change it. If we think Government has a critical role as partners for the private sector as we move toward the 21st century, then we have to have the courage to change it. That's really important. We can do more with less in a whole range of areas. And that's very, very important.

So all these changes need to be made. I cannot tell you how important I think it is for us to continue to push on defense conversion and invest massive amounts of money in the civilian technology possibilities of the future. We have been cutting defense since 1987, but we did not seriously begin to invest in defense conversion until 1993. The Congress last year passed a \$500 million bill for defense conversion, as Congressman Richardson will tell you, and there was an ideological opposition in the previous administration to spending the money. So all the people, the scientists, the engineers, the tech-

nology workers, who had lost their jobs had to wait another year just to get these programs started.

We have got to do better on that. We have all these defense labs. We have all this research. We have all these resources. I was at McClellan Air Force Base, and at McClellan Air Force Base in California they have worked with private sector people there to produce an electric car that gets 80 miles to the gallon at 55 miles an hour. It operates alternatively on electricity and gasoline and can go from zero to 60 in 12 seconds and has a maximum speed of 100 miles an hour. If we can just figure out how to produce it at an affordable price, we'll be in great shape.

But that's the way these things are done. So I could keep you here until tomorrow morning at this time talking about the changes we need to make. But let's first talk about what the security is. What's the deal we have to make with the American working people in order to make these changes, to get them to the point where they will have to make the changes? You think about everything I just said requires the concurrence of millions and tens of millions of people. You change a country—now, you can't just pass a law and change it. You can't just write a bill and change it. You have to change the behavior of the whole country. People have to change their lives.

So, we can't do that unless people feel a high level of security. I think that's self-evident. The first kind of security people need is to know that in an America where the economy is tough and where most people have to work for a living, you can work and still be a good parent. That's what the earned-income tax credit was all about, to give working people with kids a break. That's what the Family and Medical Leave Act was all about. We've still got work to do to make adequate childcare supports available to people around the country. We have got to say that there has got to be a way where every American can be a good mother, a good father, and a good worker. That's the first thing.

The second thing we have to do, I would argue to you, is to give people basic security. I mean more freedom from fear. When I did my town meeting in California, there was a

fine looking young Korean man who told me about how his brother had been shot and killed, an arbitrary shooting. And he asked me about it, told me the circumstances. Then there was a fine young junior high school student, a young African-American man. He told me that he and his brother just wanted to go to school. They said, "We don't want to be in a gang. We don't want a knife. We don't want a gun. We want to study. That's what we want to do, and we changed schools because we didn't think our old school was safe. So we showed up at our new school on the first day and were standing in line to register and my brother gets shot, standing in front of me, because he's in a crossfire." And this is not just California and New York and big cities, folks. This is my State and yours.

Now, look, I live in a State where half the people got a hunting or fishing license or both. And where we have to close down whole towns on the opening day of deer season, because nobody shows up at school, nobody shows up at the factory. But I think that even in my State people think it's nuts that there are places in this country where teenagers are better armed than police, and people are scared to walk down the street to go to school. And so we just have to decide, you know, are we going to let all this rhetoric—you know, this country we get all—there's a lot of great things about America, but we're bad to say one thing and do another. We're pretty bad about that.

We all deplore violence, and we say punish people who do it. We are punishing people who do it. Our jails are full. We have a higher percentage of people behind bars than any country in the world today. But we won't pass the Brady bill. Now, let me say why that matters. That sounds like sort of a tepid bill now, given what else is being called for. But let me tell you why that matters.

In New York City last year, they confiscated something like 19,000 guns, whatever the figure is; 85 percent of them were from other States. So a State waiting period doesn't amount to a hill of beans when you've got the constitutional right to travel.

We've got to know, how old are these people buying these guns? Who are they? Do

they have a criminal record? Do they have a mental health history? It's a big deal.

The States can do something. Seventeen States have said kids can't own handguns unless they're out with their parents on a hunting trip or a target practice. A lot of States have tried to set up laws licensing gun dealers, but the Federal law will give you a license for 10 bucks, and the States can't overturn it yet.

You got hundreds of gun dealers out there, and there's no system about it. And maybe the most important thing of all is, you've got a lot of these people, most of them very young, a lot of them with drug problems, nearly all of them with no real connection to the rest of society, who have easy access to rapid-fire assault weapons, the sole purpose of which is to kill people quicker, in greater numbers. And we have lots of bills in Congress to do something about it, and we ought to do something about it. We ought to pass one of them and do something about it and take a stand. We have a crime bill which would put 50,000 more police officers on the street. It matters how many police officers are on the street, and I say to you, not so much for catching criminals quickly, although that is a big deal, but for preventing crime.

I'll just give you—first of all, look at New York. One of the few big cities in the country, where for 2 years running, there's been a decline in the crime rate in all seven major FBI categories because they went to a community policing system. Look at Houston, where the mayor there, Bob Lanier, got elected on a commitment to put the equivalent of 655 more police officers on the street and to concentrate them in areas of high crime, and they had a 17 percent drop in the crime rate the first year they did it. You can do this. And we ought to be about the business of helping our places become more safe. This is a huge deal. And the Democratic Party ought to do it. If we were the party of Social Security, why can't we be the party of health security and personal security and freedom from fear?

And finally let me say about the health care issue, I feel very strongly that this issue will define us not only as a party but as a people. Every day—and I don't mind a lot of this—

but every day I read something about somebody saying why can't we do this, that, or the other thing? Again, we have to look at what we are doing. What we are doing, we are spending 14½ percent of our income on health care. It'll be about \$900 billion this year. Canada spends a dime, or 10 percent of its income on health care, 10 percent of every dollar. Germany and Japan spend about 8.8 percent of every dollar. Nearly all of our major competitors are below that.

Now, there are some things that make the American health care system more costly that we wouldn't want to do anything about, and some things that we can't do anything about right now, at least in health care reform. What we don't want to do anything about is we have wonderful medical research and technology. We invest more in research, and we use more technology. And we don't want to change that.

What we can't do much about right now in the health care bill is that we have a higher percentage of poor people, a higher percentage of people with AIDS, a higher percentage of teenage births and low birth weight babies, and a much higher percentage of violence than any of our competitors. And that's all a health care issue. You pay for it when those folks show up every weekend all shot up and cut, and they don't have any health insurance. They pass it on to you. So, you pay for that. That's another big cost of violence. But that makes our system more expensive.

But then there's a whole lot of things that we can do something about, that it's unconscionable that we don't. I mean, we spend more than anybody else, and yet, we're the only major country that can't figure out how to give everybody basic health care, 37.4 million people, according to the last census, without health insurance. Two million people a month lose their health insurance, 100,000 of them lose it permanently. We are adding 100,000 people a month to the rolls of people without health insurance. It is hemorrhaging the system we have.

We know we spend a dime on the dollar more on paperwork and mindless administration than any other nation. We know that from studies. We know we hired 4 times as many clerical workers to work in hospitals

as medical personnel in the last decade. We know that the average doctor, in 1980, brought home 75 percent of the money that came into his or her clinic. And by 1990, it had dropped to 52 cents because of the explosion of bureaucracy and paperwork.

We know we have more fraud and abuse in this system, and a system that actually encourages the performance of unnecessary procedure, and a system so complicated, it's easier to game and to milk. We know that. We know that we don't cover primary and preventive care like we ought to. We don't cover mammograms and x-rays and cholesterol tests and prenatal care and well-baby visits, and so we spend more money in the long run because we won't spend a little money now to keep people well. We spend lots of money to take care of them once they get sick.

These are things we know. This is not some idle theory. We know that a country like Germany, for example, relies more on medicine than we do, because we cover medicine for Medicaid patients, but if you're a senior citizen on Medicare—just a little bit too much income to be on Medicaid, you can't get any help with your medicine. And we know it costs a lot of money to cover medicine in a health care bill, as we propose to do. But we also know there's a whole lot of people, especially older people, who choose every week between food and medicine. And if they choose food and not medicine, eventually they get sick and wind up in the hospital. And they can spend more in a hospital in one week than they'll spend in a year on medicine. So, these are things we know. These are not sort of idle speculations.

So, when people say to me, "Well, you know, this is a big risk, this might be expensive." I say, "It's not going to be as expensive as what will happen." We're now spending 14½ percent of our income on health care. If we do nothing, if we stay with this system, by the end of the decade we'll probably have 40 million or more uninsured, and we'll be spending 19 or 20 percent of our money on health care. You'll have doctor and hospital fees going through the roof, and miserable doctors and hospital administrators because more and more of the money they're charg-

ing you will go to pay for clerical work to hassle people to pay on insurance policies.

The time has come to put aside all the rhetoric and the reservations and realize we can't make this system any more complicated than it is. We'd have to work from now to kingdom come to make it any more expensive than it is on wasted things. And we can no longer afford the sheer insecurity that is gripping millions of Americans, not just those without health care but those who can never change their jobs because they've had somebody in their family get sick, those who are waiting for their business to fail, and they know they'll never get health care again, those who are just wrenching with the moral dilemmas of whether they need to cut their employees off health care because they can no longer afford it. I talked to a small business man in California this week, 12 employees, didn't have a single claim on his health insurance last year except for regular trips to the doctor. His premiums went up 40 percent. He said, "What am I going to do? I've got to choose between staying in business and doing right by these people who made me the money that I have today."

So, I say to you, my friends, the plan we have offered is a fair plan. We ask people who don't contribute to the system, but who work, to make a contribution, because now we're paying for them, the rest of you are. For small businesses with low wage workers, we offer a discount. So, we'll pay a little bit, but they ought to pay something. Everybody who can pay, ought to pay something into this system. It is not fair for the rest of you to pay for it. That's where two-thirds of this plan gets paid for. We asked for an increase in the cigarette tax. We asked for big companies that are going to self-insure to make some contribution to medical research and to public health facilities, like all the rest of us do. And we asked for credit for savings that will surely come in the Medicare and Medicaid program.

When you hear that I have proposed to cut Medicare and Medicaid, don't you believe it. Medicare and Medicaid are projected to go up at 3 times the rate of inflation. What we say is, "Adopt our plan, and they'll only go up at twice the rate of inflation." Now, in Washington, they think that's a cut.

Where I come from, most of us would give anything to have an income increase at twice the rate of inflation, wouldn't we?

So I ask you to think about these things. The time has come to give the American people security, health care that's always there, health care that can never be taken away. The time has come to simplify the system. The time has come to prove that we can make savings. These are unconscionable areas of waste. And we can do it and preserve quality. We can do it and actually increase the choices most Americans have. We can do it and let about two-thirds of the people who have insurance get the same or better insurance for the same or less cost. But it is going to require some change in the system.

But this is a security issue. Unless we can be secure in our work and families, unless we can be secure on our streets, unless we can be secure in our health care, I'm not sure the American people will ever be able to recover the personal optimism and courage to open up to the rest of the world, to continue to lead the world, to continue to reach out and break down the barriers of trade because we know a rich country can only create jobs through increasing the volume of trade, to make these internal educational and investment changes without which we cannot move toward the 21st century. So I ask you to keep doing what you're doing. Help us pass these bills. Get us a crime bill. Get us a health care bill. Get us the economic bills that we've got up there. Pass the Education 2000 bill, all of our education bills.

But remember what the big picture is. The big picture is the world is trending in directions we cannot fully understand, but we pretty nearly can imagine. And we have got to get to the 21st century with America still the strongest country in the world and with the American dream alive again and with a strong middle class again. That means we've got to change. And to change we have to give our people security again. We can do it. Together, we can do it.

Thank you and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:11 a.m. at the Washington Sheraton Hotel. In his remarks, he

referred to David Wilhelm, chairman, Kathleen Vick, secretary, Lottie Shackelford, Martha Love, and Debra DeLee, vice chairs, Democratic National Committee.

### **Exchange With Reporters on Departure for New Brunswick, New Jersey**

*October 8, 1993*

#### **Secretary of Defense Les Aspin**

**Q.** Are you going to support Les Aspin?

**The President.** Well, yes. I mean, what is the question in reference to? I'm sorry.

**Q.** In reference to all the complaints on Capitol Hill about his performance.

**The President.** Well, I will say again, I asked Secretary Aspin why the extra—weren't sent to Somalia. He said to me that when they were asked for, there was no consensus among the Joint Chiefs that it should be done. And he normally relied on their reaching a consensus recommendation on an issue like that, a military—[inaudible]. And secondly that it was never suggested to him that they were needed for the kind of defensive purposes that it's been speculated that they're useful for during this last raid, that it was only for offensive purposes, and that it was his best judgment that we were trying to get the political track going again, and we didn't want to send a signal that we were trying to conduct more offense in Somalia. He also said if anybody had made the defensive argument, that would have been an entirely different thing. And obviously if he had known then what he knows now, he would have made a different decision.

**Q.** Mr. President, did you know about the request in advance, sir?

**The President.** Did I know? No.

**Q.** Were you told—[inaudible]—and also do you think—

**The President.** No. And I was talking to General Powell on a very regular basis about this whole thing. This was not something that anybody brought to me directly.

#### **Somalia**

**Q.** Why won't the Somali warlords just go underground for 6 months and wait for us to get out and then declare victory? Isn't

there a danger in giving them a deadline when we're going to get out?

**The President.** Well, it might happen. But keep in mind, we're going to wind up—by then there should be an even larger U.N. force there. And that's our objective. In 6 months, we will have been there well over a year longer than we ever committed to stay.

So we will have given them well over a year longer, more personnel, and more efforts in this endeavor. We have obligations elsewhere, including this very important effort that we've invested a lot in in Haiti, to try to support that. So, I just don't believe that we can be in a position of staying longer than that.

I also think once we send a signal to them that we're not going to tolerate people messing with us or trying to hurt our people or trying to interrupt the U.N. mission, that we have no interest in denying anybody access to playing a role in Somalia's political future. I think a mixed message has been sent out there in the last couple of months by people who are doing the right thing. Our people are doing the right thing. They're trying to keep our folks alive, trying to keep the peace-keeping mission going, trying to get the food out there. But we need to clearly state, unambiguously, that our job is not to decide who gets to play a role in post-war Somalia, that we want the political process to work. So let's give it a chance to work and see if it does.

Thank you.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:20 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

### **Proclamation 6607—Leif Erikson Day, 1993**

*October 8, 1993*

*By the President of the United States  
of America*

#### **A Proclamation**

At this time every year, Americans celebrate Leif Erikson Day. In so doing, we commemorate the voyages of the great Norse ex-

plorer who first set foot on North America nearly a thousand years ago. At the same time, we also celebrate the enduring ties between America and the Nordic countries and take note of the outstanding contributions that Nordic Americans have made to the United States. In a sense, the bonds that Leif Erikson—son of Iceland, grandson of Norway—forged continue unbroken today. We maintain an impressive exchange of people and ideas with the Nordic countries.

The early settlers inherited an adventurous spirit that had led their ancestors from Scandinavia to much of Europe and into the Atlantic. In addition, these adventurers started from lands that were already halfway points between the Old World and the New. Even today, the Nordic countries, which possess a commitment to open, democratic societies and to peaceful relations among nations, serve as links between Europe and the rest of the world.

At a time when the relations between Europe and America are being redefined, the Nordic countries retain their important role in fostering democracy, transatlantic cooperation, and an open trading system. Their many contributions to international diplomacy, humanitarian assistance, and peacekeeping in the world's trouble spots set a high standard that the rest of the world greatly admires. Americans who trace their roots to the Nordic countries—Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden—not only continue to enrich their new homeland, but also play a key part in providing a link across the Atlantic, just as their ancestors did a thousand years ago.

In honor of Leif Erikson and of our Nordic-American heritage, the Congress, by joint resolution approved on September 2, 1964 (Public Law 88-566), has authorized and requested the President to proclaim October 9 of each year as "Leif Erikson Day."

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 9, 1993, as Leif Erikson Day. I also encourage the people of the United States to observe this occasion by learning more about our rich Nordic-American heritage and the early history of our continent.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this eighth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 3:35 p.m., October 12, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 14.

### **Proclamation 6608—Columbus Day, 1993**

*October 8, 1993*

*By the President of the United States  
of America*

#### **A Proclamation**

During 1993 the world has embarked on new trails to expand humanity's horizons and to promote the betterment of the human condition. As we look with hope to the future, we also pay homage to our past and to those who have helped shape our Nation and continent. It is therefore fitting that the voyages of Christopher Columbus be remembered. I welcome this opportunity to salute this man of great courage, who, in defiance of popular myth and hardship, had the vision to explore the unknown.

Even though the Quincentennial celebrations of Columbus' landfall are past, it is still our duty to promote understanding between the old and new worlds. It is important to commemorate the mutual discovery of Europeans and Native Americans and the transformations, through toil and pain, that gave birth to brave new hopes for a better future.

For the United States, it is especially significant that we recognize the daring voyages of Christopher Columbus. As a people whose land was founded on dreams, we proceed today, just as Columbus did, with courage to overcome obstacles and search for new paths to lead us into an unknown, but promising, future.

Many people in the United States have special reason to remember and celebrate

the histories of the old and new worlds. America, a Nation of diverse peoples, has been enriched by the blending of many heritages. Americans of international descent, along with Native Americans, have contributed mightily to molding the framework of our great land, united by our allegiance to the principles of equality, democracy, and freedom. We all take justifiable pride in our accomplishments and dedicate ourselves to the pursuit of our dreams.

In tribute to Columbus' achievement, the Congress of the United States by joint resolution of April 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 657), and an Act of June 28, 1968 (82 Stat. 250), has requested the President to proclaim the second Monday in October of each year as "Columbus Day."

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 11, 1993, as Columbus Day. I call upon the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities. I also direct that the flag of the United States be displayed on all public buildings on the appointed day in honor of Christopher Columbus.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this eighth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 3:36 p.m., October 12, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 14.

### **Nomination for an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture**

*October 8, 1993*

The President today announced his intention to nominate Fred Slabach as Assistant Secretary of Congressional Relations at the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

"Fred Slabach knows how important the Agriculture Department is to rural Americans. I know he will represent their concerns

fairly in Washington, with this administration and with Congress," the President said.

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

---

### **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.

---

#### **October 3**

In the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton attended the 41st annual Red Mass at St. Matthew's Cathedral with members of the Supreme Court. In the afternoon, the President traveled to Sacramento, CA. Later that evening, he went to San Francisco, CA, where he remained overnight.

#### **October 4**

In the afternoon, the President went to Los Angeles, CA. Later in the evening, he attended the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee dinner at the Beverly Hilton Hotel.

The White House announced the President appointed two officials to the Department of Commerce: Michael J. Copps as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Basic Industries and Rolland Schmitt as Assistant Administrator of the National Marine Fisheries Service in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

#### **October 5**

In the evening, following his return from Los Angeles, CA, to Washington, DC, the President attended the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee dinner at the Washington Hilton Hotel.

#### **October 6**

In the morning, the President met with Members of Congress on NAFTA.

**October 7**

In the morning, the President met with Members of Congress on the situation in Somalia. Later in the morning, he met with Members of Congress on NAFTA. Following the meetings, the President had lunch with the Vice President.

**October 8**

In the early afternoon, the President traveled to New Brunswick, NJ, where he participated in discussions and spoke on health care and violence at the Robert Wood Johnson Hospital. He then returned to Washington, DC, in the evening.

---

**Nominations  
Submitted to the Senate**

---

**Submitted October 5**

Robert S. Gelbard,  
of Washington, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics Matters, vice Melvyn Levitsky, resigned.

**Submitted October 7**

Nicholas Andrew Rey,  
of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Poland.

David W. Hagen,  
of Nevada, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Nevada, vice Edward C. Reed, Jr., retired.

Claudia Wilken,  
of California, to be U.S. district judge for the Northern District of California, vice a new position created by Public Law 101-650, approved December 1, 1990.

Mary Dolores Nichols,  
of California, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, vice William G. Rosenberg, resigned.

---

**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 October 1<sup>1</sup>**

White House statement on emergency assistance to earthquake victims in India

**Released October 4**

Announcement of the President's plan to honor 18 artists and scholars

Fact sheet on announcement of the preferred site for the B-Factory

White House statement announcing the President's request to Congress for funds to rebuild the Cypress Freeway

**Released October 5**

Remarks by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers in Culver City, CA

**Released October 6**

Transcript of a press briefing by Assistant to the President for Economic Policy Bob Rubin, Council of Economic Advisers Chair Laura D'Andrea Tyson, Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen, Labor Secretary Bob Reich, and Small Business Administrator Erskine Bowles

Listing of Members of Congress meeting with the President on the North American Free Trade Agreement

**Released October 7**

Listing of Members of Congress meeting with the President on Somalia

Transcript of a press briefing by Secretary of State Warren Christopher, Secretary of Defense Les Aspin, and Admiral David Jeremiah

**Released October 8**

Transcript of a press briefing by the President's Senior Adviser for Policy Development

---

<sup>1</sup> This statement was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

ment Ira Magaziner on cost estimates in the President's health care reform proposal

White House statement containing excerpts of letters from business leaders supporting the President's health care reform plan

---

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

---

#### ***Approved October 6***

H.R. 20 / Public Law 103-94  
Hatch Act Reform Amendments of 1993

H.R. 1513 / Public Law 103-95  
To designate the United States courthouse located at 10th and Main Streets in Richmond, Virginia, as the "Lewis F. Powell, Jr. United States Courthouse"

H.R. 2431 / Public Law 103-96  
To designate the Federal building in Jacksonville, Florida, as the "Charles E. Bennett Federal Building"

S. 464 / Public Law 103-97  
To redesignate the Pulaski Post Office located at 111 West College Street in Pulaski, Tennessee, as the "Ross Bass Post Office"

S. 779 / Public Law 103-98  
To continue the authorization of appropriations for the East Court of the National Museum of Natural History, and for other purposes

S.J. Res. 61 / Public Law 103-99  
To designate the week of October 3, 1993, through October 9, 1993, as "Mental Illness Awareness Week"

S.J. Res. 121 / Public Law 103-100  
To designate October 6, 1993 and 1994, as "German-American Day"

#### ***Approved October 8***

H.R. 2074 / Public Law 103-101  
To authorize appropriations for the American Folklife Center for fiscal years 1994 and 1995

H.R. 3051 / Public Law 103-102  
To provide that certain property located in the State of Oklahoma owned by an Indian housing authority for the purpose of providing low-income housing shall be treated as Federal property under the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, 81st Congress)

S. 1130 / Public Law 103-103  
Federal Employees Leave Sharing Amendments Act of 1993