


Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, November 8, 1993
Volume 29—Number 44
Pages 2215–2282

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

- Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform, Executive order signing ceremony—2266
- California fires—2221, 2250
- Community in Ambridge, PA—2246
- Historically black colleges and universities, Executive order signing ceremony—2232
- New York City
 - Queens County Democrats—2217
 - Rally for Mayor David Dinkins—2215
- North American Free Trade Agreement Endorsements—2241
- Gillette Co. in Boston, MA—2218
- Legislation, transmittal signing ceremony—2244
- Lexmark International in Lexington, KY—2256
- Midwest agricultural community, teleconference—2269
- U.S. Chamber of Commerce—2225
- Radio address—2223

Appointments and Nominations

- Air Force Department
 - Assistant Secretary—2240
 - Under Secretary—2240
- Commerce Department
 - Assistant Secretary—2240
 - Patent and Trademark Office, Assistant Commissioners—2244
- Energy Department, Under Secretary—2240
- Housing and Urban Development Department, Senior Executive Service—2266
- Labor Department, Senior Executive Service—2266

Appointments and Nominations—Continued

- State Department, Ambassador to Djibouti—2240
- U.S. International Development Cooperation Agency, Agency for International Development, Senior Executive Service—2266

Bill Signings

- Most-favored-nation trade status for Romania legislation, statement—2244
- Rural Electrification Loan Restructuring Act of 1993, statement—2237
- Wool and mohair subsidies phaseout legislation, statement—2237

Communications to Congress

- Budget rescissions, message—2239
- Continuation of Iran emergency, message transmitting notice—2239
- Cyprus conflict, letter—2277
- North American Free Trade Agreement, messages—2254, 2255
- Republic of Korea-U.S. fishery agreement, message transmitting—2279

Communications to Federal Agencies

- Trade with Japan, memorandum—2225

Executive Orders

- Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform—2268
- Historically Black Colleges and Universities—2234
- Marshall Islands, Micronesia, and Palau compact management, amendment—2253

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

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

Interviews With the News Media

- Exchanges with reporters
- Cabinet Room—2266
- Lexington, KY—2256
- Oval Office—2240, 2244

Notices

- Continuation of Iran Emergency—2238

Proclamations

- National Health Information Management
 Week—2251

Statements by the President

- Peace process in Northern Ireland—2225

Statements Other Than Presidential

- Drug control policy—2252

Supplementary Materials

- Acts approved by the President—2281
- Checklist of White House press releases—
 2281
- Digest of other White House
 announcements—2279
- Nominations submitted to the Senate—2280

Week Ending Friday, November 5, 1993

Remarks at a Rally for Mayor David Dinkins in New York City

October 28, 1993

The President. This is not one but two hard acts to follow. I am glad to be back in Queens. And I'm here because I still love New York.

I want to say that when I was waiting to come out here tonight, I listened to the choir and the music and my friend Judy Collins. And they were great, and they got me in a wonderful frame of mind. I listened to all of you cheer. I listened to my friend Gary Ackerman tell me that he grew up in a public housing unit called Pominant near here. His mother is right over there. And I want to say right now that the first time Congressman Ackerman visited me in the White House, he looked around at the White House and he said, "Don't feel bad, Mr. President, I used to live in public housing, too."

I want to thank Tom Manton and Carolyn Maloney and Nydia Velázquez and my dear friend Floyd Flake and Gary Ackerman for being my partners in the Congress of the United States. I want to thank Claire Shulman and Freddy Ferrer and Peter Vallone and all the other leaders of the Democratic Party here, and Tom Van Arsdale and the leaders of the House of Labor for giving us a place to meet and a cause to fight for.

I want to say a strong word for the rest of this ticket, Alan Hevesi and my friend of many years Mark Green, who will make a strong team when Mayor Dinkins is re-elected on Tuesday.

And I want to say one other thing. I know I should be mindful of New York every waking minute, but once in a while, just once in a while, you slip my mind. [*Laughter*] Now, this morning I went out running, as I do every morning, and I wore a cap that I was given the other night when we showed a wonderful movie at the White House about

a young man who overcomes enormous odds to fulfill his lifetime dream of playing football at Notre Dame.

Audience members. "Rudy"!

The President. The title of the movie is "Rudy." I didn't realize that when they showed it on the CNN or wherever that there might be some political connotation to that. [*Laughter*] So when I learned that there was, I remembered that there was another movie made a few months ago that I also liked very much called "Dave." So let me tell you, I liked both movies a lot, but when it comes to being Mayor, Dave's my man.

Ladies and gentlemen——

Audience member. We love you, Bill!

The President. Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have read some criticism, some of which I sort of understand, from people saying, "Well, you know, the Vice President and Mrs. Gore and the President and the First Lady, they've all been there campaigning for Mayor Dinkins. What are they doing there? They don't have a vote in New York." Well, we may not have a vote in New York, but we have a stake in New York. How can America do well if New York City or New York State don't do well? How can we be the kind of country we ought to be if the home of the Statue of Liberty is not a living example of our liberty and our triumph and the strength of our diversity?

I also know that elections always stand for things. The voters of New York, no different than the voters of any other place in America, have been through a long, tough time. For 20 years now, most hourly wage earners have been working longer work weeks for the same or lower wages, when you take account of inflation. For 10 years, many workers have given up all their pay increases just to pay for higher health care costs. More and more when people lose their jobs, they don't get the same job back; they have to get another job. And often it doesn't pay as well or have as good benefits.

More and more, people look at the present with some sense of insecurity. All over America I've told the story of the man who worked at a hotel in Manhattan who told me that his son wanted him to support me, but if he did it, he wanted me to make his son free. And by that he meant free to walk to school without fear of being shot or attacked.

These are things that everyone in America feels. And when people are frustrated and anxiety-ridden, they naturally tend to vote to change things, whatever it is. Look at the Canadian elections. Look at what's happening in Europe, all over the world: every wealthy country having trouble creating jobs, having trouble giving people higher incomes when they work harder and smarter.

We are seeing, my fellow Americans, a lot of problems in the world and a lot of problems at home. I ran for President because I wanted to change that. But here's what I want to say to you. And this is the message I have to everyone in New York, whether like me, a Democrat born and bred, or a Republican or an independent or a member of one of the other parties here: Yes, we must change America.

Every day I get up and go to work to do that. Today we saw the deficit this year is over \$50 billion less than we were told it was going to be on the day I became President. Why? Because we went after it. We brought down interest rates; we proved you could bring down the deficit. And for the first time in a long time, when you got that report the deficit was smaller, not bigger, than all the politicians said it was going to be. Yes, we need change.

Yes, we need more jobs. But in the first 9 months of this administration we have more jobs in the private sector created than in the previous 4 years. Is it enough? Of course not. But we are on the right path.

Yes, we need changes in education. Yes, we need changes so we can sell more of our products around the world. Yes, we need all kinds of changes. But here is what I want to say to you: For the people who are laboring to produce change, you should have a reward, not a punishment. If we need better education, shouldn't we reelect a Mayor—without any help in Washington, no help from Washington, found a way to keep the

libraries open 6 days a week and to promote education?

If we need health care security for all, shouldn't we reelect a Mayor who's actually got a theory about how to use these public health clinics to keep people well and give primary and preventive services and keep people in a position where they can have more health care for lower costs? I think we should.

If crime is a scourge tearing at the heart of America and ripping up families and communities, shouldn't we reelect a Mayor who with no help from Washington put 6,000 more police officers on the street and, not according to his campaign literature but according to the FBI statistics, oversaw a reduction in the total number of crimes reported in all major categories from over 700,000 to over 600,000 a year? Sure, there's too much crime, but if a guy's doing right by it, why punish him? Reward him. Send a message to other people throughout America that you want change and you will reward change, and people will vote for those who have the courage to change. That's what this is about.

And tell me, you walk across to your neighboring State where Governor Florio is running for reelection, and you look here, and you see two people who said we need more cops, fewer guns, and we need to do things to give people a chance to have a better way in life; we need to give them something to say yes to, not just tell them no all the time. So we're going to prevent crime, punish crime but give people a chance to escape from a life of crime and from a fabric of destruction. When people are committed to that kind of change, no matter how frustrated, no matter how angry, no matter how hopeless people sometimes feel in their darkest moments, those are the public officials who should be rewarded. How can we make progress if the voters cannot make distinctions between those who fight for the right kind of change and those who do not? This man has earned reelection, and I hope you will give it to him on Tuesday.

The other thing I want to say to you is that it is easier to be a good President for New York City and for New York State if you have a good partner at city hall or in

the statehouse. It is easier. I know we have a lot of work to do. Today, just today, I asked Congress to act on the vision of Mayor Dinkins and Senator Moynihan so that the Federal Government can work with New York City and New York State to build a new railroad station inside the old post office on 33d Street in Manhattan. For more than half a million commuters every day, Penn Station is the gateway to New York City. We can build a beautiful new station worthy of this great future and this great city.

This is the beginning of the kinds of things we must do together. But I need your help. So what if we pass a health care plan—we've got to do that—and every one of your Members of Congress vote for it. How will it work? How will it work? We must still have the clinics in the cities where the people are isolated from care. We must still make sure the great hospitals can prosper and provide care. We must still, in short, have the kind of partnership with this city so that when we pass a bill providing health care security for all of our people, health care that is always there, health care that can never be taken away, it is really there when people show up the next day. That requires a partnership with a Mayor and a city committed to providing quality health care to all the people who live here. That is why I want you to reelect David Dinkins on Tuesday.

My fellow Americans, I believe with all my heart the decisions we make as a people in the next 4 to 5 to 6 years will shape America for 50 years. We have finally admitted as a people that we can no longer ignore the great challenges of our age: the great challenges of global economy, the great challenges of crime here at home, the challenge to make a strength out of our diversity, the challenge to educate and train our people better, the challenge to liberate our people from the scourge of fear on the streets. We know what we have to do.

We know we can no longer ignore the fact that when there is no investment in these distressed neighborhoods, whether they're in the inner cities of New York and Chicago and Detroit or back home where I come from in the Mississippi Delta, which is still the lowest income part of America, we know we can't ignore those anymore. We cannot

let the fact that we know we have great problems blind us to our promise or take away our ability to distinguish between those leaders who have embraced the challenges and change and taken the steps necessary to move to the future, and those who have not.

I come here, yes, because I am a Democrat; yes, because David Dinkins is my friend; yes, because I never pass up a chance to come to Queens and New York City. Yes, I come here for all those reasons. But I'm telling you, far more important than all of that, I come here because I believe we need leaders who think children should have a chance to read, who think people should have a chance to live in safe neighborhoods, who believe that we have to have health care that works at the grassroots level, who have plans to put people back to work and give them jobs and hopes, who have embraced the cause of change. And I know that every day, to the best of his God-given ability, in every way he can, David Dinkins gets up and does that. And I know when you give him 4 more years on Tuesday, he will be the best partner the President of the United States could ever have. Do it! We need you!

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:18 p.m. at Electric Industries Hall. In his remarks, he referred to Judy Collins, entertainer; Claire Shulman, Queens Borough president; Fernando Ferrer, Bronx Borough president; Peter Vallone, speaker, New York City Council; Tom Van Arsdale, former labor leader; Alan Hevesi, candidate for New York City comptroller; and Mark Green, candidate for New York City public advocate. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Telephone Remarks to the Queens County Democratic Dinner in New York City

October 28, 1993

Hello. Thank you very much, Tom.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's great to be with you, even by telephone. I was here tonight on behalf of Mayor Dinkins, with Congressman Manton and Congressman Ackerman and Congressman Floyd Flake, Congress-

woman Carolyn Maloney, and Congresswoman Nydia Velázquez. We think we did some good for Mayor Dinkins here tonight. And I know you will on election day.

I was just reminiscing with Tom about the time when I came to your meeting last year in early 1992 when I took the subway from Manhattan and I came out to Queens to the meeting, and your organization got behind me early and stayed with me through the dark days and the bright ones. And I will never forget it. And I want you to know that I am still as grateful to you today as I was on the day we won the New York primary and the day we won the general election.

I also want you to know that we're making progress on all the things that I talked about in Queens so long ago. We just got the report today that the Government's deficit is over \$50 billion less this year than we thought it was going to be; that we've got some real growth back in the economy; and that more jobs have been created in the private sector in the first 9 months of this administration than in the previous 4 years of the last one.

Now, we've still got a long way to go, and we've got a lot of work to do. I need your help to pass a comprehensive health care bill that gives health care security to all the people who live in Queens. And we've got a chance now to pass a crime bill that will put more police officers on the street, and pass the Brady bill and other bills that will keep some of these terrible guns out of the hands of kids and others who are using them in the wrong way. We've got to do that. And I need your help to do that.

But I want you to know we're moving in the right direction, and we're not going to stop until we've got this economy up and going, provided health care for all, and made our streets safer.

To do all that, I need to just remember the kind of people I met at the Queens Democratic meeting the first time I came up there. I want you to know I'll never forget you, and I'm grateful to you. I want you to stay behind your Members of Congress so they can stay behind me, and help elect the Mayor on Tuesday.

Thank you very much.

NOTE. The President spoke at 6:47 p.m. from Electric Industries Hall. In his remarks, he referred to Representative Thomas J. Manton. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks on NAFTA to Gillette Employees in Boston, Massachusetts

October 29, 1993

Thank you very much. I've had a good time here today. I'm a satisfied customer, that's true. And I rarely cut myself, and when I do, it's my fault, not yours. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Zeien and Governor Weld, Senator Kennedy, Senator Kerry, Congressman Moakley, Congressman Kennedy, and my other friends here today. This was a good experience for me for a lot of reasons. I've had a wonderful day today. We dedicated the Kennedy Museum over at the Kennedy Library. I urge you all to go and see it. It's wonderful, improved, accessible. It's terrific. And they even put a little clip of me in there talking, so I like it better. [*Laughter*]

And I spoke at the Kennedy Library about the challenges that President Kennedy faced over 30 years ago: trying to get America to solve its problems here at home, which at that time were largely the problems of civil rights, and still to be adventuresome when looking toward the future; when he launched the space program, which we're trying to keep alive and keep going today; when he agreed to establish and push for the establishment of the Peace Corps and the Alliance for Progress in Latin America; and when he started a trade adjustment program for people who lost their jobs in trade because he knew that if we did it right, we'd always have more winners than losers, but people who lost their jobs should be retrained so they could get new and different jobs. And this is the kind of replay in some ways of that time, with a more complex and difficult set of problems.

I feel right at home here, when before—I tell people, back when I had a life, before I became President—I was the Governor of what my opponent in the last election called

“a small southern State” that had 22 percent of its work force in manufacturing. And my job was essentially schools and jobs. That’s what I did for a living. I was in plants all the time; I frequently worked shifts in plants. I understand a little bit about machine tools and how they work and how they’re adjusted. I now know what a bam, a cam, and a pam is.

I had some plants when I was the Governor of my State that shut down and went to Mexico. And because it was a small State, I knew who they were and what they did for a living. I was quite proud of the fact that before I left office, I brought one of them back, because our people were doing a better job in productivity and product modification, just like you are.

And so I want to talk a little bit today just as briefly as I can, because Mr. Zeien has already said how this plant and this company will benefit if NAFTA passes. Everybody knows there will be some winners and some losers. But there’s a lot of sort of fogginess about why this is good for America or why it’s bad. And I want to go through this because I need your help. And the Congress needs your help, not his help. With all due respect to him, Members of Congress know most business people are for NAFTA, but they can figure out that if you’re smart and you’re running a business, you can benefit six and one-half dozen of the other. That is, you could benefit in Mexico or in the U.S. So the Members of Congress want to know that you’re going to win if it passes. And you hired them; so they should want to know if you’re going to win, right? They work for you, just like I do.

The first thing I want to say is, I have lived with the manufacturing changes of the last 15 years. And I would never knowingly do anything that would cost Americans jobs.

I am for this agreement for quite a few reasons. The first and big reason is this: There is no evidence whatever that a wealthy country cannot only grow wealthier but can actually create jobs and raise incomes unless it expands trade and promotes the growth of the global economy. Why? Because if you have a stagnant economy, when, as you know, you can move money around the world in a millisecond—technology can be adapted

around the world, management can be moved around the world—if you have a stagnant economy and poorer countries are growing with new manufacturing, that means that people in richer countries will work harder for less money.

That is exactly what has happened in the United States for 20 years. A lot of hourly wage earners have worked harder for lower wages. But guess what, it’s happening everywhere. If you look at Europe where there’s no growth today, if you look at France even when they had growth, the unemployment rate in the last 5 years never going below 9.5 percent, it is clear that a wealthy country can only grow wealthier in terms of jobs and income at a time when the global economy is growing and they are selling more of their products and services beyond their borders as well as within their borders. Nobody has ever been able to demonstrate the contrary to me in the modern world.

So therefore, one of our biggest problems in America today is no growth in Europe, no growth in Japan. One of our biggest opportunities is that Latin America, including Mexico, is the second fastest growing part of the world. And it’s right here handy, and they like to buy our products.

The second thing I want to say is this: A lot of the problems people have with this NAFTA agreement they have because they believe that the present relationships we have with Mexico have encouraged people, because wages and cost of production are lower there, to go to what is called the *maquilladora* area. It’s right across the American border in Mexico. If you produce there, you can send your product back into our country duty-free. We created that several years ago since we wanted to help Mexico grow. But in the 1980’s when the global economy got really tough and the screws were tightened on company after company after company, a lot of people said, “Okay, we’ll move down there.”

Now, here’s the second reason I’m for NAFTA. All the problems associated with the *maquilladora* issue will get better if we adopt it, and they won’t if we don’t. That is, forget about selling razor blades in Mexico. Just imagine what’s going on to the plants that have moved down there. If this agreement

passes, labor costs in Mexico will go up more rapidly, environmental costs will go up more rapidly. Their requirement that products sold in Mexico be produced in Mexico will be reduced. We'll go from selling one to 50,000 or 60,000 American cars in the first year this agreement goes into effect. Their tariffs will go down.

So I understand the resentments, the fears, the insecurities of people, probably a lot of them who work within 20 miles of this plant. But we've got to read the agreement. The agreement makes those problems better, not worse. And that's the other reason I'm for it.

Finally, just let me say this: There will be some people who will be dislocated. There always are. If you have a trade agreement, just as President Kennedy recognized in 1962, there always are. I intend to ask the Congress to literally revolutionize the unemployment and the training system in this country.

You know, the average person who loses their job today does not get called back to the same company. That's the way it was for 40 years. It's not true anymore. The average person who loses a job today has to go find a job with a different company. Often it's a very different kind of job.

I agree with what Senator Kerry said: It's one thing to talk about changing work seven times in a lifetime and another thing to do it. If every one of you stays with Gillette until you retire, I'll bet you anything you'll have to change what you do. If every one of you stays with this company—some of you are quite young—for 20, 30, 40 years, you know as well as I do, 10 years from now the nature of your work will be different than it is today, even if you have the same employer. Isn't that right?

I know how different these machines are. How long ago was it when there wasn't anybody on an assembly line reading a computer? How long ago was it that you had to do all your quality checks visually and it took longer and not as well? I mean, the world is changing.

So as cruel or tough as it is, we can't pretend that it's not going to happen. You could—if we can't get all our titles straightened out, you could give us all—we could

all shift and take one another's job and we couldn't repeal the changes. They're going to happen.

So we have to decide, are we going to make these changes our friend or our enemy? Or are we going to have more Gillettes or more plants close down? Are we going to find more markets so we can secure the jobs we've got, add more jobs, and so companies can afford to give pay raises to their employees, or not? That is what is at stake.

There are a lot of misconceptions about Mexico. A lot of people say, "Well, we've got a trade surplus with them now, but only because they're buying our plant and machinery so they can put up plants that 5 years from now they'll be shipping all this stuff back here, and we'll have a trade deficit." Let me tell you something: 40 percent of the dollar value of our exports in the entire world are in capital goods, that is, things that can be used in manufacturing; 60 percent in consumer products. But in Mexico, only 33 percent of their purchases of our products are in capital goods; two-thirds in consumer products, like razor blades; two-thirds—more than the global average. That country now is the second biggest purchaser of American products. There's 90 million people there, and they're handy.

And you say, "Well, what do they get out of this deal?" I'll tell you what they get out of this deal. If we adopt this deal, it will be safer and more secure and more attractive for Americans to invest in Mexico, not along the border to export to America but down in Mexico City or over in Vera Cruz or in other places to put them to work making products for themselves. And that's good for you, too. Why? Because if more of them have jobs and the more income they've got, the more products of ours they can buy.

Now, we have a trade problem in America today, but it's not with Mexico, and it's not with Latin America. Tiny Colombia has increased their purchases of American products 69 and 64 percent in the last 2 years. What's our trade problem: \$49 billion trade deficit with Japan; \$19 billion trade deficit with China; \$9 billion trade deficit with Taiwan. We've got a \$5.7 billion trade surplus

with Mexico, and we're worried about them, when they want to buy more of our products?

Look, the people that are against this have legitimate fears and resentments and anger. There were a lot of workers that were thrown in the streets over the last 15 or 20 years. We have gone through two decades when a lot of hourly workers never got a pay raise. We are having a tough time creating jobs and income. But we don't want to cut off our nose to spite our face. We can't let this trade agreement become the flypaper that catches all those fears, because it will make it better not worse.

So I say, if you believe that, because you know what the experience of this company is, I want you to sit down and write a letter, not a pressure letter but a nice letter. Really, just two lines, to the Senators, to the Congressmen, or collect them all up and send them here and let them send them in. But they need to know that there's somebody out here in Massachusetts, somebody out here in south Boston, somebody in the entire United States that's going to make a living out of this deal, that understands that we're going to get more jobs and higher incomes and more opportunities if we do this. Because if we turn it away, it's really going to be a terrible thing.

You know, we actually get a trade advantage over the Japanese and the Europeans in Mexico if this passes? And if it fails and they still need the money to develop their country, what are we going to do, what's Gillette going to do in Mexico if they turn around and give that trade advantage to somebody else? If they offer this same deal to somebody else, I'll guarantee you the Japanese, the European Community would take this deal in a heartbeat. This is a good deal. It is no accident that the Ministry of Trade in Japan has come out against this deal. It is a good thing for us.

So I ask you to talk to your friends and neighbors, talk to the people who are worried about it, tell them their fears are well-founded, but they don't have anything to do with this agreement. This agreement will make it better. And meanwhile, we will keep working to build the security that Americans need.

We've already had more private sector jobs come into this economy in 9 months than

in the previous 4 years. We're tackling the health care issue. We're tackling the deficit issue. Interest rates are at a 30-year low. We are moving in the right direction. But I'm telling you, nothing I do as your President within the borders of the United States can create more jobs and higher incomes unless somebody buys the stuff we produce. And that requires us to expand our market. Help us to do that by personally telling the Members of Congress you'd appreciate it if they vote for the NAFTA agreement.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:20 p.m. on the factory floor. In his remarks, he referred to Alfred M. Zeien, CEO, Gillette Co. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Teleconference Remarks on the California Fires

October 30, 1993

The President. Hello?

James Lee Witt. Good morning, Mr. President.

The President. Have we got James Lee?

Mr. Witt. Yes, sir. I have Roger Johnson with me, the Administrator of GSA, at the disaster field office here in Pasadena. Secretary Espy is also on, who is at the Oak Grove fire camp in southern California.

Secretary Espy. Hello, Mr. President.

The President. Hello, Secretary Espy. How are you?

Secretary Espy. How are you doing, sir? I'm at the Oak Grove fire camp near Altadena, California.

Mr. Witt. Also, Mr. President, we have Senator Feinstein and Senator Boxer on, and Dick Andrews, the California director of emergency service is here in the disaster field office with Roger and I.

[At this point, Mr. Witt, Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, reported on conditions in California and discussed Federal, State, and private efforts to deal with the disaster.]

The President. That's good. That's very good.

[Mr. Andrews discussed the improvement in weather conditions which helped in fighting the fires, the number of fires still burning, and deployment of State and Federal resources to fight the fires.]

Mr. Witt then asked if the President had any questions.]

The President. No. I want to say before I go on to Secretary Espy that I have just been terribly impressed by the work of the people who have been out there fighting the fires. I know that we have provided from the Federal Government a lot of the firefighters. And of course, there have been the folks here at the local level. But it's been really amazing to me just to watch and see how hard they've worked.

As you know, Mack McLarty, who is here with me now, has been coordinating this from our end, so I've been pretty well briefed all along. I also want to say I'm very pleased that the Insurance Association is going to have people in the disaster assistance area. That's something, as you well know, James Lee, all of us could have used for years. And that's a very, very good sign, and I thank them.

Maybe I should hear from Secretary Espy and Roger Johnson and Senator Boxer and Senator Feinstein, and maybe then I'll see if we've got any questions.

[Secretary Espy reported to the President on the Kinneloa fire, the highest priority fire at that time, and the efforts of firefighters.]

The President. How much Federal land have we lost out there?

Secretary Espy. Oh, gosh. We've got 150,000 or so acres already burned.

The President. But a lot of it belongs to the Federal Government, doesn't it?

Secretary Espy. Yes, sir.

The President. Twenty thousand or thirty thousand acres, something like that?

Secretary Espy. We've got two major national forests out here, and it's under pretty good attack here. The problem in the future, of course, once the fires have receded, is re-vegetating and reseeding, making sure that in the Forest Service area, we can do a lot of rehabilitation. And so that's what we've got to turn our attention once the immediate situation abates.

The President. Well, we should be able to help California with that.

Secretary Espy. Yes, sir.

The President. We know how to do that.

Secretary Espy. We are. The Soil Conservation Service will be taking the lead in the rehabilitation exercises out here.

The President. Is Jim Lyons out there with you?

Secretary Espy. Jim Lyons is here. He's been here for a couple of days. Now, he's a little bleary-eyed, he had to get up this morning to do a bunch of things, but—

The President. He used to be a firefighter, didn't he?

Secretary Espy. Yes, he said he did. We're in a place that looks like a—

The President. We just thought he ought to have a little continuing education. [Laughter]

Secretary Espy. That's right. We need those pale guys to get their hands dirty every now and then.

The President. I really appreciate you, Mike. Thank you.

Secretary Espy. Well, thank you. Thank you. I just can't say enough about the good work. It's very prompt, very vigorous, effective. And you know, they've been out here from day one, many without sleep, without rest, and it's just incredible to be here. It's great.

The President. Is Roger Johnson on?

Roger Johnson. He's here, Mr. President. Good morning.

The President. You saved your home, didn't you?

Mr. Johnson. Yes, sir. They saved it.

The President. Congratulations.

[Mr. Johnson gave a brief description of the efforts of the General Services Administration's efforts to respond to the disaster and a personal view of the losses and firefighting efforts.]

The President. That's great. How many homes were lost, 350 in Laguna alone?

Mr. Johnson. Yes. About 700 overall, I think. Jumped into an area, Emerald Bay, where we used to live. So there were a lot of our friends there, and I think the home we used to live in is gone as well.

[At this point, Mr. Witt reported on plans for Federal and State authorities to meet with California insurance associations to provide for special needs in the application centers.]

The President. Thank you very much.

Senator Feinstein, Senator Boxer?

Senator Feinstein. Good morning, Mr. President. How are you?

The President. I'm fine.

[Senator Feinstein described the mobilization and organization of State firefighting strike teams and described Firescope, a unified command of Federal, State, and local authorities for dealing with the disaster.]

The President. Thank you. Thank you, Senator.

James Lee, I think you and Mike—

Senator Boxer. Do you have room for one more Senator?

The President. Yes. I'm going to call in just a minute. I just wanted to say to James Lee and Mike Espy, I think you ought to make a recommendation to me on what we should do on this unified command issue after you get back.

Senator Boxer, the floor is yours.

[Senator Boxer described the devastation, commended FEMA for its response to the disaster, and expressed her thanks to the President.]

The President. Thank you, Senator. I want to thank both the Senators. And, Dick Andrews, I thank you, and through you Governor Wilson, you tell him that if there's anything else we can do, you just pick up the phone and call.

And, to Roger Johnson and Secretary Espy and to James Lee Witt, I thank you all for your quick response, and I can't wait to talk to you some more in person after the fire dies down some more and we make sure that we don't forget them when the fire's gone. We'll be there for the followup.

I thank you all, and I hope you have a good day and keep those winds away out there. Thank you. Goodbye.

[At this point, the teleconference ended.]

Q. Are you going to California?

The President. I don't know that yet. We're going to monitor the winds today. That's the big issue. I don't want to be in

the way out there. They've got a lot of work to do. The thing, I think, is pretty well in hand now if they don't have a resurgence of the winds. So we're all basically going to—it's quite early there, it's still 7 a.m. in the morning. And we're just going to spend the next 4 or 5 hours waiting for the weather reports.

I've got to do the radio address, folks.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House. A portion of this item could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

The President's Radio Address

October 30, 1993

Good morning. In the next few days, you'll have the chance to pick up what may be the most important book of information you'll read for yourself, your children, your parents, and others you care about. It's a book that's also very important for the future of our Nation. The book is called "Health Security: The President's Report to the American People." And while it deals with a very complex issue, the overhaul and reform of our health care system, it does so in straightforward, very human terms.

The book describes our plan to solve the Nation's health care crisis by guaranteeing every working American comprehensive health care that's always there, that can never be taken away. While many people worked hard on this book, especially the First Lady and her task force on health care reform, in many ways, the book was written by you, the American people. For a long time, since I was the Governor of my State, I've been talking with Americans who, against their will, become all too familiar with the failings of our health care system, Americans caught without insurance or with inadequate insurance when they or a loved one became ill and when they needed the coverage the most, people who had their bank accounts emptied, their trust in the system betrayed, and too often their hearts broken.

Many of you listening today know someone who has fallen through the cracks of our

health care system. These cracks have become chasms that swallow hard-working Americans. More than 37 million Americans don't have health insurance at all, and 25 million more have very inadequate coverage with very high deductibles. Every month, 100,000 Americans lose their health coverage permanently.

Who are these people caught in this broken system? They are a working mother with a sick child who had to buy her own insurance and who, every month, must ask herself, "Do I pay the rent or the medical bills?"; a seventh grade teacher with breast cancer whose insurance provider disagreed with doctors over her care, the teacher had to run herself into debt to pay for her own chemotherapy; a doctor, frustrated by miles of red-tape and forms that steal time he should have with his patients.

These stories are not unique. Here at the White House, Hillary and I have had over 700,000 letters about health care, and 10,000 more pour in every week. Every one of them is a cry for action. So now we have a plan for action. Our health security legislation is a detailed bill to provide comprehensive, universal coverage for our people. Of course, it's only fair to ask who pays and how much.

There's been some confusion on this, so today let me give it to you straight. Under our plan, 60 percent of all the American people will pay the same or less to get the same or better benefits. I'll repeat that: 6 out of 10 of all Americans, and even more as the reforms begin to take effect and cost increases go down, will pay the same or less for the same or better benefits.

About 25 percent of our people, people who are now underinsured or people without insurance at all who can afford to pay, will pay a little more for coverage. But many of them will actually pay less in medical bills. Right now, there are lots of people with cheap premiums, because their deductibles, their up-front costs are so high, \$2,500, \$3,000, even \$5,000. Under our plan, their premiums may be a little higher, but their out-of-pocket costs will be lower.

Finally, about 15 percent, and only 15 percent of the American people or their employers, will pay more for the same benefits. These are the young, healthy, usually single

Americans whose insurance companies gamble under the current plan that they won't get sick. Is it fair to ask them to pay a little more so we can have broad-based community rating? I believe it is. Why? Because there are lots of young people who can't get insurance at all, because all these younger people will be older themselves someday, with children, and they'll need this fair rate. And when these young people do get sick or have an accident, or even marry someone with a preexisting health condition, well then, all bets are off. The insurance company may double their rates or drop them altogether. With our plan, their premiums may be a little higher, just a few dollars a month, but they'll be guaranteed coverage no matter what happens, and a guarantee that rates won't rise unchecked.

That's another thing I want to emphasize. Under our plan, there is a limit to what anyone can have taken away from them in health care. That's not true today. So 100 percent of the American people get something no one has today, absolute security. This plan is based on the principles of security, simplicity, savings, maintaining the quality of our health care system, maintaining and even increasing choice for consumers of health care, and insisting on more responsibility.

We focus on keeping people healthy, not just treating them after they get sick. We reduce paperwork and crack down on fraud. We protect the right to choose doctors and preserve and strengthen Medicare.

Right now I'll say again: There is no guarantee for anyone that health care will be there tomorrow. One of our citizens wrote us and said even employed insured people are one major illness away from financial disaster.

Before the end of the year, I want our lawmakers to pass a bill to guarantee health security for every American. That's the end of the congressional session next year. And I want to be clear on this. We'll debate many points of this plan, but this point must remain nonnegotiable: The health care plan must guarantee every American a comprehensive package of benefits that can never be taken

away. And I will only sign a bill into law that meets that fundamental commitment to the American people. We have delayed making good on it for too long.

Our lawmakers have a big job ahead, but they won't be alone. We've seen extraordinary support from both parties to reform health care. And I promise to work with Congress every step of the way. As a responsible citizen, you have a job, too. Learn all you can about this plan. Start with a book called "Health Security," and join the debate.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. from the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Statement on the Peace Process in Northern Ireland

October 30, 1993

I welcome the efforts of Irish Prime Minister Albert Reynolds and British Prime Minister John Major to reinvigorate the negotiations for peace in Northern Ireland. I join their condemnation of the use of violence for political ends and strongly support their commitment to restart talks among their two Governments and the four constitutional parties of Northern Ireland. Their joint statement issued yesterday in Brussels underscores their common resolve to work for peace, justice, and reconciliation in Northern Ireland. The United States stands ready to support this process in any appropriate way.

All friends of peace were outraged at the tragic and senseless IRA bombing in Belfast on October 23 and the ensuing violence. Especially in the wake of such action, we must redouble our efforts to reject violence and pursue the path of peace. As we remember the victims of the sectarian violence that has torn the region for too long, let us work together to ensure that the vision of the two Governments demonstrated in their joint statement bears lasting fruit.

Memorandum on Trade With Japan

October 29, 1993

Presidential Determination No. 94-3

Memorandum for the United States Trade Representative

Subject: Delegation of Authority to Modify or Restrict Title VII Trade Action Taken Against Japan

By the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including 3 U.S.C. section 301, I hereby delegate to the United States Trade Representative the powers granted the President in section 305(g)(2) of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2515(g)(2)) to modify or restrict the application of sanctions that were imposed upon Japan as a result of the identification of Japan as a country that discriminates against United States products or services in government procurement of construction, architectural and engineering services; 58 Fed. Reg. 36226 (July 6, 1993).

This delegation of authority is effective until November 8, 1993. You are authorized and directed to publish this determination in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:37 a.m., November 1, 1993]

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 1, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on November 2.

Teleconference Remarks on NAFTA to the United States Chamber of Commerce

November 1, 1993

The President. Thank you very much. I'm delighted to see all of you here and to know

that there are people all across the country watching this important event. I thank the chamber of commerce for organizing this and for providing the technology that makes it possible. I'm glad to see Governor Edgar of Illinois here. And I listened intently in the back room there to my former colleagues, Governor Wilson and Governor Weld, talk about NAFTA. I want to thank Dick Leshner and Ivan Gorr and Larry Bossidy for their work through USA*NAFTA and the chamber of commerce to help us pass this very important piece of legislation. And I think former Congressman Bill Frenzel, who's the cochair of our effort, is here somewhere. I want to thank him for making our bipartisan administration effort as successful as it's been.

I know that there are people all over the country here, but if you'll forgive me for a little bit of parochialism, I want to observe that there are 150 people from my home State of Arkansas listening at the Excelsior Hotel in Little Rock, where we had the economic summit last December, and one of our good employers I just shook hands with on the platform up here.

I say that to make this point: Any Governor will tell you that the job of being Governor today is the job of getting and keeping jobs and educating and training people to do them. That is the lion's share of the work, on a daily basis, of doing that job. For a dozen years, it was my job to try to deal with the pressures of global competition, the enormous economic difficulties of the 1980's. When plants closed, I knew people's names who ran the plants and worked in the plants. When people closed their plants and went to Mexico, I knew about them. And I was proud that of the three or four we lost when I was Governor, we actually brought one back before I left office. It made me feel that in part, we had squared the circle.

The point I want to make is this: Anybody who has ever dealt with these issues knows that most of the arguments being raised against NAFTA today are arguments being raised about economic forces and developments that occurred in the past. And anybody who has ever read the agreement knows that if you don't like it when people shut plants down and move to Mexico, that this agree-

ment will actually make that less likely. And if we don't pass it, it will do nothing to stop what people who are complaining about it are complaining about.

I would never knowingly do anything that would cost an American a job. My job is to try to recover the economic vitality of this country by working in partnership with the private sector. It is important, it is imperative that we make it clear to the American people, first of all, that you ought to look at what this agreement does: It helps to alleviate the problems that led to so many jobs moving out of our manufacturing sector, either into machines or offshore, whether to Mexico or to other places.

I want to acknowledge that in Cincinnati today, Congressman David Mann is there with 130 people at the General Electric aircraft engine plant. I think if NAFTA passes we'll not only sell aircraft engines from Cincinnati, we may even sell some of that Cincinnati chili, too. In Seattle there are 100 people in attendance at the Lake Washington Technical College. One in six jobs in the State of Washington are related to trade today, and by the time most of the students at that college hit their stride, even more jobs will be dependent on trade.

I have to tell you that again I have heard all the debates on this issue. I have listened carefully to the opponents and the supporters. I have never heard anyone seriously argue that a great country with a high per capita income can expand its incomes or its jobs without expanding trade. There is simply no way to do it. There is no example anywhere now of a country that can grow more jobs without selling its products beyond its borders. And that, in the end, is the most important lesson we have to learn if we're going to make a good decision about NAFTA.

When I became President, I had a very clear set of priorities in my mind about what I thought we ought to do with this economy. I knew we had to try to bring the deficit down and get interest rates down. And it's immensely gratifying to have the lowest home mortgage rates in 25 years, the lowest 30-year rate since we've been calculating them come out in the last few months, to know that the deficit came in \$55 billion less this

year than we were told it would be on January 20th. But I also know that even though there are indications that we see an increase in investment in homes, in cars, in long-term investments by businesses, in the end this economy will not grow unless we sell more of our products and services beyond our borders. We cannot simply create a healthy economy only by changes here.

The other day we announced our new export initiative, which among other things removed over \$35 billion worth of high-tech equipment from export controls and opened those things to the international market, computers, supercomputers, telecommunications equipment. Someone has to buy them. In the last 2 years, Mexico has gone from purchasing 390,000 to 600,000 computers, just from one year to the next. But 600,000 in a consumer market of 90 million men, women, and children is not so many. Think what will happen when the barriers, the tariffs, go down, when there is no 20 percent tariff barrier. And think what it will be like when that tariff barrier is down for us but not for our major competitors. We've been on the opposite side of that fence a lot of times. Now we're going to be given preferential treatment in a market that we're going to help develop. It's a very, very important issue.

I want to say to all of you that if we don't approve NAFTA, it will weaken our ability to get a General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade passed by the end of the year. If we do approve NAFTA, it will not only put us in a stronger position with Mexico and with all the rest of Latin America, it will help us to say to our trading partners in Europe and in Asia what we really need is to continue to expand trade worldwide.

The real job gains in NAFTA come not just from passing NAFTA, although we are convinced it will create 200,000 new jobs by 1995. The real job gains come when we take that NAFTA agreement and we take it to Chile, we take it to Argentina, we take it to Colombia, we take it to Venezuela, we take it to the other market-oriented democracies in Latin America and enable us to create a consumer market of over 700 million people, soon to be over one billion people, early in the next century, and we use that leverage

then to say to our friends in Asia and our friends in Europe that it's okay for you to have trading blocs but we need to open up trading worldwide. We need that. If we don't pass NAFTA, our leverage to get that done will be much more limited.

So I say to all of you it is important not only on its own terms, but this issue has acquired an enormous significance because of the advantage it will give us in the Mexican market over our competitors in Japan and Europe and because of the leverage that will then give us to get a worldwide trade agreement that the world desperately needs to restore global growth. Without that, we're not going to be able to sell our products; we're not going to be able to create more jobs; we're not going to be able to see our workers' incomes go up. With it, we have the prospect of having several years now of sustained, vigorous economic growth because we are getting control of our economic house; we are putting things in order; we are getting our priorities straightened out in this country; we are focusing on investment and on training. We have to have the markets.

Now let me just say one final thing about this. I think if there were a secret vote in the Congress today, we would win. Now, that's a big issue, winning the secret ballot. I say that not to criticize anyone or to put anyone down but to recognize that the pressures against NAFTA are enormous. But they reflect, as I have said many times in many places, the accumulated frustrations and grievances and insecurities people bring to this day in American history. More and more people are worried about losing their jobs. More and more people know if they lose their jobs, they won't get it back. That's true. That's true. We have an unemployment system premised on a set of conditions that no longer exist, you know, you lose your job, and then the recession's over and your old company hires you back. That only happens about one in five times now.

So there is all this uncertainty out there in America today. I understand that. And our administration has done what we could to try to alleviate the insecurities of the American working families. The family leave law was designed to say to people, "You can be a good worker and a good parent." The attempt to

control health care costs and still provide health care for everyone is an attempt to say, "Yes, you may lose your job, but at least your family can be taken care of." The attempt that the Congress is making now on a bipartisan basis to pass a new crime bill is a way of saying, "We know you have to feel safer on your streets. If you work hard and play by the rules, you shouldn't worry about having your children shot going to and from school."

But with all of this, we cannot turn away from the global economy that is engulfing us. And what I want to ask all of you to do, every one of you listening to me today, is to think about what you can do between now and November 17th, either directly by contacting a Member of Congress or indirectly by getting employees or friends or others to contact Members of Congress to say, "We know America can compete and win. We are not going to turn tail and run. We have not given up on America."

The Mexican economy may have 90 million people, but today it is the size of California from Los Angeles to the Mexican border. The idea that America is just going to shrivel up if we adopt this trade agreement is ridiculous. This trade agreement is a door that opens all of Latin America to us. It is a lever that will open a broader trading system in the world to us. And we cannot run away. We've got to compete and win. You have to be, in other words, the engines of confidence in our future. And employees, people who work with you who understand this, can have a huge impact on turning what is now only a secret ballot victory on NAFTA into a public victory on November 17th.

This is a difficult time for America. And it's hard for people to have confidence when they've been battered and pushed around and worried. But we cannot turn away from the future that is there before us. I honestly believe the next 20 years could be the best 20 years this country ever had if we have the courage and the vision to take advantage of the end of the cold war, the continued efforts to reduce nuclear arms, the fact that economic competition may expand opportunity for everyone if we do it right.

When we started, NAFTA had a significance for those who were fighting against it

all out of proportion, all out of proportion to the impact it could have. You saw on that film there are several unions, many major unions in this country, who are going to gain jobs if this passes. But they decided that NAFTA would be the receptacle in which all the resentments and fears and insecurities of that last 12 to 20 years of stagnant wages and economic difficulties would be poured.

It has acquired a symbolic significance for those of us who are for it, too. This is a huge diplomatic, foreign policy, and economic issue for America. You simply cannot divide domestic and foreign policy anymore, as you once could. This is a major thing for the United States. If we walk away from this, if we walk away from this and Mexico decides to pursue its development strategy, what must it do? It must make this deal with Europe or with Japan. And what would that do? That could change the purchasing habits of 90 million Mexicans and hundreds of millions of people in Latin America. It could cut us off from not only economic but political opportunities to promote democracy and freedom and stability in our hemisphere that we can now only imagine.

If we embrace it, we not only will get in the immediate future a competitive advantage in selling into the Mexican market, a way of embracing all of Latin America, but the security of knowing that America is still marching in the right direction, that we are on future's side, that we are grasping for a time when our people will be able to compete and win in a global economy that will be less protectionist, more open, more full of opportunity, and more full of peace and democracy. This is a huge issue.

So I will close with this plea to you. This is not exactly like a church service. I know I am preaching to the saved, as we say at home, but you all have to be missionaries. We only have 17 days or so. We need you to go out and make sure that your Members of Congress, every man and woman in the Congress that you can reach, is contacted by real people who say, "My life will be better." I don't know how many Members I've heard from both parties saying, "All the organized vote is against this. I'd just like to hear from a few people who will rationally tell me that their lives will be better and that our country

will be better off and that our district will be better off.”

Please do that. Don't miss a chance to do it. Don't wake up on the morning of November 18th and wish that you had done something to give America a brighter future; to give our hemisphere a more solid, more democratic, more market-oriented future; and to open up the future in a way that is worthy of our country and that I am convinced is absolutely essential for our long-term success. We need your help. Many of these Members, you can have more influence on them than I can, because I can only vote in one congressional district every 2 years. You can vote in all of them. We need your help.

Thank you very much.

Meryl Comer. Ladies and gentlemen, the President has agreed to take some questions. Behind you are small business owners. They all are wearing NAFTA buttons, but there's one man who's wearing an attitude button as well. Would you like to ask the President a question?

[*At this point, a participant requested the President's response to people who favor protectionism.*]

The President. I respond in two ways. Number one, most of those people believe that all managers make all decisions based on labor costs. If that were true, what you would be reading this morning about Haiti is not whether a police chief and an army guy want to make it even poorer, even though it's already the third poorest country in the world. What you would read is that Haiti had all the manufacturing jobs in America, right? I mean, if this were a case of low wages, the headlines on Haiti today would be “General Motors shuts down in Michigan,” “Caterpillar leaves Illinois, goes to Port-au-Prince,” right? Number one, it's not factually true that labor costs or environmental investments are the only thing involved. Germany, which has a trading system arguably more open than ours and higher labor costs, has almost one-third of its work force in manufacturing, almost twice the percentage we do. It's simply not true. How well you do in production of goods and services depends upon how productive you are, how

well-organized you are, and whether you can sell.

The second thing I would say is there is this fear, because of what's happened to us, because we're going through this wrenching restructuring, that is emotional, that we can't compete and win anymore. And that's just not true either. We're going to have to be able to suit up and go out and play and win. That's the attitude issue: Do you believe that this country can win or not? I mean, we're gaining back market share in autos, American autos, shoving our foreign competitors out of the American market because of quality and price. And there are lots of other examples. Our manufacturing productivity's gone up now for a dozen years at an annual rate of over 4 percent a year. This is nuts, this idea that we can't compete and win. It is true we're having trouble creating large numbers of new jobs. That is true for every wealthy country in the world. We have to solve that problem. But no one can solve it without more markets.

Those are my answers, and I thank you.

Ms. Comer. Please raise your hand for questions. Mr. President, while I'm trying to find a question, there's a gentleman who got up at 3 this morning, milked the cows, and came because he cares about NAFTA. If you shook his hand he'd have stories to tell for years. He's right behind you in the white shirt.

The President. Where is he? I want to say this before you get to the question: That man is a dairy farmer, and sometimes I feel sorry for myself—if you think you work hard, you ought to start a dairy farm. It's a 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week job. I never could figure out how any of the dairy farmers in my State even made it to their kids' high school graduation. But I thank you for coming here today.

[*Another participant asked about the economic impact if NAFTA is not passed.*]

The President. Let me say, first of all, to the opponents of NAFTA, you can't name a single solitary thing you don't like that wouldn't continue to happen at maybe a greater pace if it fails. So you don't gain anything by beating it, for the people who are against it.

In addition to that, if Mexico follows the same strategy—let's ask rationally, what do they get out of this deal? If it's such a good deal for us and we sell even more consumer products—they are already the second biggest purchaser of American products in the world, even though they're by no means a wealthy country. They buy more per person than any other country in the world except Canada. What do they get out of it? They get development capital, not to invest to export back to the American market but to build up Mexico. That's what they get.

Now, if they stay with that strategy and we turn them down, what do you think they're going to do? There's only two places they can get it. They can make the same deal with Europe or the same deal with Japan, which means they will give them preferential access to their market instead of giving us preferential access to their market. Which means that you, sir, will have to face a 20 percent disability, if you want to sell into the Mexican market, against either the European people doing more or less what you do or the Japanese business people who do. That's exactly what's going to happen.

In addition to that, we will probably see a reversal of the good feeling that now exists for the United States in Mexico and throughout Latin America and the opportunity to do this same deal with other countries—I mentioned a few, Chile, Argentina, Colombia, Venezuela; there are others—none of whom will be getting investment to export back to the American market, but all of whom will buy more American products. Those opportunities will also be lost.

So, this is a good deal for this country. And not doing it, conversely, is a very, very dangerous strategy. It's a dangerous strategy economically; it's dangerous politically. It will hurt us in the short run, and it will hurt us for 20 years. I am convinced it is a terrible, terrible mistake.

Ms. Comer. Do you have time for one more, Mr. President?

The President. Sure, I'm with you.

Ms. Comer. This gentleman flew all the way in from California. He didn't want to talk to the Governor, he wanted to talk to the President. Please go ahead.

[*The participant asked if NAFTA would increase illegal immigration.*]

The President. It won't. There's no evidence that it will. I can't even figure out that argument. I stayed up late trying to figure that one. I can't figure it out.

To be fair, let's talk about it. There is a sophisticated argument that development in Mexico increases immigration to America. And let me tell you what it is and then say why NAFTA makes it better. Most of the people who immigrate from Mexico to the United States illegally are looking for jobs. Some are looking for welfare, but most are looking for work. When we set up the *maquilladora* system along the Mexican border—which, after all, was set up by our Government to help Mexico develop, right?—the idea was you could go down there and put up a plant and then export back to the United States duty-free. So a lot of people who don't have access to other jobs in other parts of Mexico come up there, they work in the *maquilladora* plant, but they can make more money in America. Or they come looking for a job, they don't get it, so they just—it's very close to the border. So you could argue that the *maquilladora* system has perversely increased illegal immigration.

How will NAFTA reverse that? It erases the *maquilladora* line. This will permit investment to occur in Mexico City and south of there. This will permit a balanced development approach so there will not only be more jobs and higher incomes, but they'll be strewn out all over the country instead of right there on the American border, all of which will reduce illegal immigration long-term.

Also, since you said that, if NAFTA passes we will get much more cooperation from the Mexican Government in enforcing our immigration laws and our drug laws. There's no question that we'll get a higher level of cooperation on both those very important issues if this passes.

Thank you.

Ms. Comer. Was that answer worth your trip?

Q. Absolutely perfect. And I'll go home and tell—

The President. Don't you think it's right—

Q. You're absolutely right. And I'll go home and tell the story for you.

The President. Thank you.

[A participant asked why many Americans feel U.S. businesses cannot compete.]

The President. Again, you see, I don't agree with it. But we have lost a lot of manufacturing jobs in the last 20 years. We've been losing manufacturing jobs for 35 years. But the percentage of our economy devoted to manufacturing is just what it was 12 years ago. In other words, what's happening is we're doing just what happened in agriculture, going back to the beginning of this century. You've got fewer people increasing their productivity and therefore increasing their output. That doesn't mean we can't compete, it means we have to get more and more productive to compete.

Now, here's my argument to the people against NAFTA. Let's say we've got 16 percent of the American work force in manufacturing today—it is 16 to 17—producing about 20 percent of our national wealth. And let's say that 15 years ago, I can't remember, but let's say 15 years ago it was about 23 percent—I think that's about what it was—producing 20 percent of our national wealth. If you want to go back to 23 percent, what do you have to do? You have to make more things and sell them to more people.

I will say it again: Germany, a country with a shorter work week and higher labor costs but extraordinary productivity in manufacturing, has almost a third of its workers in manufacturing. Now, do they account for 20 percent of the wealth in Germany? No, they account for about 40 percent of the wealth. So if you want to do more in manufacturing or in services or in agriculture or in anything else, you have to have somebody to sell to.

So people have missed the—they assume that when the number of manufacturing workers go down, that the production's going down because nobody's buying it. In fact, production is just where it was. It's just that more people are more productive.

So my answer to those folks is, if you want more people to work in manufacturing again, find more customers. There is no other way to do it. Find new products and more customers. This gentleman here in the environmental area, one of the things we're trying

to do is to take a lot of these defense companies that are losing their defense contracts and do partnerships with the Federal Government to give them the time they need to develop new technologies. You have to find different products and more customers. There is no other way. It has nothing to do with lower wages. That's not what the problem is.

Ms. Comer. Mr. President, your friends from the Excelsior Hotel are trying to reach you.

The President. I may owe some money—
[laughter]

Ms. Comer. They've gotten to you by fax. It's your Arkansas NAFTA coalition assembled at the Excelsior Hotel. How is that hotel?

The President. It's a very nice hotel.

Ms. Comer. Okay. All right.

The President. Also to give you—it happens to belong to some Japanese investors who employ a lot of Arkansans. I mean, I think that's the world we're living in. We can't run from it. We ought to embrace it and figure out a way to win in it.

Ms. Comer. Here is their question, Mr. President: If NAFTA fails, isn't it reasonable to expect that Japan and the European Community will step into Mexico and take much of the market away from the U.S., thereby costing U.S. jobs, not saving them?

The President. Well, I'll tell you what I would do. If I were the Prime Minister of Japan and I had a low growth rate and I had my companies going crazy because they have hidden unemployment, since they have in theory lifetime employment—so they've got about 7 percent unemployment, but it only scores at 2.5 percent, which means all those companies are carrying idle workers on their books—I would jump on this like flies on a Junebug. I would be there on the next day. If Congress votes this down on the 17th of November, I would, if I were the Prime Minister of Japan, have the Finance Minister of my country in to see the President of Mexico on the 18th of November. That's what I would do. I'd say, "We've got more money than they do anyway; make the deal with us." That's what I would do. And if I were running the economic affairs of the European

Community, I would do that same thing because it's a new market for them at a preferential rate, so they can actually push us out of a new market that we're already well established in. That's what I would do; that's what I think will happen. That's what you'd do, too, isn't it? If you were running——

Ms. Comer. Mr. President, you remember the budget vote?

The President. I do. As the Vice President says, whenever he votes, he always wins. [Laughter]

Ms. Comer. The speculation is that it's going to come down to a pretty close vote, so I was trying to see whether or not you might have the same feeling about this vote that you had about the budget vote.

The President. I'll tell you what I think will happen. I think it will pass for the same reason the budget passed. I think what will happen is people will get up to the point of decision, they will look over the abyss, Members of Congress who have been subjected to unbelievable pressure, and they will think, "Can I actually do this to my country? What are the consequences of not doing this?"

Now, you can say whatever you want to about the details of the budget, it's hard to argue with the conclusions. We've now got very stable long-term low interest rates. We've got investment going back up in the country. We've got America being complimented instead of condemned by the Europeans and the Asians for getting control of our budgetary affairs. That's what the Members of the Congress knew. So finally, they had to swap and squall and break, and everything happened, but we got enough votes to pass the thing. So, that's what I think will happen with NAFTA.

But let me say this, in order to win by a vote or two or three or four, you have to be close so that there is a magnet leading people to take the right decision. If the Members of the Congress who are under so much pressure from organized groups, whether it's the Perot crowd or the labor groups, if they sense that it's not close, they might run away from it in great numbers, which is why your efforts are so important. I honestly believe it will pass, but you need to understand, that is the dynamic that will operate in the Congress.

Let me also say that one of the things that I think is worth pointing out is we all know who's against NAFTA, but it's worth pointing out that 41 of the 50 Governors have endorsed it—and they make their living, without regard to party, they make their living creating jobs, keeping jobs—12 Nobel Prize winning economists, and every living former President. I had several of them at the White House the other day, and we were trying to figure out if there was any other issue on which all of us have ever agreed. [Laughter] Maybe something else equally controversial, who knows. But I think that's important.

So, that's the answer. The answer is yes, I remember the budget vote. Yes, it could be close. But in order for it to be close, you all have to push between now and then. If it's close, I think we'll win. If they perceive it's not close, then you'll see a big movement away from it just to avoid making anybody mad who's arguing to vote against it.

Ms. Comer. Thank you, Mr. President. They're here to help you. And thank you so much for your time.

The President. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:35 p.m. at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and his remarks were broadcast via satellite. In his remarks, he referred to Dick Leshner, chamber president; Ivan Gorr, chamber chairman and CEO and chairman, Cooper Tire and Rubber; and Larry Bossidy, chairman, USA*NAFTA, and CEO, Allied-Signal, Inc. The teleconference was moderated by Meryl Comer, chamber vice president of community development.

Remarks on Signing the Executive Order on Historically Black Colleges and Universities

November 1, 1993

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, Secretary Riley. Ladies and gentlemen, it's a great pleasure for me to be here today with my longtime friend chancellor Vic Hackley and with so many of the distinguished persons in the audience: Dr. Sam Myers; Dr. Joyce Payne; our longtime friend Bill Gray; Dr. James Cheek, we're glad to see you here; Dr. Art Thomas; General Alonzo Short is

here, I'm glad to see you, General Short; and Mr. Emmett Paige, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, and Intelligence. And I also know that in addition to the Members of Congress already introduced, Congressman Bobby Scott from Virginia just came in. Somewhere he's standing; I saw him. Thank you for coming.

Now, since the Vice President was so parochial—[laughter]—I have four people here I want to introduce: my friends Dr. William Keaton, from Arkansas Baptist College, in the back there; Dr. Katherine Mitchell from Shorter College, I saw Katherine over here; Dr. Lawrence Davis, from the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff; and Dr. Myer Titus from Philander Smith College, where I used to run every day in my former life.

I am so glad to see all of you here. For 130 years the institutions you represent have been beacons of hope and opportunity for Americans for whom no other options existed. You have nurtured young minds. You have built self-esteem. You've educated some of our Nation's foremost scholars and leaders. When Thurgood Marshall was refused admittance to the University of Maryland Law School because of the color of his skin, it was Howard University Law School that prepared him for the challenge, for the United States Supreme Court. Seventeen Members of the United States Congress are graduates of historically black institutions of higher education, as well as one United States Senator who is not an African-American, Senator Harris Wofford from Pennsylvania, a graduate of Howard Law School.

Martin Luther King's way to Oslo, Norway, to receive the Nobel Prize was, as the Vice President said, plainly paved by the fact that he was a Morehouse man. The rhythms of my friend Toni Morrison's writings, which garnered her this year's Nobel Prize in Literature, are rooted in her study of classics and literature at Howard University.

In seeking the best and most skilled Americans to serve here in our administration, graduates from historically black colleges and universities have been a part of our team. Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary and the Assistant to the President for Public Liaison, Alexis Herman, are Xavier graduates. Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy and Under Sec-

retary Bob Nash attended Howard. Our Surgeon General, Joycelyn Elders, was a graduate of Philander Smith. Sarah Summerville, my Alabama campaign coordinator and now at the Department of Defense, attended both Mississippi Industrial and Miles Colleges. And there are many more.

The Executive order I sign today and all the education initiatives that Secretary Riley discussed have to do with change, preserving educational institutions and ensuring that every young person in this country who wants to get a college education has the opportunity to do it and finding new ways to get people into college and into training programs and to help them succeed once they're there.

Since the average person will change jobs seven times in a lifetime, and the 1990 census makes it crystal clear the very harsh economic consequences of not having at least 2 years of post-high school education, we know we have much to do. This year we have begun already by reorganizing the student loan programs to cut their costs of overhead, to lower the interest rates, to change the repayment terms so that young people can now borrow money without fear of being bankrupted in paying the loans back. Now young people can borrow the money at lower interest rates and then elect to pay them back as a percentage of their incomes, without regard to the amount of the loan, so that no one will ever be discouraged from borrowing the money and, even more important perhaps, from taking a job after college which might not be a high-paying job but which might do an awful lot of good for our society, a job in our inner cities as a teacher perhaps or working in a program to help our young people. I'm very proud of the changes that we made in the student loan program, and I thank Secretary Riley for his outstanding leadership in that regard.

We have also passed the national service program which will give, over the next 3 to 4 years, up to 100,000 young Americans a chance to earn some credit against their college education and help to serve their communities at the grassroots level, to rebuild lives and to build their own minds in the process.

The Goals 2000 legislation, which Secretary Riley mentioned and to which the Vice

President alluded, will forge a new partnership between our National Government and States and communities to set some meaningful national standards about what our young people should know, because we know that they're going to be competing in a global economy, and they're entitled to have a shot at the best we have to offer.

With this Executive order and working in close cooperation with Secretary Riley and Catherine LeBlanc, the Executive Director of the White House Initiative Office, we'll expand the opportunities for participation in Federal programs. Ultimately, we'll strengthen the capacity of historically black colleges and universities to provide quality education. Within the next few days, I'll announce my appointments to the Presidential Advisory Board on Historically Black Colleges and Universities and will ask my longtime friend and the former chancellor of the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, Vic Hackley, now at Fayetteville State University, to serve as the Chair.

I want to say a special word of thanks to the current board, which was appointed by President Bush, for their service and commitment and especially to Dr. James Cheek for his leadership. And I thank you, Dr. Cheek, for what you have done.

I'd like to close by mentioning a very disturbing article that appeared in the morning paper here. You may have seen it, about children in our Nation's Capital, not even teenagers, discussing their own funerals, planning their funerals, thinking about what they would wear and what music they hope would be played. I am profoundly concerned as we take up the debate this week on the crime bill, on the Brady bill, on the establishment of boot camps as alternatives to prison for young people, on trying to get more law enforcement officers on our streets, that we not underestimate the gravity of the task before us. Somehow we have to get those young people to you, and through you, to the world.

I know this is a difficult, frustrating, perplexing time. Every day the Vice President and I start the morning together talking about problems that have no easy solution. But I know that this ought to be a time of immense celebration and hopefulness for the American people with the end of the cold

war, with the receding threat of nuclear annihilation, with the clear evidence that, for all of our problems, our economy is doing better than the other wealthy countries in creating jobs and promoting growth and that there is so much out there for us still to do.

But the truth is that we are squandering our most valuable resource, our young people, at a rate that no other nation would tolerate. We permit so many of them to grow up without the basic supports of family and community. We permit many of them to live in circumstances, frankly, more dangerous than those experienced by people we go halfway around the world to protect. And so many of them, by the time they are old enough for you to get ahold of them, aren't there for you to get hold of.

I say that not to end this on a down moment but to remind you of just how important this is, what you are doing. A lot of these kids still won't have a chance if you don't do your job well. And we have to find a way for you to reach them at an even earlier point. And if we want to make it, we've got to find a way to remind the rest of America that we are really all in this together. We cannot afford to have 11-year-olds thinking about their funerals. They need to be thinking about their children. You can do that.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:38 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Sam Myers, president, National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education; Joyce Payne, director, Office for the Advancement of Public Black Colleges; William H. Gray III, CEO and president, United Negro College Fund; Art Thomas, former chairman, National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education; and Lt. Gen. Alonzo E. Short, Jr., USA, Director, Defense Information Systems Agency. Following his remarks, the President signed the Executive order.

Executive Order 12876—Historically Black Colleges and Universities

November 1, 1993

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the Unit-

ed States of America, in order to advance the development of human potential, to strengthen the capacity of historically Black colleges and universities to provide quality education, and to increase opportunities to participate in and benefit from Federal programs, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. There shall be established in the Department of Education the President's Board of Advisors on Historically Black Colleges and Universities ("Board of Advisors" or "Board"), a Presidential advisory committee. The Board of Advisors shall issue an annual report to the President on participation by historically Black colleges and universities in federally sponsored programs. The Board of Advisors will also provide advice to the Secretary of Education ("Secretary") and in the annual report to the President on how to increase the private sector role in strengthening historically Black colleges and universities, with particular emphasis on enhancing institutional infrastructure and facilitating planning, development, and the use of new technologies to ensure the goal of long-term viability and enhancement of these institutions. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other Executive order, the responsibilities of the President under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 2), which is applicable to the Board of Advisors, shall be performed by the Secretary, in accordance with the guidelines and procedures established by the Administrator of General Services.

Sec. 2. The members of the Board of Advisors shall be appointed by the President. The Board shall include representatives of historically Black colleges and universities, other institutions of higher education, business and financial institutions, private foundations, and secondary education.

Sec. 3. The White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities, housed in the Department of Education, shall: (1) provide the staff, resources, and assistance for the Board of Advisors; (2) assist the Secretary in the role of liaison between the executive branch and historically Black colleges and universities; and (3) serve the Secretary in carrying out his responsibilities under this order.

Sec. 4. To carry out the purposes of this order, each executive department and each agency designated by the Secretary shall, consistent with applicable law, enter into appropriate grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements with historically Black colleges and universities. The head of each agency subject to this order shall establish an annual goal for the amount of funds to be awarded in grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to historically Black colleges and universities. Consistent with the funds available to the agency, the goal shall be an amount above the actual amount of such awards from the previous fiscal year and shall represent a substantial effort to increase the amounts available to historically Black colleges and universities for grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements. In order to facilitate the attainment of the goals established by this section, the head of each agency subject to this order shall provide technical assistance and information to historically Black colleges and universities regarding the program activities of the agency and the preparation of applications or proposals for grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements.

Sec. 5. Each executive department and designated agency shall appoint a senior official, who is a full-time officer of the Federal Government and who is responsible for management or program administration, to report directly to the department or agency head or designated agency representative on department or agency activity under this order and to serve as liaison to the Board and White House Initiative. To the extent permitted by law and regulation, each executive department and designated agency shall provide appropriate information requested by the Board and the White House Initiative staff pursuant to this order.

Sec. 6. Each executive department and designated agency shall develop an annual plan for, and shall document, the agency's effort to increase the ability of historically Black colleges and universities to participate in federally sponsored programs. These plans shall describe the measurable objectives for proposed agency actions to fulfill this order and shall be submitted at such time and in such form as the Secretary shall designate. In consultation with participating agencies,

the Secretary shall review these plans and develop, with the advice of the Board of Advisors, an integrated Annual Federal Plan for Assistance to Historically Black Colleges and Universities for consideration by the President. The Secretary shall ensure that each president of a historically Black college or university is given the opportunity to comment on the proposed Annual Federal Plan prior to consideration by the President. Each participating agency shall submit to the Secretary and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, an Annual Performance Report that shall measure each agency's performance against the objectives set forth in its annual plan. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall be responsible for overseeing compliance with the Annual Federal Plan.

Sec. 7. Each year the Board of Advisors shall report to the President on the progress achieved in enhancing the role and capabilities of historically Black colleges and universities, including findings and recommendations on the Annual Performance Reports, described in Section 6, submitted by the participating agencies. The Secretary shall disseminate the annual report to appropriate members of the executive branch and make every effort to ensure that findings of the Board of Advisors are taken into account in the policies and actions of every executive agency.

Sec. 8. The Department of Education, along with other Federal departments or agencies, shall work to encourage the private sector to assist historically Black colleges and universities through increased use of such devices and activities as: (1) private sector matching funds to support increased endowments; (2) private sector task forces for institutions in need of assistance; and (3) private sector expertise to facilitate the development of more effective ways to manage finances, improve information management, strengthen facilities, and improve course offerings. These steps will be taken with the goals of enhancing the career prospects of graduates of historically Black colleges and universities and increasing the number of such graduates with degrees in science and technology.

Sec. 9. In all its recommendations, the Board of Advisors shall emphasize ways to

support the long-term development plans of each historically Black college and university. The Board of Advisors shall recommend alternative sources of faculty talent, particularly in the fields of science and technology, including faculty exchanges and referrals from other institutions of higher education, private sector retirees, Federal employees and retirees, and emeritus faculty members at other institutions of higher education.

Sec. 10. The Board of Advisors, through the White House Initiative, shall provide advice on how historically Black colleges and universities can achieve greater financial security. To the maximum extent possible, the Board of Advisors shall consider how such institutions can enlist the resources and experience of the private sector to achieve such security.

Sec. 11. The Director of the Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with the Secretary and the Secretary of Labor, shall develop a program to improve recruitment and participation of graduates and undergraduate students of historically Black colleges and universities in part-time, summer and permanent positions in the Federal Government.

Sec. 12. Administration: (a) Members of the Board of Advisors shall serve without compensation, but shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons serving intermittently in the Government service, (5 U.S.C. 5701-5707).

(b) The Board of Advisors and the White House Initiative shall obtain funding for their activities from the Department of Education.

(c) The Department of Education shall provide such administrative services for the Board as may be required.

Sec. 13. Executive Order No. 12677 of April 28, 1989, is hereby revoked.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 1, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:30 p.m., November 2, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on November 4.

Statement on Signing the Rural Electrification Loan Restructuring Act of 1993

November 1, 1993

I am pleased to sign into law H.R. 3123, the "Rural Electrification Loan Restructuring Act of 1993." This Act modifies the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) direct loan programs for rural electric and telephone cooperatives. It represents the culmination of many months of long, hard work by the Congress and the Administration in our commitment to revitalize the infrastructure of rural America.

Earlier this year in my State of the Union Address, I announced my intent to reform the REA. H.R. 3123 does just that. It represents an important first step towards reforming the REA loan programs and is a good example of the Government doing more with less. This legislation will enhance our ability to provide affordable electric and telephone services in rural areas and to ensure access to the emerging telecommunications technologies that are essential for the economic strength of rural areas and the Nation as a whole. It also allows the REA for the first time to make loans for energy conservation purposes.

This Act makes much needed program adjustments to minimize budget expenditures and save over \$100 million in 1994 alone. Despite this reduction in Federal assistance, rural electric and telephone consumer bills should not change substantially. By using means tests to target Federal funds and raising the maximum interest rate, H.R. 3123 allows the REA to use scarce resources more effectively. We should no longer hear about wealthy electric and telephone borrowers that receive Government loans at extremely low interest rates.

Although H.R. 3123 clearly represents a major improvement over current law, I have one concern with it. The Act places a 7 percent interest rate cap on certain REA loans, including those refinanced through the Department of the Treasury's Federal Financing Bank. Experience with Federal credit programs indicates that such statutorily fixed interest rate ceilings produce unpredictable

and unintended results, including (1) inequities among borrowers using the program at different times; (2) extraordinary demands for loans when market interest rates are high; and (3) increased budget deficits. The "open-ended" character of subsidies resulting from the interest rate cap is inconsistent with the Administration's objective of managing Federal subsidies more effectively. Accordingly, my Administration will work with the Congress to remove this provision.

Nevertheless, H.R. 3123 is, overall, a solid step forward. Today I wish to congratulate the Members of Congress and friends of rural America that helped to enact this first major reform of the REA loan programs.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 1, 1993.

NOTE: H.R. 3123, approved November 1, was assigned Public Law No. 103-129.

Statement on Signing Legislation To Phase Out Wool and Mohair Subsidies

November 1, 1993

Today, in signing S. 1548, something unusual will happen: a Federal program is being abolished so that more than a half billion dollars can be saved. This is a departure from business-as-usual in Washington, where programs seem destined to live forever, and Federal dollars raised from average Americans are treated as if they were meant to be spent or squandered instead of saved. But to accomplish the change my Administration is seeking, for the economy and for our country, it is no longer adequate to conduct the business of Government bound by the old arrangements. The legislation, which phases out the wool and mohair program, eliminates an outdated program, reduces the deficit, and affirms for the American people our commitment to change.

In February of 1993, I sent to the Congress "A Vision of Change for America," the budget document accompanying my economic reform program. Among the recommendations were reforms in the wool and mohair program; subsidies provided for nearly 40 years to wool and mohair producers when materials for uniforms and gloves were deemed by the Federal Government as "strategic materials." Although the Department of Defense determined by 1960 that wool was no longer a strategic material, the subsidies continued. It would have been unthinkable to engage in an across-the-board effort to reduce the deficit—as we did in the beginning of our Administration—and not seek changes in this program.

The Congress responded well to our recommendations: first, by providing a phase-down of the subsidies in the budget reconciliation legislation I signed last August; second, in the appropriations process when the Congress provided for a moratorium for one year on wool and mohair payments. The Vice President's National Performance Review suggested that the program be terminated. This legislation does precisely that.

Since these products are no longer strategic materials; since the wealthiest producers receive the largest fraction of the payments; and since many program participants can focus their operations on other profitable sales, there is no justification for maintaining this program on the books. I therefore welcome the decision by the Congress to repeal the authority under which the program operates at the end of 1995, with payments reduced in the intervening years, so that the termination of the wool and mohair subsidy can occur in an orderly but final manner.

This legislation reduces the deficit by \$514 million over fiscal years 1994 to 1998.

In February, when we first asked the Congress to reform this program, we initiated a national debate on changing the economic direction of our country. Since then, we have seen the Congress adopt nearly \$500 billion in deficit reduction, and we have seen a marked and welcome change in our economic circumstances. We have seen positive changes in the deficit, and interest, inflation, and unemployment rates. Much, much more needs to be done. We need to do better in

the creation of good-paying jobs. We need to make further reforms in spending by Washington, and we have proposed such reforms in the National Performance Review. We need to expand trade with adoption of the North American Free Trade Agreement. And, most of all, we must reform health care.

In the past, our citizens might well assume that Washington could not adopt this much change. But, in 1993, the American people have seen their Government fulfill its commitments on a wide variety of issues. It is my hope, as I affix my signature on S. 1548, that this additional, promised reform expands their trust for the work we must undertake in the weeks and months ahead.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 1, 1993.

NOTE: S. 1548, approved November 1, was assigned Public Law No. 103-130.

Notice on Continuation of Iran Emergency

November 1, 1993

On November 14, 1979, by Executive Order No. 12170, the President declared a national emergency to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States constituted by the situation in Iran. Notices of the continuation of this national emergency have been transmitted annually by the President to the Congress and the *Federal Register*. The most recent notice appeared in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 1992. Because our relations with Iran have not yet returned to normal, and the process of implementing the January 19, 1981, agreements with Iran is still underway, the national emergency declared on November 14, 1979, must continue in effect beyond November 14, 1993. Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)),

I am continuing the national emergency with respect to Iran. This notice shall be published in the *Federal Register* and transmitted to the Congress.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 1, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register,
12:04 p.m., November 1, 1993]

NOTE: This notice was published in the *Federal Register* on November 2.

**Message to the Congress
Transmitting the Notice on
Continuation of Iran Emergency
November 1, 1993**

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iran emergency is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 1993, to the *Federal Register* for publication. Similar notices have been sent annually to the Congress and the *Federal Register* since November 12, 1980. The most recent notice appeared in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 1992.

The crisis between the United States and Iran that began in 1979 has not been fully resolved. The international tribunal established to adjudicate claims of the United States and U.S. nationals against the Iranian government and Iranian nationals against the United States continues to function, and normalization of commercial and diplomatic relations between the United States and Iran has not been achieved. In these circumstances, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities that are needed in the process of imple-

menting the January 1981 agreements with Iran and in the eventual normalization of relations with that country.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 1, 1993.

**Message to the Congress Reporting
Budget Rescissions
November 1, 1993**

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report 37 proposed rescissions of budget authority, totaling \$1.9 billion.

These proposed rescissions affect programs of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Energy, Housing and Urban Development, Interior, State, and Transportation, International Security Assistance programs, and programs of the Agency for International Development, the Army Corps of Engineers, the General Services Administration, the Small Business Administration, the State Justice Institute, and the United States Information Agency. The details of these proposed rescissions are set forth in the attached letter from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and in the accompanying report.

Concurrent with these proposals, I am transmitting to the Congress FY 1994 supplemental appropriations language requests that would remove a variety of restrictions that impede effective functioning of the government, including certain proposals outlined in the recommendations of the National Performance Review.

Together, the supplemental language requests and the rescission proposals would result in a total budget authority reduction of \$2.0 billion. My Administration is committed to working closely with the Congress to

produce legislation that will achieve this level of savings.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 1, 1993.

**Nomination for Posts at the
Department of the Air Force**

November 1, 1993

The President announced today that he intends to nominate Edwin A. Deagle, Jr., to be Under Secretary of the Air Force and Clark G. Fiester to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition.

“Edwin Deagle and Clark Fiester have each spent the better part of his life in watching out for our Nation’s security. They are well prepared to continue that work at the Pentagon,” said the President.

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

**Nomination for an Assistant
Secretary of Commerce**

November 1, 1993

The President announced his intention today to nominate research and international trade consultant Sue E. Eckert to be the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Administration.

“Sue Eckert brings a wide range of both public and private sector experience in international trade to this position,” said the President. “That experience will be invaluable as we seek to expand our country’s exports to create more jobs here at home.”

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

**Nomination for Under Secretary of
Energy**

November 1, 1993

The President announced today that he intends to nominate Charles B. Curtis to be the Under Secretary of Energy. After he is confirmed, he will assume management responsibility for science and technology programs, weapons and waste cleanup programs, and energy policy matters assigned by the Secretary.

“There are few Americans who can match Charles Curtis’ governmental experience or his knowledge of energy policy,” said the President. “He will be an outstanding addition to Secretary O’Leary’s team at the Energy Department.”

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

**Nomination for Ambassador to the
Republic of Djibouti**

November 1, 1993

The President today announced his intention to nominate career Foreign Service officer Martin L. Cheshes to be the U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Djibouti.

“Over his nearly 30-year career in the Foreign Service, Martin Cheshes has served his country well. I expect him to continue to do so during his tenure in Djibouti,” said the President.

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

**Exchange With Reporters Prior to a
Meeting With James and Sarah
Brady**

November 2, 1993

Crime and Handgun Legislation

Q. Jim, is the crime bill going to pass?

The President. He asked you. Yes, it’s going to pass. What do you think, Jim? He wants to know if the crime bill’s going to pass

and the Brady bill. That's what Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press] asked you.

Mr. Brady. Well, this is your house, so I'll defer to you, sir.

The President. I already said yes. You answer it.

Q. In that case, Mr. President, I'm wondering if you could tell us what the Brady bill would do in urban areas, like the District of Columbia, where the guns that kill people are not sold so much in shops but more on the street, where there's not much of a waiting—

The President. But they all do come out of regular manufacturers, and they come into the country. And what the Brady bill would do, it would make uniform the losing battle a lot of States are fighting now, because they're all alone, to at least check those people who do buy from registered gun dealers. And there are an enormous number of people who do have criminal backgrounds, who have mental health problems, who don't even meet any kind of age requirement. We would be able to check all that uniformly, nationwide. We find now that in a lot of States that have pretty strict gun laws, an enormous percentage of the guns that are confiscated by law enforcement officials every year come from other States that don't.

So we do have some evidence that these laws work, but it's not the end-all and be-all. We've got a couple hundred million guns out there. There are a lot of other problems that we need to deal with in terms of minors in possession, in terms of assault weapons, in terms of the way the permitting process works for Federal arms dealers.

But the Brady bill is the first step. And we are going to pass it this year, I believe, because the American people finally have heard the long call of Jim and Sarah Brady. They've been out here on this for years and years and years, oftentimes alone with no support. And finally, thanks to the leadership of the Members of Congress who are here and others, we're going to be able to put it over.

Q. Does it go far enough?

Q. [*Inaudible*]—enough votes—

The President. To pass it? I believe we clearly have the votes to pass it if we can get it to the floor. Mr. Schumer got it out

of the House subcommittee last week, and we're hoping that the House committee will mark it up this week. Senator Biden's going to bring it up separate from the crime bill so that no one will be able to hide behind other issues in trying to find clever ways to filibuster it. And I compliment him on that. And I just believe that the time has come.

And you read all these stories, like the story that was in the Washington Post yesterday of the children planning for their funerals. I think it's going to be very difficult for the Congress to justify continued inaction on what millions of Americans believe is the number one problem in their lives.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—on the Newsday report saying that—[*inaudible*]—campaign?

The President. First of all, we did nothing improper, and I have nothing to say about it.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:10 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. Former White House Press Secretary James Brady was wounded in the 1981 assassination attempt on President Ronald Reagan. His wife, Sarah, is head of Handgun Control, Inc. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks on Endorsements of the North American Free Trade Agreement

November 2, 1993

Thank you very much, President Carter, Mr. Vice President, all the distinguished people who have spoken here today.

I would like to begin by making two observations. First of all, after hearing what has been said, I'm pretty proud to be an American today. And I think all of you should be, too. Secondly, I have been sent an extra-terrestrial telegram stating, "I, too, am for NAFTA," signed Otto von Bismarck. [*Laughter*]

You know, it is something of note that every living President, Secretary of State, Secretaries of Defense, national security advisers, Secretaries of Commerce, leaders of the Federal Reserve, distinguished contributors to the American spirit like John Gardner and Father Hesburgh and other great Amer-

ican citizens all support this agreement, for economic reasons, for foreign policy reasons. Our own Secretary of State, Warren Christopher, is in California even as we are here, talking about the foreign policy implications of NAFTA for our Government and our country.

Why have all of us declared this issue above politics? Why have we come to agree that whatever else has divided us in the past, this will weld us together in the cause of more jobs for our people, more exports for our markets, and more democracy for our allies? Why do we all know down deep inside that this would be such a profound setback for America and the world economy and in the new global polity we are striving so honestly to create? Why are we so willing to say no to partisan politics and yes to NAFTA? I think it is because we know, as all of these have said in different ways, that NAFTA reflects this moment's expression of all the lessons we have learned in the 20th century. It reflects this moment's expression of what we learned not to do after World War I, what we learned we had to do during and after World War II. It reflects the sheer economic weight of argument that Mr. Samuelson referred to, that we have seen even more expressed just in the last few years when a higher and higher percentage of our new jobs in this country are clearly traceable directly to exports.

I see it in my own work here. For years and years and years our allies in Europe and Asia said, "Well, if America really wanted to promote global growth, you would do something about your deficit and get your interest rates down and quit taking so much money out of the global economy." And so we have tried to do that. And we have low interest rates and the deficit is coming down, and our own deficit this year was much lower, in no small measure because of those lower rates.

But we still have this great global recession. Why? Because we are not trading with one another. We are not buying and selling and investing across national lines and sparking the kind of global growth that is the only way any wealthy country, anyway, generates any new jobs.

No one attacking NAFTA has yet made a single solitary argument to refute this es-

sential point: There is no evidence that any wealthy country—not just the United States, anyone, not one—can create new jobs and higher incomes without more global growth fueled by trade. If you strip away all the other arguments, no one has offered a single solitary shred of evidence to refute that central point.

And I know there is great insecurity and instability in all the wealthy countries in the world. You can say whatever you want about this being the first Tuesday in November; you've seen a lot of other Tuesdays come along in other nations, great political upheavals all across the world. Why? Because people feel the walls are closing in on them.

And in truth, I think when you strip all this away, we are facing a real decision about whether the psychological pressures of the moment will overcome what we know in our hearts and our minds is the right thing to do. Whether the same pressures that people in Canada feel, or France, or Japan, in a time when wealthy countries are not generating new jobs and people are working harder for stagnant wages, will those pressures make us do what is easy and perhaps popular in the moment? Or will we do what we should really do? The honorable thing to do to respond to those pressures is to take an action that may not be popular in the moment but that actually holds the promise of alleviating the pressures.

If we believe the feelings, the anxieties are legitimate, as has been said already by other speakers, then don't we have the obligation to do what will alleviate the anxieties over the long haul, instead of play to them in the moment? That, in the end, is what this decision is all about. That is really what we mean when we say the secret ballot on this issue has already been won.

These students over here to my left are from my alma mater, Georgetown. And when I was in their place 25 years ago now, when we were studying global affairs, we came out really worrying about and thinking about the cold war and trying to debate exactly how much the pattern of the bipolar world could be manifested in every—[inaudible]—devel-

opment, in every country in the world, in every region of the world. And sometimes we were wrong, and sometimes we were right. But at least we had a framework within which to view the world.

As Dr. Kissinger said, we are in the process now of creating a new framework. And a lot of people are complaining about how we don't have all the answers. I don't mean we, the administration, I mean we, the people. But I say to you—many of you in this room are old enough to remember, and I think I now qualify in that category—there are a lot of generations of Americans who would kill to be alive and of age in this time with this set of problems. I mean, who are we to complain about this set of problems? Very few mornings do I come to work in the Oval Office and wonder about whether some decision I make can spark a nuclear war. Very few mornings do I wonder whether, even in all the difficulties we face, we might make an economic error and a quarter of our people will be out of work, as they were during the Great Depression.

We see people in positions of responsibility going around wringing their hands about the difficulties of the moment. Yes, it's a new time. It's always difficult in a new time to see the future with clarity and to have the kind of framework you need. But none of that is an excuse to give in to the emotional pressure of the moment instead of to take steps that will alleviate the pressure. That is the dilemma before us.

You know, it's true that it's good for us economically. It's also true that what Mexico gets out of it is investment, so that if we don't take this deal somebody else probably will. And that will be bad for us economically, as has already been said by President Carter. But the real thing that this is about is how we are going to view ourselves as we relate to the rest of the world. Keep in mind, this is not an isolated incident. This is not just a trade deal between the United States and Mexico; not even a deal that affects our relationships with the rest of Latin America, although that's where the real jobs and long-term economic benefit to us lie, perhaps; not even a deal that will help us to get the GATT agreement by the end of the year, although, I tell you, it will give enormously increased

leverage to the United States to push that agreement through by the end of the year if this passes, enormous, and great incentive to other nations to support this. But over and above that, this is a decision which will demonstrate whether in this difficult moment we still have confidence in ourselves and our potential.

And I would say to all of you, anything you can do to the people at large and to the Congress in particular to instill that confidence again is very important. If we have lost our way at all in the last couple of years, it is in not having any historic memory. These are difficult problems. But for goodness sakes, give us these problems as compared with many of those our forebears faced, and give us these problems as compared to those we are about to create if we start turning away from the world that is plainly before us. Help us to give the Congress the freedom, the confidence, the courage that is inside every Member of the Congress waiting to be brought out. Help to give them the space they need to take the steps they know are right for America.

This is about whether we really have confidence in ourselves. I believe with all my heart the next 20 years can be the best we ever had. But they're going to require some tough decisions, some difficult moments, some uncertain moments. What do you do in moments like that? Do what the priests would tell you to do: Fall back on what you believe and what you know is right. What we know is right for America is to be confident, to reach out, to believe in ourselves and our potential, to believe that we can adjust to change, just as we have been doing for 200 years now.

Make three calls. Make 12 calls. Make two dozen calls. For goodness sakes, make however many you can. But remember, this is a test of our confidence. Every one of you can give confidence to someone else by the life you have lived, the experiences you have had, the things that you know. Give it now. We need it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:20 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to John Gardner, writer and founder of Common Cause; Theodore M. Hesburgh, president emeritus, University of Notre Dame; Paul A. Samuelson, Nobel Prize-winning economist; and Henry Kissinger, former Secretary of State.

Statement on Signing Legislation on Most-Favored-Nation Trade Status for Romania

November 2, 1993

I am pleased to sign today House Joint Resolution 228, which extends most-favored-nation tariff treatment for Romania. This action, which will lower tariffs on Romanian exports to the United States, reflects Romania's significant progress thus far in rejoining the community of democratic nations. It will also assist the growth of Romania's private sector and enhance our bilateral trading relations, improving American access to one of the largest markets in Eastern Europe.

Romania's people are emerging from a long period of tyranny and Communist rule. Their road toward democracy, respect for human rights and rule of law, and a functioning market economy is not an easy one. While important steps have been taken, more remains to be done. As Romania continues to make progress, the United States will offer our friendship and help in tangible ways. Romania deserves recognition for its close cooperation with the United States in international organizations, particularly for its compliance with United Nations sanctions on Serbia. Romania, like the other frontline states, has made real sacrifices in this important effort, earning the appreciation of the international community.

I welcome this positive step in U.S.-Romanian relations and look forward to working with the people and leaders of Romania to promote democracy, human rights, a market economy, and prosperity.

NOTE: H.J. Res. 228, approved November 2, was assigned Public Law No. 103-133.

Nomination for Assistant Commissioners of the Patent and Trademark Office

November 2, 1993

The President announced his intention today to nominate two Assistant Commissioners of the Patent and Trademark Office in the Department of Commerce. He named Lawrence O. Goffney, Jr., to be the Assistant Commissioner for Patents and Philip G. Hampton II to be the Assistant Commissioner for Trademarks.

"Each of these men combines substantial legal experience with a solid background in engineering," said the President. "I have great confidence in their ability to maintain the highest standards at the Patent and Trademark Commission."

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

Remarks on Signing the Message Transmitting NAFTA Legislation to the Congress and an Exchange With Reporters

November 3, 1993

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, today I am sending to Congress the implementing legislation for NAFTA. This will create the world's largest tariff-free zone, from the Canadian arc to the Mexican tropics, with more than 370 million consumers and over \$6.5 trillion of production. It will clearly benefit America's workers. Mexican tariffs today are 2½ times United States tariffs. As the walls come down, we estimate that another 200,000 American jobs will be created by 1995.

NAFTA will also enable us to operate in an unprecedented manner in other areas. It will improve environmental conditions on the

U.S.-Mexican border, something that all Americans know we need to do and something that all Mexicans know we need to do. It will be the stimulus for economic growth beyond Mexico, enabling us to go into the rest of Latin America with similar agreements. And perhaps most important in the short run, it will give the United States access to the Mexican markets on terms more favorable than those available to many of our competitors who have also rapidly been expanding their sales into Mexico, whether from Europe or Japan or the rest of Asia.

If we turn away from NAFTA, we risk losing the natural trade advantage that should come to the United States as Mexico and the rest of Latin America build market economies and stronger democracies. If we embrace NAFTA, it is one strong step to take this country into the 21st century with a revitalized economy. That is clearly in the forefront of the minds of all Americans, and that is why we are all pursuing it here in this bipartisan fashion.

I want to thank the Democratic and the Republican leaders of the Congress who are here with me today, thank them for their tireless efforts, along with our administration, Ambassador Kantor, Mr. Daley, Mr. Frenzel, and others. We are working hard. We are making progress, and I hope when we send this bill up to the Congress today that it will reaffirm the clear interest of the United States in adopting this agreement.

I'd like to sign it now, and then we'll take a couple of questions.

[At this point, the President signed the messages transmitting the proposed legislation to implement the North American Free Trade Agreement.]

Q. Mr. President?

The President. I have to sign two, there being two Houses. *[Laughter]*

Election Results

Q. Mr. President, it's a year after your election and the Democrats have now lost two Senate seats, two Governors, the mayors of—*[inaudible]*—the largest cities in the country. Do you view it in any way as a judgment on your policies in the Democratic Party?

The President. No. When Governor Robb was elected Governor of Virginia in 1981, I didn't think it was a repudiation of President Reagan. We also won a lot of mayors' races last night, including a lot of people who were early supporters of mine and very instrumental in the campaign. And we won the special elections for the House of Representatives that had come up that we had before. I don't think you can draw too much conclusion from this. I think what you can say is, the American people want change, and they want results. The point I want to make is that I believe every Member of Congress, without regard for party, who votes for this agreement will be rewarded for it, because it represents change and the creation of more economic opportunity. I think it represents change and results. That's the way incumbents are going to survive, by providing the kind of changes that the voters want.

Q. So you don't think it's any reflection on you, or any referendum on you or your programs?

The President. Let me say this: I was elected Governor of my State five times. Once I was elected in 1984 when Ronald Reagan got 59 percent of the vote in my State, and I got 63 percent. Voters are extremely discriminating. They make their own judgments for their own reasons. I think it is a manifestation that the voters are not yet happy with the pace of economic renewal, social reunification in this country. They're worried about crime. They're worried about all of these other social problems we've got. And I think it's also a sense they have that Government's not yet working for them.

And all that is right. There's nothing wrong about that. And I think that all people who are in, if they want to stay in, are going to have to work together until we produce economic results, a country that's coming together instead of coming apart, and political reform. But that's why I will say again, it's certainly not a message to run and hide from the tough issues; that is not what it is. And that's why I think, again, I think NAFTA is symbolic of the kinds of things that people ought to be doing across party lines, because it will create economic opportunity. And that will lower voter anxiety. When people won't have to worry about whether the economy

is growing or not, they'll be much more secure, and we'll be able to deal with a whole lot of these other issues that we've got. That's why I think this is a very important, symbolic issue.

NAFTA

Q. Do you have the votes?

The President. Do we have the votes? We don't have them today, but we're getting there. Really, I think all of these people would admit, thanks to all of them, we're making rapid progress. And we had a real movement in the last 10 days or so, and I think you'll see more and more progress in the next few days.

Q. Are you going to win?

The President. Yes. We're going to win it.

Q. Are you cutting too many deals? The big sugar deal, is this just—

The President. No.

Q. Isn't that protectionist, the sugar concessions for the Louisiana Members?

The President. I think the Ambassador is going to have a—you're going to have a press conference this afternoon to talk about that, aren't you?

Ambassador Kantor. Yes.

The President. We haven't done anything that's not consistent with what we said we'd try to do from the beginning on this agreement. And Mickey's going to talk about it today.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:25 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Remarks to the Community in Ambridge, Pennsylvania

November 3, 1993

Thank you very much. It is wonderful to be back in Pennsylvania, wonderful to be here in western Pennsylvania with so many of my friends and so many of the people who helped to make one year ago today, the day that I was elected President, a wonderful day for me. I thank you for that.

I thank Congressman Klink for coming here today and hosting us here today in his district. He's done a terrific job being your advocate. He has, on occasion, chewed my

ear off about the interests of the people in this area, and I know you can be proud of him for what he has done. I thank Senator Specter for coming here today and for being willing to work across party lines to solve this problem that has affected him and every other American and every other American family. I thank my good friend, Senator Wofford—I want to say a little bit about him in a moment—for coming here and for nourishing this issue long before it was popular. I want to thank you, Mayor Panek, for having us here today. And I thank Congressman Murphy for coming up with us. And I thank my friends from Allegheny County: Commissioner Tom Forrester and the outgoing Mayor of Pittsburgh who's serving the end of her term, Mayor Sophie Masloff. We're glad to see you, Sophie. [Applause] Thank you.

I want to thank your superintendent, Dr. DePaul, and your principal, David Perry, for having us here. And let me say, as an old band boy, I congratulate the band on your achievement, and I wish you well.

I wanted to come here to Pennsylvania today to put this book in the library here in your wonderful hometown, in that beautiful library, to symbolize the placement of the health care plan in 1,600 Federal depository libraries all across America today and in hundreds of others who will ask for and receive copies of the book. Soon it will not only be in your libraries but it will be on your bookstands. I ask every one of you to get this book and read it.

It deals with a system that is central to our personal health, our family's health, our community's health, and the economic strength and well-being of our Nation. For that reason alone it may contain the most important information of any book you could read this year. What we want the American people to do, as has already been said, is to read this book, to get familiar with the dynamics of the problem: Why is it that our health care system costs more than any other nation, about 40 percent more of our income, and still is the only major health care system in the world that doesn't provide health insurance to everyone? Why is it that it's so expensive and yet 100,000 Americans a

month lose their health insurance permanently? Why is it that it's so costly and yet we still don't have the primary and preventive services that help to keep people well? What could we do to provide coverage to people with long-term diseases or people with disabilities who could be more independent, who could make more of a contribution to our national life if only they could get better health insurance themselves?

Some of the American citizens who deal with their disabilities every year are in this audience today. I thank them for their courage in coming here. And I say to you, you and your families will be among those most advanced by this effort, but so will we all be helped. There are untold numbers of people on public assistance today who would not be there if only they had access to preventive, primary, and comprehensive health care. You should ask and answer these questions.

Two years ago when Pennsylvania elected Harris Wofford in a stunning upset on the health care issue, you fired a shot heard 'round America. You said something to the people making public policy that had not been heard before. You said, "I know this is a complicated problem. I know there are lot of interests on all sides. I know this gives people a headache. I know there's always something you can say to object to any reform. But I still expect you to deal with it because it is eating the heart out of America. There is too much insecurity. There is too much cost. There is too little health care. Do something to make it better." And we got the message.

One year ago when I crossed this country, I had already spent over 2 years as a Governor trying to come to grips with a health care system that was threatening to bankrupt the State governments of the country with higher and higher costs for Medicaid programs for the poor, both elderly and non-elderly; with working people in my State who worked hard and played by the rules and wondered why they were working because their children didn't have health insurance; with elderly people who were not quite poor enough to be on Medicaid, so every month they were making a decision about whether to buy food or the medicine they needed to stay out of the hospital and save the rest of

us even more money, as well as keeping themselves healthier; and on and on and on.

Hillary and I have personal friends, friends from our childhood, who have told us the most heart-wrenching stories. A friend of ours who runs a small business and has only four employees because he had one employee with one child who had Down syndrome. And because this young man couldn't change his job and because that family couldn't be let go, their premiums went up so much in that small business that they had to go to a \$2,500 deductible for the families, which as many of you know, depending on what your income is, is like not having any insurance at all. And many people are on even higher ones.

I say that to make this point. This book is a specific, detailed reflection of years of common effort, months of effort in which thousands of people were involved: doctors, nurses, other health care providers, consumers, business people—small, medium, and large—people in the insurance industry, people in all aspects of health care. And it attempts to do something no one has yet done, except for this product, which is to say here is specifically how we would propose to change it.

When those come forward—who should come forward—who disagree with us, I ask only that they be held to the same standard. Where is their book? What are their answers? Who pays for theirs? Where are the costs in theirs? What is their answer? Hold them to the same standard.

The bottom line, my fellow Americans, is this: We have to create a system of comprehensive benefits that are always there that can never be taken away. You know here in this river valley as well as any group of Americans—look back over the last 20 years—you know we are living in a churning economy that sometimes helps us and sometimes hurts us. You know how few guarantees there are in life anymore. You know how many people have been hurt by the insecurity and the uncertainties of the sweeping global economic changes that we have. We have to be able to say to the American people, if you're willing to work hard and play by the rules, if you're a good taxpaying citizen, if you're poor

and you have children, no matter what happens to you, you will always have basic health care. And we know we can do it, because every other country besides us has already done it.

We can do it. We're tired of making excuses for why we spend 10 cents on the dollar more on paperwork, regulation, and insurance premiums than any country in the world and we can't figure out how to get health care to real people. We are tired of making excuses, and we are ready to solve the problem.

When I look at all these young people here and I think about what their future is going to hold and I realize we are so close to the 21st century and you see the kids on either side of all of us adults who are sitting in the middle—although there are some young people in the middle, too; young is defined by whoever is a day younger than you are—*[laughter]*—I think about what I know in my heart are the challenges of this country. We basically have three huge challenges as we move toward the 21st century. One is economic stagnation. We're not creating enough jobs, and too many people are working harder without ever getting a raise. Right? Two is, we are not dealing with the social problems we have. We are coming apart when we ought to be coming together. We have seen communities and families under stress. There are too many children who are subject to violence on our streets and in our schools. We have too many human problems that are not being faced. And the third problem is that the political system has too much talk and too little action on the real problems. It is too dominated by vested interest and fears.

Now, in our way we have tried to address all these things in the last 10 months since I have been your President. The budget plan we adopted brought interest rates to their lowest point and mortgages to their lowest point in 25 years. And we now have more private sector jobs which have come into America in the last 10 months than in the previous 4 years. Is it enough? Of course not, but it's a darned good beginning. We're moving in the right direction.

The second thing—and we talked about this on the plane coming up here—to try to

put the American family back together. We have passed the family leave law so you can get some time off without losing your job with a sick child or a sick parent. On April 15th this year, when taxes are due, over 15 million American working families will get a tax break because they have children and because they are working hard and they're still below the Federal poverty line. They will be lifted above it. It's the biggest incentive to get off welfare we've ever had, to reward the working people who make modest incomes and have children.

To all the students, I say this Congress lowered the cost of college loans, made the terms of repayment easier, and will give thousands of young people a chance to work their way through college by serving their communities in national service.

The last thing I want to say is we are also, between now and Thanksgiving, determined to do something that gives communities a chance to fight crime more, with more police officers on the street, with alternatives for correction, and by passing the Brady bill. To make the political system work better, this Congress has before it today a campaign finance reform bill, a bill to limit the influence of lobbyists, a bill to require Congress to live under the same laws that it requires private employers to live under, and a bill to give the President the power to make specific line-item vetoes in unnecessary spending. All of those are before the Congress today.

But there is no issue which combines all three of these things like health care. Health care is important to the economy. Why? Because we're spending 40 percent more of our income than any other nation on health care; we're getting less for it. That means if you want our cars to sell at home and overseas, they're going to pay a nickel on the dollar more than the Germans and the Japanese for health care for every dollar and every automobile. It's important to our economy that we do something to stop health care costs from going up at 3 times the rate of inflation.

It's important to our social fabric. Why? Because how can you tell America's families that they ought to get a good education and they ought to be willing to be retrained all through their lives and they ought to play by the rules, when they know if one bad thing

happens to them they'll have to go home at night and look at their children, and they won't even be able to provide health care. How can we hold this country together?

And it is important for making the political system work. Why? Because there will never be an issue, never, at least in my tenure, where so many special interests have so much to gain or lose based on the decisions made by Congress.

You know, my wife had a little argument with the Health Insurance Association about a television ad they're running. So they're going to come out, they're going to run another ad and tell you they've got a better idea, except we're all still waiting for it.

Let me tell you what the issue is. You need to know what's behind these ads. This is the only country in the world that has 1,500 separate companies writing thousands and thousands and thousands of different policies designed to divide people up into smaller and smaller and smaller groups, so that some of you are in insurance groups so small that 40 percent of your premium goes to overhead, profit, and administrative costs. It is because of that that hospital after hospital after hospital tells us that their doctors, their nurses, their administrators are spending millions of dollars a year in time filling out unnecessary forms because people have to keep up with all these insurance policies.

It is because of that that a doctor I grew up with told me the other day that it was bad enough that he and his partner in a two-doctor firm—clinic—had to hire a lot of people to do administrative work. He now had to hire one woman to do nothing but stay on the phone all day to call these hundreds of different insurance companies, to pound on them to pay what they already owed. You pay for that when they hire somebody else to do that. That is what is going on here.

Now, look, there are a lot of good people who do this work. They're entitled to work, too. But you've got to make up your mind. Do you want to spend one dime on every dollar for health care when we're already spending 14.5 percent of our income—no other nation over a dime, 10 percent of their income; Germany and Japan at 9 percent of their income—do you want to keep paying 10 cents on every dollar to pay for profit and

paperwork and bureaucracy that no other people anywhere in the world pay, money that could go to cover the uninsured, money that could go to give primary and preventive care, money that could go to give mammograms to women, to give cholesterol tests to men, to give dental help to children, to give drugs to the elderly who are above the poverty line but still don't have enough money to pay their drug bill?

To me it is an easy answer. But you need to know what is fueling those television ads you see from a lot of these special interest groups. There's a lot of money in this health care system that doesn't have zip to do with your health care. And we want to develop it in a way that can be devoted to your health care.

They say, "What are you going to do when the money runs out?" You know, our plan proposes to raise public spending at twice the rate of inflation for the next 5 years instead of 3 times the rate of inflation. Nobody's cutting anything. We are going to have to have some discipline in this system like every other system we have. You are not going to run out of health care, but we are going to limit the extent to which you can be gouged in a system over which you now have no control. I think that is what you want. We have to have some discipline in this system, as in every other system of our life. If we need discipline for our kids in the schools, discipline on our streets, and enforcement of the law, we ought to have discipline in how our health care system operates. It shouldn't be able to run crazy.

So I say to you, my fellow Americans, under this plan no insurance company can take away your coverage. There is a limit to how much it can increase. What we are trying to do over the long run is to bring ourselves into a position where we increase health care costs at the rate of inflation plus the rate of population growth, utilization of the system every year.

There will have to be special provisions, as we make them, for new technologies, for medical research, for all those things that give us the best health care in the world to the people who can access it. But I tell you, we did not put this plan together without talking to literally hundreds of doctors and

nurses and other health care providers. We heard them. They are screaming, literally screaming, for relief from the over complicated, burdensome, bureaucratic paperwork decisions that are driving the costs of this system through the roof.

And I ask you to remember that when you hear the million-dollar campaign ads of those who are going to tell you that we cannot have health security and comprehensive benefits for all at a price that will not break the American economy. I refuse to believe we can't do something everybody else has done. I think America can still do things that no one else has done. We can certainly do things that everybody else has done.

Let me say a special word about senior citizens. Our plan does not change Medicare at all. It preserves the benefits of Medicare and the integrity of the system. But our plan does cover prescription medicines for the elderly as well as for the nonelderly.

Now, let me tell you why that's important. If you look at the United States as compared with Germany, for example—two countries that have great pharmaceutical systems—we don't use as many prescription drugs as the Germans do. Why? Because they're not covered in our health care plans. Because they're not covered for elderly people on Medicare who aren't on Medicaid. What does that mean? It means people don't get the medicine they need. Eventually, they get sicker. They go to the hospital, and it costs more money. It is very important for the elderly, also important for some of these young people who might have asthma or some other condition that would require medication. Our plan covers it, and I think America should have it.

Under this plan we also move to cover long-term care for elderly people who aren't in nursing homes. This is a big deal, folks. The fastest growing group of Americans are people over 80. And more and more of our elderly people are going to need some help but want to maintain as much independence as possible. Our plan, over a period of time, as we can afford it, gives our older citizens the chance to maintain that independence. Nobody else does it. That's another good reason to support it, and I hope you will.

Finally, let me say to the students here, you will be more affected by this than any of the rest of us. You will live your whole life in an American economy hurtling toward the 21st century that will or won't escape economic stagnation, that will or won't bring us together as a family again and promote the values that made this community great, that will or won't have a political system that works through problems instead of just talks about them. The test of that, in large measure, will be this.

I say, this may not be perfect, but it is the only comprehensive plan that gives security to all Americans. It is the only one. I challenge the others to come forward with their ideas, send you their books, stand on their ideas. And I urge all of you to read this, ask the questions, and push ahead. America needs it. The next generation needs it. And you need it right here in this wonderful town.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:21 p.m. in the gymnasium at Ambridge Area High School. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Walter Panek of Ambridge and Samuel A. DePaul, superintendent of schools, Ambridge Area School District. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on the California Fires

November 3, 1993

Good evening. For just a few moments, I want to speak to you good people in southern California who are enduring in an agonizing tragedy with the spread of the wildfires. Whenever natural disasters like this strike one region of our Nation, all the rest of us try to pull together as one community, a family, to help those in need. That's what Americans do. And that's why the prayers and good wishes of all the citizens of our Nation are with the people of California. We're facing those fires together.

This has to be a terrifying experience for children awakened at night by their parents and carried away from their homes before they're lost; for property owners, some of whom have faced down a wall of fire with

nothing more than a garden hose in their hands and a prayer in their hearts; and especially, for the gallant, heroic men and women who are fighting these fires and risking their lives to save people and property from being consumed by the blaze.

I'm especially grateful for the work of the pilots, many of whom have flown after dark into strong winds to drop water on the fires to contain their fury. Their actions and the work of countless others define the word "courage," and we can never repay them for what they have done and what they are still prepared to do.

In the fires which struck the southland, we've moved quickly to speed Federal resources and a strong Federal response to those places where it could do the most good in helping the State and local efforts. After designating several counties as major disaster areas, we dispatched Forest Service air tankers and Federal firefighters to the scene. At my direction, Mr. McLarty, the White House Chief of Staff, has coordinated the Federal response. The Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, James Lee Witt, traveled immediately to the scene of the fires, along with Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy and our General Services Administrator, from Orange County, Roger Johnson. We worked with Governor Wilson and his emergency director, Dick Andrews, as well as the leaders in your congressional delegation, especially your Senators Boxer and Feinstein.

And until these fires are out, those in the inland empire, and the new ones tearing through the Santa Monica mountains, our work will continue, and we won't rest either. For these new fires, the Federal response has already begun. We're providing 37 air tankers, 100 fire crews amounting to 2,000 Federal firefighters, 86 fire engines, and 22 helicopters.

I've just spoken with FEMA Director Witt, and he assures me that the Federal efforts are well coordinated with the extraordinary work being done by private citizens and State and local government. I talked with Governor Wilson, and he said the same thing. Just a few moments ago, Director Witt announced my decision to provide \$15 million

to the California Office of Emergency Services to help pay for the State and local fire-fighting costs. This advance will be supplemented as further costs are identified in the coming weeks.

I know this is a big burden for California with all your other troubles, and we ought to do what we can to help. I know, too, from dealing with natural disasters in my home State of Arkansas that these problems put unbearable strains on the budgets of State and local government as well as on private citizens. We're going to try to help communities shoulder their extraordinary expenses that they're facing through no fault of their own. As we provide this help, we'll monitor the situation closely so that we can do more when more is needed to be done.

I know there are people who suffered losses who are upset and frightened about the future. I know there are families concerned about leaving their homes in the fire's path and moving to safety, perhaps spending the night in a shelter. I know there are public safety officers and firefighters who are exhausted from their exertions. And I know there are children who are frightened.

For them especially, but for all of you, I know words alone will not heal your hurt or make you whole. But I hope you will take some solace in knowing that your country is concerned about you and that I am closely following the work being done to protect you. I hope you are sustained by the knowledge that communities in California are pulling together and neighbors are helping each other. This is what our great country is all about.

Have faith, and take heart. Soon the tragedy will pass, and the recovery will begin. And as this happens, and you know that it will, you will be in the prayers and hearts of your fellow citizens. You are not facing these fires alone.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke via satellite at 8:45 p.m. from Room 459 of the Old Executive Office Building to the southern California community.

Proclamation 6620—National Health Information Management Week, 1993

November 3, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Over the course of the next months, the people of the United States and their elected Members of Congress will have the opportunity to participate in one of the most important processes of our times: the implementation of health care reform. As the proposals have been developed, the authors have relied on extensive information that has been collected regarding the well-being of the people of our Nation and the efficiency of our health care delivery system. Those working on plans for health care reform were extremely fortunate that they could draw upon the vast fund of knowledge contained in some of the most comprehensive health management systems in the world.

Our Nation's status as a world leader in this field is largely due to the role of professional health information managers as they continually investigate and apply new technologies to advance their administrative expertise.

America's 35,000 health information management leaders have a tradition of commitment to excellence and competence, which have become increasingly important components of the health care delivery system of our country.

At the heart of the profession's information management responsibilities are medical history records, both computer-based and paper-generated. On a daily basis, health information managers must take into consideration patients' privacy rights and, at the same time, protect the integrity, accuracy, consistency, reliability, and validity of health information. The professional health information manager orchestrates the collection of many kinds of documentation from a variety of sources, monitors the integrity of the information, and ensures appropriate access to medical records. This professional also collects health care data by abstracting and encoding information, by using computer pro-

grams to interpret data, and by putting in place quality control procedures to guarantee the validity of the information.

Throughout the ongoing health care reform discussions, there has been a strong consensus about the need to lessen the bureaucracy of our Nation's current health care delivery system and to streamline and simplify administrative operations. During this very important time in our Nation's history, health information management professionals are key players in our efforts to reshape the existing system. These dedicated experts are working hard to computerize patient record systems in order to reduce health care costs by decreasing the logjam of unnecessary paperwork confronting hospitals and other health facilities.

We want to recognize the devotion of those who are working to decrease the cost and improve the quality of our health care system. Their past efforts have contributed immeasurably to the health care delivery system and to the medical research community. As health care reform is implemented, the challenges will be quite substantial, but so will the opportunities for demonstrating the creativity and commitment to quality that characterize these important professionals. I urge all Americans to join me in saluting this determined group of men and women, who work as professional health information managers.

The Congress, by House Joint Resolution 205, has designated the week of October 31 through November 6, 1993, as "National Health Information Management Week" and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this week.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week of October 31 through November 6, 1993, as National Health Information Management Week. I call upon all Americans to observe this week by demonstrating their respect and gratitude for all those professionals who have dedicated their careers to consistently improving our systems of health information management.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this third day of November, 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, 9:12 a.m., November 4, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on November 5.

**Statement by the Press Secretary on
Drug Control Policy**
November 3, 1993

The President today signed a decision directive that provides a policy framework for U.S. international drug control efforts as part of the Administration's overall counter-drug policy. The President designated Director Lee Brown of the Office of National Drug Control Policy as responsible for oversight and direction for all counter-drug policies, in coordination with the National Security Council.

In his directive to Agencies involved in the fight against illicit drugs in the hemisphere, the President said that the scourge of illegal narcotics is severely damaging the social fabric of the United States and other countries. He said that the operation of international criminal narcotics syndicates is a national security threat requiring an extraordinary and coordinated response by civilian and military agencies, both unilaterally and by mobilizing international cooperation with other nations and international organizations such as the U.N., OAS, and international financial institutions.

The President's directive, the result of an exhaustive 8-month review of U.S. international policies and strategies, instructed Federal Agencies to change the emphasis in U.S. international drug programs from the past concentration largely on stopping narcotics shipments to a more evenly distributed effort across three programs:

—assisting source countries in addressing the root causes of narcotics production and trafficking through assistance for sustainable development, strengthening democratic institutions and cooperative

programs to counter narcotics traffickers, money laundering, and supply of chemical precursors;

—combating international narco-trafficking organizations;

—emphasizing more selective and flexible interdiction programs near the U.S. border, in the transit zone, and in source countries.

He directed that a working group chaired by the State Department manage implementation of the international strategy, reporting its activities to Director Brown.

The President stressed the need for American leadership in the fight against international drug trafficking. He pledged to work with the Congress to ensure adequate funding for international counter-drug programs.

**Executive Order 12877—
Amendment to Executive Order No.
12569**

November 3, 1993

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the Compact of Free Association (the Compact) and Public Laws 99-239 and 99-658, I hereby order that Executive Order No. 12569 of October 16, 1986, be amended as follows:

Section 1. Paragraphs (1)–(3) of subsection (e) of section 3 shall read:

“(e)(1) The Secretary of State shall be responsible for the conduct of United States relations with the Freely Associated States, carry out related matters, and provide appropriate support to the Interagency Group, bearing in mind the continued special relationship between the United States and the Freely Associated States.

(2) The Secretaries of Defense and Interior may, to the extent permitted by law, delegate any or all of their respective authorities and responsibilities as described in this Order to the Secretary of State or his or her designee. The Secretary of State or his or her designee shall serve as Executive Secretary of the Interagency Group.

(3) Personnel additional to that provided by the Secretary of State may be detailed to the Department of State by the Executive departments and agencies that are members of the Interagency Group, and by other agencies as appropriate. Executive departments and agencies shall, to the extent permitted by law, provide such information, advice, and administrative services and facilities to the Secretary of State as may be necessary to conduct United States relations with the Freely Associated States.”

Sec. 2. Section 5 shall read:

“Sec. 5. Cooperation among Executive Departments and Agencies. All Executive departments and agencies shall cooperate in the effectuation of the provisions of this Order. The Interagency Group and the Secretary of State shall facilitate such cooperative measures. Nothing in this Order shall be construed to impair the authority and responsibility of the Secretary of Defense for security and defense matters in or relating to the Freely Associated States.”

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 3, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:08 p.m., November 4, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 4, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on November 8.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the NAFTA Legislation November 3, 1993

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit today legislation to implement the North American Free Trade Agreement, an agreement vital to the national interest and to our ability to compete in the global economy. I also am transmitting a number of related documents required for the implementation of NAFTA.

For decades, the United States has enjoyed a bipartisan consensus on behalf of a free and open trading system. Administrations of both parties have negotiated, and

Congresses have approved, agreements that lower tariffs and expand opportunities for American workers and American firms to export their products overseas. The result has been bigger profits and more jobs here at home.

Our commitment to more free and more fair world trade has encouraged democracy and human rights in nations that trade with us. With the end of the Cold War, and the growing significance of the global economy, trade agreements that lower barriers to American exports rise in importance.

The North American Free Trade Agreement is the first trade expansion measure of this new era, and it is in the national interest that the Congress vote its approval.

Not only will passage of NAFTA reduce tariff barriers to American goods, but it also will operate in an unprecedented manner—to improve environmental conditions on the shared border between the United States and Mexico, to raise the wages and living standards of Mexican workers, and to protect our workers from the effects of unexpected surges in Mexican imports into the United States.

This pro-growth, pro-jobs, pro-exports agreement—if adopted by the Congress—will vastly improve the status quo with regard to trade, the environment, labor rights, and the creation and protection of American jobs.

Without NAFTA, American business will continue to face high tariff rates and restrictive nontariff barriers that inhibit their ability to export to Mexico. Without NAFTA, incentives will continue to encourage American firms to relocate their operations and take American jobs to Mexico. Without NAFTA, we face continued degradation of the natural environment with no strategy for clean-up. Most of all, without NAFTA, Mexico will have every incentive to make arrangements with Europe and Japan that operate to our disadvantage.

Today, Mexican tariffs are two and a half times greater than U.S. tariffs. This agreement will create the world’s largest tariff-free zone, from the Canadian Arctic to the Mexican tropics—more than 370 million consumers and over \$6.5 trillion of production, led by the United States. As tariff walls come

down and exports go up, the United States will create 200,000 new jobs by 1995. American goods will enter this market at lower tariff rates than goods made by our competitors.

Mexico is a rapidly growing country with a rapidly expanding middle class and a large pent-up demand for goods—especially American goods. Key U.S. companies are poised to take advantage of this market of 90 million people. NAFTA ensures that Mexico's reforms will take root, and then flower.

Moreover, NAFTA is a critical step toward building a new post-Cold War community of free markets and free nations throughout the Western Hemisphere. Our neighbors—not just in Mexico but throughout Latin America—are waiting to see whether the United States will lead the way toward a more open, hopeful, and prosperous future or will instead hunker down behind protective, but self-defeating walls. This Nation—and this Congress—has never turned away from the challenge of international leadership. This is no time to start.

The North American Free Trade Agreement is accompanied by supplemental agreements, which will help ensure that increased trade does not come at the cost of our workers or the border environment. Never before has a trade agreement provided for such comprehensive arrangements to raise the living standards of workers or to improve the environmental quality of an entire region. This makes NAFTA not only a stimulus for economic growth, but a force for social good.

Finally, NAFTA will also provide strong incentives for cooperation on illegal immigration and drug interdiction.

The implementing legislation for NAFTA I forward to the Congress today completes a process that has been accomplished in the best spirit of bipartisan teamwork. NAFTA was negotiated by two Presidents of both parties and is supported by all living former Presidents of the United States as well as by distinguished Americans from many walks of life—government, civil rights, and business.

They recognize what trade expanding agreements have meant for America's economic greatness in the past, and what this agreement will mean for America's economic

and international leadership in the years to come. The North American Free Trade Agreement is an essential part of the economic strategy of this country: expanding markets abroad and providing a level playing field for American workers to compete and win in the global economy.

America is a Nation built on hope and renewal. If the Congress honors this tradition and approves this agreement, it will help lead our country into the new era of prosperity and leadership that awaits us.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 3, 1993.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 4.

Message to the Congress Transmitting NAFTA Supplemental Agreements

November 4, 1993

To the Congress of the United States:

By separate message, I have transmitted to the Congress a bill to approve and implement the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). In fulfillment of legal requirements of our trade laws, that message also transmitted a statement of administrative action, the NAFTA itself, and certain supporting information required by law.

Beyond the legally required documents conveyed with that message, I want to provide you with the following important documents:

- The supplemental agreements on labor, the environment, and import surges;
- Agreements concluded with Mexico relating to citrus products and to sugar and sweeteners;
- The border funding agreement with Mexico;
- Letters agreeing to further negotiations to accelerate duty reductions;
- An environmental report on the NAFTA and side agreements;

- A list of more technical letters related to NAFTA that have previously been provided to the Congress and that are already on file with relevant congressional committees.

These additional documents are not subject to formal congressional approval under fast-track procedures. However, the additional agreements provide significant benefits for the United States that will be obtained only if the Congress approves the NAFTA. In that sense, these additional agreements, as well as the other documents conveyed, warrant the careful consideration of each Member of Congress. The documents I have transmitted in these two messages constitute the entire NAFTA package.

I strongly believe that the NAFTA and the other agreements will mark a significant step forward for our country, our economy, our environment, and our relations with our neighbors on this continent. I urge the Congress to seize this historic opportunity by approving the legislation I have transmitted.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 4, 1993.

Exchange With Reporters in Lexington, Kentucky

November 4, 1993

Elections and NAFTA

Q. Mr. President, isn't it going to be a lot tougher to get NAFTA votes from Democrats after the election results?

The President: No.

Q. Why not?

The President. What in the world would that have to do with anything?

Q. Well, Members are going to say that you can't get the numbers.

The President. That's ludicrous. That's just a Washington story. That's ridiculous. What about all the mayors that walked in with no opposition that were active in my

campaign in the primaries? That's ridiculous. I'm proud of the showing that those two guys had, Florio and Dinkins. They came back from the dead. Everybody wrote them off. Besides that, NAFTA wasn't an issue in any of those races. I just think it's ridiculous. The only thing they need—[inaudible]—is doing the right thing for America. And I think they will.

The real evidence is that if people think you're for change you get elected, and if they think you're for the status quo that's not working, you're—[inaudible]—and the proper change this time is to support NAFTA.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 1:30 p.m. at Lexmark International, Inc. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks on NAFTA to Employees of Lexmark International in Lexington

November 4, 1993

The President. Thank you very much. You know, Roberta was nervous as a cat, but she did a good job, didn't she? Let's give her a hand. She did great. [Applause]

I want to thank Marvin Mann for his remarks and for hosting us here today; my long-time friend and former colleague Governor Jones for his support and his kind remarks; your fine Congressman, Scotty Baesler, for his support of NAFTA. And I want to thank also—there are people here from at least four other operations, business operations, in this area I know of. Raise your hand if you're here so I'll know whether I've got it right. There are people here from Texas Instruments, I think. Where are you? Over here. From Monarch Tool and Manufacturing, from Rand McNally, and from DataBeam. Gosh, I can't believe they roped you off over here. They're afraid you'll pick up some trade secrets, I think. [Laughter]

I wanted to come here to Kentucky and to this plant and to you folks today to talk about the North American Free Trade

Agreement. I also asked to come to a place where I could spend some time with real American workers, men and women whose lives are on the line every day and whose children have a stake in the decisions that I must make and the Congress must make for you and for our economy.

I came here mostly to answer questions. And I'm going to take some time answering questions when I finish my remarks, so I hope you'll be thinking of them, questions about this North American Free Trade Agreement, about our economy, about how they fit together. And if you have some hard questions just give them to me with the bark off. I'm used to it. One of the things that dealing with the distinguished Washington press corps back there does is to sort of harden you to the questions of daily life, and now I look forward to them every day.

I also want to say to you this: Before I became President I was Governor of a State not all that much unlike Kentucky. My job was to try to create jobs and keep jobs. It was to try to educate people so they could do the jobs of today and tomorrow. For most of the time I was Governor, our unemployment rate was above the national average, but we kept working to export, to increase investment, both domestic and foreign, to improve our education and training programs. And in my last year in office, in every month we were first or second in the country in job growth after a long dry spell. We had plants shut down and move to Mexico when I was Governor of my State, at least three that I know of. I'm proud to say that we got one of them to come back, because our people were more productive and they were good at changing the product line on a quick basis when the demand required it.

I say that to make this point, first and foremost: I spent most of the last 20 years around hard-working people who were struggling to survive and sometimes to get ahead in a tough global economy. I ran for President because I was worried about the future of our country and my own child's future moving toward the 20th century, because I thought we had three great problems: economic stagnation, a society that was coming apart with violence and other problems when it ought to be coming together, and a political

system that was not facing up to the problems, where there was a huge gap between what people in public office said and what they did. And ever since I have been in Washington, I have been trying to change that. We've tried to give the economy some help by bringing the deficit down, getting interest rates down, getting the economy going again. We've had more private sector jobs come into this economy in the last 9 months than in the previous 4 years. We're beginning to turn it around.

But I came here to talk about this trade agreement today for one simple reason: Every wealthy country in the world, including the United States, is having trouble creating jobs. Every wealthy country in the world in the last 10 years saw an increase in inequality. That is, middle class people's wages didn't keep up with inflation, while people who were particularly able to triumph in the global economy had their incomes go way up. So what had happened in America from World War II until about 10 or 15 years ago—which was we all got richer but we came together, the country was growing together—began to change, and we began to grow apart, so that a majority of our people were working a longer work week for the same or lower wages to pay more for the basics in life, health care, housing, education. And I was concerned about that.

We can bring the deficit down; we can get interest rates down; we can get investment back up. But there is nobody anywhere in the world who has come forward with a good argument for any way to create more jobs and raise the incomes of working people without expanding trade. You've got to have more people to buy more products if you want to have the benefits of all the increasing productivity.

When we were coming here today, Mr. Mann said, "You know, we're producing a new product, and the workers really figured out how to produce it. We have a new way of dealing with defects, and they figured out how to do that. We now have all this empty space in this factory because they figured out how to do more in less space and increase productivity." Well, if you want the benefits of that, you've got to have more people to buy the things that you're producing, because

productivity is the same person producing more in less time, right? No wealthy country can create more jobs and increase incomes, I will say again, without expanding world trade and global economic growth. Nobody has explained how that gets done. And nobody fighting this trade agreement has made an argument about how that gets done. It cannot be done.

About a half of the growth of our economy in the last 5 years has come from exports. Jobs that are tied to exports, on average, pay about 17 percent more than jobs that have nothing to do with exports. We do have trade problems in America, but they aren't with Mexico. Five years ago we had a \$5.6 billion trade deficit with Mexico. This year we're going to have a \$5.5 billion trade surplus with Mexico. The Mexican people collectively bought over \$40 billion worth of American products last year. We have a big trade deficit with our trading partners in Asia, and I'm working hard to do something about that. I'm going out to Washington State to meet with the leaders of all the Asian countries later this month. But we need to know that right here at home, on our border, there are people who like American products who are dying to buy them.

Let me just give you one example: This company produces components that go into personal computers. Three years ago Mexico bought 120,000 computers from us, last year 390,000, this year 600,000. There are 90 million people there. This trade agreement, NAFTA, takes the tariff on computers and for software from 20 percent to zero. In other words, instead of 600,000 computers, we can be selling millions there. That's just one example. It will create jobs for us. Exports from Kentucky alone have grown 350 percent to Mexico over the last 5 years because they've been bringing their tariffs down.

Now, if this trade agreement passes, NAFTA, we estimate America will add another 200,000 jobs by 1995 alone. Why? For the following reasons: Number one, our tariffs today on Mexican products are much lower than their tariffs on ours, so when they take theirs down we'll gain more. Number two, they have a lot of domestic content requirements, especially on automobiles. In other words, they say, "If you want to sell

them in the Mexican market you've got to make this stuff here." That alone, that change alone, we estimate will enable our auto-workers here in America to go from selling only 1,000 cars in Mexico to 50,000 to 60,000 cars in Mexico next year alone. This is a big deal.

Now, the people who are against this, what do they say? They say, "You don't want to have a trade agreement with Mexico because look at all the jobs that went to Mexico in the 1980's because they had low wages and lax environmental enforcement. And all this will do is to make that happen everywhere in the country. It will be a disaster."

That one fellow talks about the giant sucking sound. Let me tell you something, folks. I know a little about this. I was a Governor of a State that lost plants to Mexico. My State was small enough that if somebody shut a plant down and moved it to Mexico, there was a good chance I knew who they were, the people that ran the plants, the people that worked in the plants. I used to go stand at plants on the last day they were open and shake hands with people when they walked off the job for the last time. I know something about that. And I want you to understand this very clearly from somebody who's lived through this: This agreement will make that less likely, not more likely. If we beat this NAFTA agreement, anybody who wants to go down to Mexico, right across the line, for low wages, for lax environmental enforcement, can go right on doing it and can make products there and put it back into the American market with zero tariff as long as they're close enough to the border, if we beat it.

If we adopt it, their tariffs will go down on our products; their requirements that we produce in their country to sell in their country will go down: less incentive to move factories there. They will get factories all over their country, not to import stuff to America but to produce for the Mexican market. That's what they get out of this.

The short of it is everything bad that everybody tells you about with this agreement can go right on happening if we don't adopt it. If we do adopt it, it will get better. Why? Because wages will go up faster in Mexico if they adopt it, because they'll have more growth and because the trade agreement re-

quires them to observe their own labor code, and the President has committed to raise the minimum wage every time economic growth goes up every year. Number two, for the first time their own environmental codes, which are pretty good on the books, will have to be enforced because they're in this trade agreement. This has never happened in the whole history of world trade where one country has said, you can put our environmental laws in the trade agreement and enforce them. We'll be able to do that.

The third thing I want to say to you is that you know this here in Kentucky because you trade so much. Wage rates are not the only thing that determine where smart people put their plants. Otherwise there would be no plants at all in Kentucky, and Haiti would have no unemployment rate. Right? I mean, you don't even have to take the Americans' word for it. Look at where Toyota is. Pretty close to here, right? BMW, where are they? South Carolina. Mercedes just made a decision; where did they go? To Mexico? No, to Alabama. Why? Because a study recently concluded on the auto industry shows that you can manufacture a car in America and put it in an American showroom for over \$400 less than you can manufacture it in Mexico and put it in an American showroom, because our workers are more than 5 times more productive, and the transportation cost is less, even though the labor costs are higher.

We can compete and win. People talk all the time about the apparel industry because we phased out some of the protections on apparel and textiles. Do you know that we exported to Mexico \$1.6 billion of textiles and apparels last year? We sent to them. They wanted to buy our stuff. Even there, we can compete when given the chance.

Now, will some people be dislocated? Yes, they will. Some people will be dislocated if we do nothing. Every year, Americans lose their jobs. And one of the tough parts of the world economy we're living in is that now, unlike it was 10 or 20 years ago, when people lose their jobs, they don't normally get back the same job they lost. They normally have to find a new job. That means that we owe you, those of us who are in Washington, we owe you a system of education and training

and investment incentives that will help people to find new jobs. We have to do that, and we are going to do that.

The whole unemployment system today is a joke for the economy we're facing today. I know that, and I know we have to fix it. But that has to be done without regard to NAFTA. NAFTA creates jobs. NAFTA makes the problems we've got in our trade and investment with Mexico go down, not go up. NAFTA enables us—and this is the last point I want to make—NAFTA enables us to take this trade agreement with Mexico and extend it to other countries in Latin America who are democracies and believe in free market economics. And that's where the real jobs come in, when you've got a whole trading bloc from Canada all the way to the southern tip of Latin America, when you've got over 700 million people working together and trading together. And we know those people like Americans, like American products, and want to be a part of our future.

It is our insurance policy. We hope that we will have a new trade agreement by the end of the year when all nations, from Asia to Europe and all around, lower their barriers to our products. We hope that. But we know the people in Latin America like our people, like our culture, like our products, will buy them if they get a chance, and are dying to do it. And they are going to look at Congress and how we vote on this NAFTA legislation, and they're going to decide whether America is going to be a trustworthy, reliable leader and partner in the years ahead to make this world what it ought to be.

I have worked my heart out for this because I think it's good for your jobs and good for your children's future. And I don't think we can afford to cut and run. We cannot turn away from the world. If I thought for a minute that we could run off from this agreement and all the others and build a wall around this country and make jobs stable again and raise incomes, well then I would certainly do it because it would be in your interest. But it won't happen. You cannot run and hide from the world we are living in. So we better just rear back and do exactly what this company's doing: We're going to have to compete and win. I think we can do it. This is a big vote.

I compliment your Congressman for having the courage to be for this agreement. I hope you'll ask the other Members of the Kentucky delegation and the Senators to vote for it, because it will determine in large measure where we go as an economy over the next 10 years and whether we can escape this terrible trap that is gripping Japan and Europe and the United States of not being able to create enough jobs and not being able to raise people's incomes every year. We've got to turn it around. This is the first step, and I ask you to help us get it done.

Thank you very much.

We've got some microphones in the back. Who has the mikes? Raise your hands. Anybody have a question about this? There are some. Just go through and find people, and I'll go from mike to mike. Go ahead.

[A participant asked if Mexico has similar tariffs on trade with the European Community and Asia and if Mexico might sign trade agreements with Europe and Asia if NAFTA does not pass.]

The President. The answer to both questions is, yes. And let me explain that. Let's just take computers because that's an easy example. If you take computers, there's a 20 percent tariff on all computers made outside of Mexico for sale in Mexico, on our products, on European products, on Japanese products. If this agreement goes through, the tariffs will be phased out on American products; they will maintain the same tariffs on Japanese and European products. So we will get a trade advantage over them in the Mexican market, in return for which they will get more access to American investment throughout their country.

If we don't do it, what will happen? They'll go get the money from Japan or Europe, and they'll give them the same deal. And they won't be nearly as concerned as we have been at what effect this has on American wages and on the environment, because they don't live next door to Mexico. I mean, what would you do? If I were the Finance Minister of Japan, on the day after Congress voted down the North American Free Trade Agreement, I'd get on an airplane and go to Mexico City and cut a deal. That's what I would do. And the risk of that is very high.

That's one reason why, in addition to these others—I should have said this in my talk—every living former President, every living former Secretary of State, every living former Secretary of the Treasury, every living Nobel Prize-winning economist, and 41 of the 50 Governors have endorsed this. You know, these economists, they disagree on more stuff than all the living former Presidents do. You might think any one of us would do something wrong to you, but surely not all of us would at the same time, right? [Laughter] And that's one reason.

Next question.

Q. Can NAFTA help improve exports to Japan and the European Community as well?

The President. It can indirectly, and let me tell you why. That's a very good question, and it's important. Let me explain, first of all, from the point of view of these other nations that have basically caught up to the United States since World War II. That's not all bad; that's enabled them to buy more of our products. But in Asia, most nations have developed by willfully keeping their wages down, getting very high savings rates, plowing back the savings into new plant and equipment and new products all the time. That's what they've done. When you do that, you don't have enough money to buy other people's products.

So Japan has a big trade surplus with us. They've been very good about investing in our country and putting our people to work, but they still don't buy as many of our products. This year, for the first time, we're selling some rice to them, for example, which is at least popular back where I come from. China has a \$19 billion trade surplus with us—we buy 38 percent of all the exports of China, all of us do—Taiwan this year about \$9 billion, although it goes up and down. Europe will have a trade deficit or a trade surplus with us. Sometimes they buy a lot more from us than they sell us, but they have to be growing to do it. Now their economies are flat.

Here's what I think will happen. I can't promise you this, but here's what I think will happen. If we adopt NAFTA, the rest of the world, Europe and Japan will see, "Well, America might have a whole trading bloc, from Canada down to the southern tip of

South America, and we could be really at a disadvantage there. So we better adopt this new worldwide trading agreement they wanted, lower our tariffs, lower our barriers, let them sell into our markets so we'll have at least some access to the rest of the markets."

So I think NAFTA will be a huge indirect incentive for Japan and for Europe to reach an agreement on a new world trading system by the end of the year that I've been pushing for hard and that we've been working for, for years and years. If that happens, you will see a very large increase in the number of manufacturing jobs in America in a short time, just because Europe and Japan have so much more money than Mexico does. I mean, there's more of them, and they've got more money. So I think that would really be a godsend, and I think there's a good chance that it will happen.

[A participant asked about programs to help American workers who lose their jobs because of NAFTA.]

The President. He said there's a big difference of opinion about what will happen in the long and the short run. Even if it's good for us in the long run, will we lose some jobs in the short run? What did we do for people who lost their jobs when I was in Arkansas? And what have we proposed to do with this NAFTA agreement? All good questions.

First, let me say what I think will happen in the long and short run, then let me answer the other two questions. And this is a complicated thing. There will still be people from the United States who will vest in factories in Mexico if this agreement goes through. But today when people invest in factories in Mexico, they invest along the American border in factories for the purpose of producing there and selling here. What the Mexicans want is to, in effect, erase that borderline and get investments in Mexico City to put people to work there to produce for the Mexican market, not for the American market. That's what they get out of this deal. And obviously, the more investment they get down there and the more jobs that are created and the more they sell to themselves, the higher their incomes will be and the more they'll be able to spend money on foreign products, too.

Today—this is an astonishing thing—Mexico buys more American products per capita than any country in the world except Canada, even though it's still a poor country. That's because 70 percent of all the money they have to spend on foreign products gets spent on American products. So what I think will happen is, there will be more investment by Americans in Mexico, but instead of being along the border to make products to sell back here, it will be down in the country to make products to sell in the country. That will put more people to work. It will stabilize the population. Over the long run it will reduce illegal immigration and will increase their ability to buy our products.

Now, will some people be dislocated? Probably, because nearly every trade agreement that creates jobs costs some. When that happened at home, what we did was several things. First of all, we'd go into a community if it had high unemployment and actually offer to invest money at the State level to help attract new industries to that town. Then we would offer to share the cost of training the workers. And if it was a distressed community, we would also give them an enterprise zone that would give extra tax incentives to invest there.

What we're doing at the national level is to provide much more money for job retraining, number one. Number two, we're going to set up a development bank to try to get funds for indigenous businesses to start in areas that have been hurt by this, which I think is very important. And number three, we're going to have something we now—we don't call them enterprise zones, we call them empowerment zones at the Federal level—that we're going to locate in some of the most distressed communities in this country that will give huge incentives for people in the private sector to put Americans back to work in high unemployment areas. There is not enough Government money to fix all these problems. You've got to get the private sector to invest and put people back to work. So those are the three things we're working on doing now. That's a very good question.

Q. Since this is basically an extension of the U.S.-Canada trade agreement, what numerical benefits has the U.S. gained from the U.S.-Canadian trade agreement?

The President. Well, the trade agreement we have with Canada is—it is an extension of it, but what we did with Canada was to basically take more and more of our trade and put it into a free trade zone, that is, we took quotas off, we lowered tariffs. But Canada and the United States are both quite well-developed countries. So the main benefit that we got out of the Canada-U.S. trade agreement is we got to sell more of the things that we were really good at producing or had a low cost advantage in, they got to sell more of what they were good at producing or had a low cost advantage in, so that we essentially got to play to our strengths. And the volume in trade in both countries went way up.

Our trade with Canada is more or less in balance. But even when trade is in balance, it can be a great benefit to both countries if, by putting it in balance, it grows faster than your economy would have grown otherwise. In other words, if we added more economic growth and they added more economic growth, we both came out ahead. And that's been the primary benefit there.

In the case of Mexico, because they're at a different point in their development, in all probability we will continue to have a trade surplus with them, and they will get an investment advantage from us in the rest of their country. So I do think that the two countries are not too analogous now. I think 30 years from now they will be. But I think in the meanwhile—let me just say, the people in Mexico who are not for this deal, and there are people in Mexico who are not for it, they're not for it because they think that they're giving us a permanent trade surplus with them in return for having access to our capital, because Mexicans like American products so much.

So there will be a difference there. In other words, they can't possibly quite enter into the same relationship with us that Canada did because they're not capable, their economy's not big enough or diverse enough yet. The Mexican economy, even though 90 million people live there, is about the size of the California economy from Los Angeles

to the Mexican border. That's about how big it is, about one-twentieth the American economy.

Q. Good afternoon, Mr. President. Thank you for coming to Lexmark. We certainly appreciate it. I'd like to take us into the future, say, maybe 1996, the month October, Hillary is ahead by maybe five points in the—no, I understand that you'll be running for re-election; hopefully, Congressman Baesler will be right there with you.

The President. I don't know; this has turned out to be a hard job. [Laughter] Go ahead.

[The participant then asked about possible legislation to help workers displaced because of NAFTA.]

The President. The people who are specifically displaced, there are only three things you can do for them in my opinion, that I can think of, anyway. And I've been working at this now for the better part of 20 years, on and off. One is, they should have access to a system of training and education that is much more effective than the one we have today. The Federal Government's got 150 different employment training programs. The unemployment system, as all of you know, still works like it used to: You get an unemployment check, and you're supposed to basically check around and see if you can find a new job. But the idea is, people wait until the benefits run out, hoping their old employer will call them back. That used to happen; it doesn't happen much anymore. What we're going to do is to construct a system that will give anybody who loses their job because of a trade-related dislocation access to a much better training program, much more quickly, tied to identifying those areas where the jobs are growing in number anywhere within driving distance of them, first thing.

Secondly, we're going to have a development bank, a North American development bank which will concentrate its activities in areas where there have been substantial job losses to try to start new job enterprises there.

The third thing we're going to do is to develop special investment incentives targeted to those areas where the jobs have been lost.

Those are the only things that I can think of that we can do, except to give you a healthy economy that's producing more jobs.

One of the things that makes this so frightening to people is that it used to be—I mean, when I was a kid, when somebody lost their job, when the country had a 3 percent unemployment rate, that was like having zero unemployment, because there were 3 percent of the people who were moving around all the time. Now when people lose their jobs, they're afraid they'll never get another one or they'll never get another one paying as much as the one that they just lost. So we have a much heavier responsibility.

The answer to your question is that you should be able to see these specific programs on the books not by October of '96 but by the end of the budget cycle in '94; we should have passed these programs and put them in place for those folks, because that's when you'll begin to see it. In other words, when we adopt the trade agreement the end of this year, we have \$90 million set aside right now for extra training investment for those folks in the short run, to buy us a year and a half to enact a new training program and investment strategy. But we should be able to get it done by the end of '94 when Congress goes home; that's our goal. And if I could plug my wife a bit, if we provide health care security to all of them, that'll also be a huge incentive, because then at least they won't lose that for their children.

Q. Welcome to Lexmark, Mr. President. My question is, do you have any concerns, if there are any concerns, about Canada's recent leadership change being—and it is an anti-NAFTA leadership change. Are you concerned about that?

The President. Basically, no. We've had a lot of conversations with the new leader of Canada and the new party. He raised a lot of the same questions about NAFTA that I did. And when I called him—I mean, what I wanted to do with this trade agreement, and I guess I ought to tell you that, I wanted to have three things added to the agreement, which have been added. One is, I wanted to know that there would be some device by which we could make sure the Mexicans were moving to enforce their own labor code

so that we would raise labor standards on both sides of the border. We have that now.

Secondly, I wanted to know that they would enforce their environmental laws, because they weren't now. Their environmental code is actually pretty good, but it's not being enforced. So we set up a mechanism for doing that and a financing mechanism to get the money to do it.

The third thing I wanted was a provision that would take account of unintended consequences. And that really goes to something that two or three of you have asked about. That is, suppose all these brilliant people who have been negotiating this turn out to be wrong about something, not just for us but for them, too? I mean, suppose within a year after this deal takes effect, there's some small but not insignificant part of their economy or ours that seems to be on the verge of just vanishing like that, something no one foresaw? This agreement has a provision to put the brakes on that and to reinstitute the former system as it applies to that sector of the economy for a period of 3 years while we work it out. So there's a protection against unintended consequences.

And the last thing I guess I ought to say is, suppose any party becomes convinced that the others are proceeding in bad faith; you can pull out with 6 months notice. That's another thing most Americans don't know. This is not the enemy. In other words, if somebody turns out to be lying or some development turns out to be unanticipated, there are ways to correct this.

Now, to go back to your specific question, Canada likes what we did on the environmental agreement, on the labor agreement; they wanted that done. They now have substantially, to the best of my knowledge, no more problems with Mexico. They have some outstanding problems with us in trade, which we are negotiating through now. We do not believe that it will be in any way necessary to reopen the agreement to resolve those problems, and we're working hard on them and we have been this week. So I feel pretty optimistic that it'll be okay.

Let's get over here. Give equal time to the other folks here.

Q. Mr. President, many Americans and American companies are concerned with in-

lectual property rights, and particularly in the Mexican market. Has there been any provision in NAFTA to address that?

The President. Yes. The NAFTA agreement offers protections for intellectual property rights and for investment, which I think are quite important. You know, the intellectual property rights may sound esoteric to some of you, may sound like somebody wants to write a book and not have it copied, and that's part of it. But it's also part of the software business and part of anything that comes out of people's creative skills. It's a big part of America's economic advantage in the world is that we develop all these ideas.

And I've just been working to try to open other markets for a lot of our products that were closed during the cold war because we were worried about letting other people get our technology or our ideas. And we've just taken the wraps off \$37 billion a year worth of computers, supercomputers, and telecommunications equipment. And we're looking at some others, some software and things like that. And one of the problems is protecting the intellectual property rights of our people around the world. But I think you will find that the provisions there on intellectual property substantially improve what happens now there.

Q. Mr. President, I haven't seen too many things in my life that Republicans and Democrats have agreed on. You may have noticed some of that in Washington. Doesn't it scare you when your opponents suddenly become friendly? And also, are there some human rights demands in this thing?

The President. He's worried about the agreement because the Republicans and Democrats agree on it, right?

Let me just say, first of all, back when I was a Governor I had much less partisanship to contend with than I do in Washington. It seems to be a disease that grips the water up there. But I think what happens, I think all these people who have served as President, when they get out and they have no other personal agenda really, by and large, and they look on their country and they look at the rest of the world, and most people, after they've been President and they can't run for anything else or do much else in terms of their personal ambition or politi-

cally, I think that they really are saying what they honestly believe to be in the best interests of the country.

Now, there are a lot of people who have criticized the NAFTA agreement, coming out of the labor movement, particularly, on the grounds that there are violations of human rights in Mexico or the Mexican system is not as democratic as ours is. It is different from ours and not as open and democratic as ours is. But it is becoming more democratic. Again, I think if we shut them off from us, it is likely to become less democratic.

We do a lot of trade with a lot of other countries that are not as close to us politically as they are. I mean, we've had a lot of political problems, for example, with China after Tiananmen Square. But we keep buying a lot of products from them, and most American business interests have asked us to continue to do it. And many American labor interests have asked us to continue to do it because we're beginning to invest over there and get some markets over there.

I think we have to be mindful of that. And if we think that there are abuses of human rights anywhere, we should stand up to them. And I've tried to do that. But I don't think, given the dramatic improvements in the people who, on that score, who are operating in Mexico in the last several years, I don't think that that's a good argument to run away from this trade agreement.

That is, to me, the Salinas government and the man who was there before him started a move away from their anti-American, single-party, hunker-down, isolate-from-the-world, operate-in-ways-that-we-don't-consider-acceptable system, to one that's more pro-American, more open, and more democratic. I think they are moving in our direction. I think if we reject them, they will develop a different strategy, and it'll make it less likely that they will grow in human rights and democracy observance.

Q. It's been estimated that this is going to require \$2.4 billion in funding over the next 5 years. How do you propose that we generate that funding?

The President. I don't think it will. What will it require the money for? What's the money going to be spent on? They keep

throwing these dollars around. What money will be required?

Q. The lack of tariffs, what we're charging on tariffs now, funding for the programs that would be for the displaced jobs, et cetera.

The President. Over the next 5 years, I'll tell you what I think it will cost. The tariffs are a tax, essentially, and we're going to reduce the tariffs; that costs \$2.5 billion over 5 years. The package that we sent up to the Congress will replace those tariffs by having a temporary fee of \$1.50 on foreign travel, air travel coming into the United States, and by changing some of the ways we collect customs and things of that kind. They will make up the \$2.5 billion.

Then, we think that the training programs will cost about \$90 million in the first year, and then thereafter more. But they will be funded next year in the budget cycle, in the ordinary course of planning the Federal budget, not massive amounts.

On the environmental cost, we've now got an agreement with the World Bank to finance through appropriate loans several billion dollars' worth of environmental cleanup in Mexico which will be paid back presumably by the polluters themselves in Mexico; they have to work out the repayment terms.

Now, that will be the lion's share of it. There may be some environmental obligations on us that are not yet fully paid for, but they won't get up to anywhere near the figure you mentioned. And we have a border commission with some money in the till there, a few hundred million dollars, and some other bonding options that we have to fund the environmental costs. So we've covered the loss of tariffs in the bill now before the Congress, the training programs will be covered as part of the training initiative I present to the Congress next year, and the only other issue we have to worry about is whatever comes up over the next 5 years in environmental costs that we have to pay for in America; that is usually done by asking the people who do the pollution to pay the lion's share of cleaning it up through making bond payments. So I think we're going to be okay on that.

A lot of the costs have been way overstated, in my view, based on what we know.

Marvin Mann. I hesitate to interrupt this important discussion, but we here at Lexmark have a serious problem.

The President. You've got to go back to work? [Laughter]

Mr. Mann. Our laser printers are so hot in the marketplace that people want more of them than we can build. And so these people are going to be mad at me. They're going to be upset at me if I don't let them get back to work soon. [Laughter] So please take one more question, and then we probably ought to close.

Q. It's my understanding that some tariffs will still be in place after the agreement comes into effect. My question is what percentage of goods going each way will still have tariffs on them immediately after, and then after 5 years?

The President. Most of them will be all gone after 5 years. I can't answer that, but I'll get you an answer. If you give me your address, I'll sent you a specific answer to it.

Let me tell you, this was a part of the negotiation, but some of the particularly sensitive items that were clearly felt by one side or the other to need a longer period of time to get to where they could fully compete were given more time. There are a few things where the phaseout goes all the way to 7 years or 10 years. But by and large, there are substantial reductions in the tariffs immediately, and almost all the reductions occur within the first 3 years.

And let me just back up and say, while the products that we've mentioned here, and I think all the products that are produced by any of these folks at these five companies that could be sold into Mexico, have a 20 percent tariff, some Mexican products are less. And the average Mexican tariff is just a little over 10 percent. But a lot of the stuff where we've got real hot opportunities, that's a 20 percent tariff. So that's why I've been so interested in them. Our average tariff on their products is 4 percent.

Where there is a longer phaseout period, it's normally because we have something called a nontariff barrier, that is, an absolute limit on how much can come in. That's normally on textiles and apparel. So there's a longer period of phaseout there to make sure that there's more of an opportunity to adjust

to whatever the competitive developments are, so that we don't just throw cold water on them.

I wish I could stay all day. You guys have been great. I hope you will support this. It means more jobs for this country.

And also, don't forget, one of the things I want to emphasize again, it didn't come up in the questions. When I was at the United Nations a few weeks ago, I had a reception for the leaders of all the other Latin American countries who were there. And I can tell you that Argentina and Chile and Venezuela and Colombia and Bolivia and a lot of other countries that are struggling to maintain democracy want to open up markets with us, and they want to buy our products. Tiny Colombia, in the last 2 years, has increased their purchase of American products by 69 to 64 percent a year. This is a big deal. But if we don't do NAFTA, they'll wonder whether we're really serious about embracing all of Latin America.

Again, I say I hope you will support it. I do believe that it will give us in the short term a competitive advantage over the Europeans and the Japanese. But the most important thing is it will pressure them to adopt a new worldwide trade agreement. American workers are now the most productive in the world. You've got to believe in yourselves. We can do this. We can compete. We can win if we have access to the markets. That's what this gives us.

Thank you very much. We need your help.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:45 p.m. on the production floor. He was introduced by employee Roberta Canady. In his remarks, he referred to Marvin L. Mann, president and chief executive officer, Lexmark International, Inc. A portion of the question-and-answer session could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Appointment of Officials to Senior Executive Service Posts

November 4, 1993

The President today approved seven men and women for Senior Executive Service posts at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Labor, and the Agency for International De-

velopment, U.S. International Development Cooperation Agency.

"I am pleased to announce the addition of these hard-working men and women to my administration," the President said.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Jeanne K. Engel, General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Housing, Federal Housing Commissioner

Art Agnos, Regional Administrator, Region IX

Margery Austin Turner, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Research, Evaluation, and Monitoring, Office of Policy Development and Research

Department of Labor

Edmundo A. Gonzales, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of the American Workplace

Oliver B. Quinn, Deputy Solicitor of Labor, Office of the Solicitor

U.S. Agency for International Development

Nan Borton, Director, Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, Bureau for Food & Humanitarian Assistance

Ramon E. Daubon, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau of Latin America and the Caribbean

NOTE: Biographies of the appointees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Remarks on Establishing the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform and an Exchange With Reporters

November 5, 1993

The President. First of all, I want to thank the leaders of Congress who are here and make a couple of comments, if I might. I am delighted that now both Houses have acted on the crime legislation. I congratulate the House and the Senate, and I look forward to working with them on getting the strongest possible crime bill out we can and hopefully meeting that goal that I have had for a long

time now of putting another 100,000 police officers on the street, which I am convinced will do more in less time to lower the crime rate than anything else. I also hope that we can now move forward to a debate in the Senate and the House on the Brady bill. I hope that it will pass before the Senate goes home and the House goes home.

Finally, let me make one other preliminary comment. During all the debates on the budget, many of which were acrimonious and partisan, there was virtually 100 percent understanding on the part of every Member of Congress that, over the long run, our ability to bring our budget closer to balance and to free up money for needed investments required us to take a hard look at the entitlements part of our budget.

The budget that we have just adopted has been very successful in many ways. It's helped to bring interest rates to historically low levels. We've got investment coming back into the country. We have more jobs coming back in. But we don't have the money to invest in new ventures that might be important to our national defense or to our economic growth and that's because we had to adopt steep defense cuts and a hard freeze on domestic spending for 5 years while the entitlement growth continued unchecked.

As a result of that, today I am establishing by Executive order a bipartisan commission to look into the issue of entitlements of our Government, how it works, and what's the impact on the budget long-term as well as into the general tax structure of the Federal Government. I want to acknowledge and thank the leaders, Republican and Democrat, of the House and the Senate for agreeing to support this commission and name members to it. Two-thirds of the members will be appointed by the congressional leadership on a strictly bipartisan basis. I will appoint a third.

And then I want to give special attention to two Members of the Congress who have worked on this very hard. One is Senator Kerrey who had the idea for this commission, and I intend to name him the Chair. The other is Senator Danforth of Missouri, who is in his last term but has been interested in the entitlement issue for a very long time, and I have asked him to serve as the Vice

Chair. We will be naming the rest of the commission in the fairly near future. But I'm hopeful that this commission, by next spring, will be able to do some work which will chart a future for the Congress and for the country, which will enable us to do the people's business up here and keep the country moving forward into the 21st century.

So I thank all the leadership for their willingness to support this. And I'm going to sign the Executive order and then we'll answer a few questions and get on with our meeting, because there's a vote in the Senate.

[At this point, the President signed the Executive order.]

NAFTA Debate

Q. Mr. President, why are you putting the Vice President up against the king of the one-liners? Aren't you sacrificing a political career here?

The President. Let me say this, I certainly appreciate the way you characterized it. If we get an honest discussion of the issues, the Vice President will do just fine because he's an accomplished debater and, more importantly, because he's got the evidence on his side. I understand why Mr. Perot wanted to have a rally packed with people that he could get there who already had their minds made up against NAFTA. But I think the Vice President's issued the challenge to show up in Florida and have Larry King moderate the debate. And if we get a genuine discussion of the issues, I'm very confident that he'll do fine. It was his idea; I've got to compliment him. It wasn't mine. Wasn't it?

The Vice President. Absolutely——

Q. Why do you feel it's necessary to take on Ross Perot to do what many people would consider sinking to his level?

The President. Why are you sinking to his level, Mr. Vice President? [Laughter] Why did you want to do that?

The Vice President. I think the country does this from a discussion of the facts about NAFTA. What we're finding is that a whole lot of people in the Congress say, "We agree with you on the facts, but we're getting a lot of political pressure on the other side. Is there any way that you can get the facts out to a wider audience?" And I think the discussion of what NAFTA really does—it

creates new jobs in America. The volume of our products being shipped to Mexico has been increasing twice as fast as the volume of their goods being shipped here. The more discussion of the facts, the better.

Q. Are you going to do one debate or three, Mr. Vice President?

The Vice President. Well, I've contacted Larry King and said that first of all, I issued this challenge; he accepted and proposed Florida. I said I'll be there on Sunday. I contacted Larry King. And we want a neutral format and a neutral place. I don't want to go to a rally filled with 20,000 people on one side of the issue. He was generous to say that he would buy the television time. Well, let's let Larry King provide the television time.

Senator Mitchell. Why don't you pay for the television time?

The Vice President. I considered that—[laughter]—I considered just picking up the tab.

Q. Mr. President, aren't you the slightest bit concerned, not the least bit worried?

The President. No. We're making progress on NAFTA. I feel good about it. And what we find is that if people—I went yesterday, when he was having a press conference saying I wouldn't answer questions from ordinary workers. I was with a thousand ordinary working people in Kentucky answering their questions. They were good questions, good, firm, hard questions. But I just believe that this is one of those issues where the truth will set you free. I think the more people know, the more they'll be for it.

We have confidence. The Vice President, actually, when he went on David Letterman, I knew that he could stick up Ross Perot on one-liners, right? So, that's it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:44 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House.

Executive Order 12878—Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform

November 5, 1993

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), and in order to establish a Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Establishment. (a) There is established the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform ("Commission"). The Commission shall comprise 30 members to be appointed by the President. Ten members shall be Senators, five each from the Democratic and Republican parties. Ten members shall be Members of the House of Representatives, five each from the Democratic and Republican parties. Ten members shall be individuals from either the public or private sector who have experience and expertise in the areas to be considered by the Commission.

(b) The President shall designate a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson from among the members of the Commission.

Sec. 2. Functions. (a) The Commission shall recommend potential long-term budget savings measures involving (1) revisions to statutory entitlement and other mandatory programs; and (2) alternative tax reform proposals. The Commission shall report its recommendations respecting potential entitlement and other mandatory program savings and tax system revisions to the National Economic Council and to the Congressional leadership by May 1, 1994.

(b) The Commission shall decide by a three-fifths vote which recommendations to include in the report. At the request of any Commission member, the report will include that Commission member's dissenting views or opinions.

(c) The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, as the Commission may find advisable.

Sec. 3. Administration. (a) To the extent permitted by law, the heads of executive de-

partments, agencies, and independent instrumentalities shall provide the Commission, upon request, with such information as it may require for the purposes of carrying out its functions.

(b) Upon request of the Chairperson of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency or instrumentality shall, to the extent possible and subject to the discretion of such head, (1) make any of the facilities and services of such agency or instrumentality available to the Commission; and (2) detail any of the personnel of such agency or instrumentality to the Commission, to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties.

(c) Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation for their work on the Commission. While engaged in the work of the Commission, members appointed from among private citizens of the United States may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons serving intermittently in the Government service (5 U.S.C. 5701–5707) to the extent funds are available for such purposes.

(d) To the extent permitted by law and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Department of Health and Human Services shall provide the Commission with administrative services, funds, facilities, staff, and other support services necessary for the performance of the Commission's functions. The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall perform the functions of the President under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.) ("Act"), except that of reporting to the Congress, in accordance with the guidelines and procedures established by the Administrator of General Services.

(e) The Commission shall adhere to the requirements set forth in the Act. All executive branch officials assigned duties by the Act shall comply with its requirements with respect to the Commission.

Sec. 4. General Provision. The Commission shall terminate 30 days after submitting its report.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 5, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 3:10 p.m., November 5, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order will be published in the *Federal Register* on November 9.

Teleconference on NAFTA With Midwest Farmers, Ranchers, and Agricultural Broadcasters and an Exchange With Reporters

November 5, 1993

The President. Hello?

Q. Hello, Mr. President.

The President. How are you?

Q. Well, pretty good today, sir. How are you?

The President. I'm great. Thank you for taking this time to visit with us.

Q. Thank you for affording us the opportunity.

The President. I know that all of you have some questions, but I'd like to make just a brief opening statement, if I might. As all of you know, I think, before I took this job I was a Governor of an agricultural State, and I learned very early that the future of agriculture in America is in exports. We've got over 700,000 agriculture jobs in America today that are export-related. And if NAFTA passes, that number will continue to rise, meaning more jobs for people in our farm communities.

I know now that a big part of my job as President is going to be to continue to raise more and more opportunities for exports in America, and I'm doing that and the negotiations we have going on with Japan now, we even have some hopes that we're going to be able to sell some rice in Japan before too long, which is a big issue for farmers in my part of the country.

We're working hard across the board to get a new GATT agreement that will open agricultural markets for our farmers. And NAFTA is a part of our comprehensive strategy to boost farm income.

Since 1986, our agricultural exports to Mexico have nearly tripled. Mexico is now our fastest growing major export market. In 1992 we exported almost \$4 billion worth of

products to Mexico, 40 percent higher than 1990. And the Agriculture Department—and Secretary Espy is here with me today as you know—estimates that we will export \$2.6 billion more with NAFTA than without it by the end of the transition period in the agreement.

So I think this is a good deal for our farmers. It's an even better deal this week than it was last week because of some of the agreements made by the Mexican Government affecting sugar and citrus and, to a lesser extent, vegetables. But it is clearly a good thing for America's farmers. That's why most of the major farm groups have endorsed it. And I'm looking forward to discussing it with the farmers today and with the people from the ag radio networks. So maybe we ought to get right into your questions and go forward.

I think Howard Hardecke is first. Is that right?

Q. That is correct, Mr. President.

The President. I remember when I was at your school.

Q. You're kidding.

The President. [*Inaudible*]*—it was a great night.*

Q. Yes, it was.

The President. My second grade teacher was there. I hadn't seen her since she left Arkansas. She was my second and third grade teacher. I really enjoyed that.

[*At this point, Mr. Hardecke asked if other cattle-producing countries could import cattle duty-free through Mexico under NAFTA.*]

The President. That's a good question. And believe it or not, it's a question that applies not only to agriculture but to some of our manufacturing. We have strict rules of origin that apply to our agriculture as you know already—

Q. Yes.

The President. —and there is nothing in the NAFTA agreement which changes that, so that the rules of origin that apply to Australian beef coming here directly would apply to them with equal force after NAFTA passes if they pass through Mexico. In other words, there's no loophole in the agreement to escape our rules of origin. So you'll be all right with that.

Q. Okay, appreciate it.

The President. Thank you. Terry Baer, are you next?

Q. Yes, sir.

The President. Howard, did you have another question? I want to make sure I've got this right, now.

Q. We were told we had one question, so—

The President. Okay. Well, go ahead, Terry.

Q. Okay. Greetings, Mr. President, from central Illinois. I live near Edelstein, Illinois, which is near Peoria in central Illinois, and I have a grain production operation, consisting of corn and soybeans, and then I also work at Caterpillar, Inc., in Peoria.

The President. Good for you. I've been there.

Q. Yes well, I personally met you there when you were campaigning.

The President. It's a great company.

Q. Yes it is, and I'm glad they're as close to my farm as they are. It works out real well.

The President. It cuts the transportation cost of the equipment, too, doesn't it?

Q. It sure does. So, Mr. President, I have a question on NAFTA for you. And that is, if NAFTA does not pass, what efforts do you see of Mexico forming treaties with other countries who also compete for the same markets as our U.S. farmers, and what effect might that have on our future farm economy and foreign competition for our U.S. products?

The President. I think it'll make it a lot tougher on us. Keep in mind Mexico has been opening its economy, its purchases of foreign products have been going up across the board. They want to give us some special opportunities to export into the Mexican market in return for being able to attract more investment to their country. So they will have to pursue their strategy of getting more investment and opening their markets to get it somewhere else if we don't take advantage of this. And, therefore, it could be an enormous setback for us. It would just give our competitors a big leg up in one of the fastest growing markets in the world.

And of course, depending on whom they reached out to, it could really hurt the farmers. If the European Community, for exam-

ple, decided that they would try to replace the United States in NAFTA, it could really foreclose a lot of farm markets. You know all the troubles we've been through just trying to get a new GATT agreement. I'm very, very concerned about it.

I would also point out to all the farmers who are listening that we believe if we do NAFTA, and Mexico as the example will lead us to the same opportunities in other Latin American countries with big possibilities for agricultural exports of all kinds. So I think it's a big plus if we do it, but frankly I think we have to face the fact that Mexico has got to have a plan B. And if we turn out to be unreliable, if we can't see through this trade agreement, they will be forced to turn elsewhere to try to get capital and in return for that will almost certainly be willing to give the same kind of extra access to their market that the United States now has just for the asking if we'll go ahead and adopt this agreement.

Q. Well, I agree with you if they do seek treaties with other countries and we fail to ratify NAFTA, it will put us at a big disadvantage. And so you feel that Mexico is aggressively seeking agreements whether it's with us or whether it's with our competitors.

The President. Right now they've aggressively sought it with us. But they've made it clear, and they've been very much willing to let us put some things in this trade agreement, I might add, that have never been in any other trade agreement. I mean, they've agreed with us to invest more money in cleaning up the environment and to subject their own environmental code to the trade controls of this agreement. They've agreed to do the same thing with their labor code. No other country's ever done that in a trade agreement. So they very much want to deal with the United States. Mexican people like American products of all kinds. They are now the second biggest per capita purchasers of American products, even though their incomes aren't very high. We sell over \$40 billion worth of stuff down there every year. Seventy cents of every dollar the Mexicans spend on foreign products are spent on American products. And we have a chance to dramatically increase that or run the risk

of shutting it down. And I think it would be a terrible mistake to turn away from it.

Q. Yeah, I agree, and rest assured that I will do all I can to help you get this passed. I would hate to think that our U.S. Congress would pass up a chance at free trade.

The President. Also good for Caterpillar, you know. Caterpillar's one of the greatest exporting companies in the whole United States.

Q. Yeah, I realize that.

The President. One of the few companies that's been able to really triumph in the Japanese market. And the more per capita income goes up in Mexico, the better that company will do, too. I appreciate that. Thank you very much.

Q. Thank you.

Secretary Espy. Mr. President, could I just jump right in one second just to agree with you.

The President. Sure.

[Secretary Espy stated that Mexico is interested in expanding the trade relationship with the United States but would quickly look elsewhere should NAFTA fail and institute old tariff barriers as well.]

The President. Is Bill Wheeler on the phone?

Q. Hello, Mr. President. Hello, Secretary Espy.

The President. You calling us from Montana?

Q. Yes sir, from Missoula, Montana. That's the western part of the State.

The President. I've been there. I know it well.

Q. Well, we hope that you see fit to come again. We would extend the invitation certainly.

The President. Thank you

[Mr. Wheeler described the regional impact on grain producers of Canadian grains crossing the border under the Canada-United States Free Trade Agreement and asked if NAFTA would rectify this situation.]

The President. Well, let me first of all say that the agreement itself won't rectify it, but it will make it somewhat better, and by opening other markets it'll make a big difference. Let me make three or four comments. First of all, for all the others that are

listening, there's been a special problem with a lot of our farmers in the northern part—[*inaudible*—especially the wheat farmers, because of exports from Canada and because the support of the prices in Canada comes primarily in transportation supports, something that were not covered. Those supports were not covered when the United States negotiated its agreement with Canada several years ago.

Now, under this agreement, there will be certain provisions which should help to address the problem a little bit, such as end use certificates for Canadian imports that will help improve it. [*Inaudible*—no, in an attempt to offset the impact of the Canadian imports, I approved export enhancement supports for American wheat to Mexico recently.

Thirdly, I've asked the Secretary of Agriculture, now that there's been a Canadian election and there's a new Canadian Agriculture Minister ready to take office, to go to Canada and to sit down and meet with him about this issue, because it is not covered by the agreement, to see what we can do to go forward.

The last thing I'd like to say is, I think that the prices are going to go up here in America if we adopt the NAFTA agreement, because the primary thing NAFTA does is to give us access to sell more of our wheat and other grain crops to Mexico so that we'll have access to that market, and that will help to not only provide more sales but, as you know, increase the price.

So I think it will be better, but it does not specifically address the provision you don't like from the Canadian agreement that was made several years ago. We're going to try to do that in these negotiations the Secretary of Agriculture is going to undertake. And I think we sent a signal to the Canadians that we're concerned about it when we use the export enhancement program to try to sell some of our wheat to Mexico to offset what had happened to the farmers.

Q. Well, Mr. President, if Congress approves NAFTA, when will NAFTA go into effect, and will all parties involved sign simultaneously?

The President. The answer is, it'll go into effect everywhere at the same time. But the

different provisions are phased in over several years.

Mike, were you going to say something?

[*Secretary Espy acknowledged several weak points in the Canada-United States Free Trade Agreement and indicated that NAFTA did not have these weak points.*]

The President. But to go back to your question, if we can pass it now, it will go into effect starting the first of 1994, at the beginning of the next year. But there are some provisions that are phased in. We will get the lion's share of the benefits from the tariff reductions almost immediately, and we'll see a big increase in American exports in 1994 if it goes in. But there are some things—for example, some of our markets phase out their protection over a period of 7 or 8 years.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Thanks.

Now, Murray Corriher? Is that right?

Q. China Grove, North Carolina.

The President. Where is that?

[*Mr. Corriher briefly described several economic conditions working against the farmer and asked if NAFTA will increase prices enough to allow farmers to stay in business.*]

The President. The answer to that is, it should. Having lived on a farm and having been a Governor of a farm State for many years, I've learned never to say that something will increase farm prices. But the answer is that it should for this reason: There's no question that American exports will increase in the aggregate if NAFTA passes, and that Mexico is our fastest growing farm export market. Normally, when there's an increased demand for products abroad, that has an impact in increasing prices at home. That is, unless there is something that happens here at home that dramatically reduces domestic consumption, increasing demand abroad will increase the prices, because the aggregate supply and demand relationship will change. So it should happen.

Secondly, farmers should have their prices rise because they'll recover some of the monies that now go to tariffs in their trade. And we know that that will have some positive impact.

So for those reasons, I certainly would be real surprised if there was not an increase in the price and an increase in farm profits. You know, most Americans don't know this, but when the cost of production goes up 5 times as fast as the price of the product, the only way the farmers or any farmers are still in business in America is that we have the most productive farmers in the world. But there is a limit to how much you can do, and one of the things I like about NAFTA is, by giving the tariff relief and by increasing the total volume of agricultural sales, we should be able to have a positive impact on the price.

Q. I certainly hope so.

The President. I do, too. I wouldn't be for this if I didn't think it was going to help you, and I think it will.

Q. I wouldn't be for it, either, if I didn't think it would help.

The President. Thank you, Murray.

Q. Thank you.

The President. I think we're supposed to turn to the broadcasters now, and I think we're staying in North Carolina.

Bill Ray?

Q. Yes, Mr. President.

The President. You're from Elizabeth City, North Carolina?

Q. That's true. We sure are. The question that I had for you, Mr. President, this afternoon is, how do you think NAFTA will affect U.S. positions of negotiations at the GATT? What happens if this thing doesn't pass?

The President. It weakens our ability to get a GATT agreement by the end of the year because—well, let me back up and say I think most farmers know we're worked real hard to open up more European markets and other ag markets. As I said earlier, we're working hard to make some progress in the Asian markets, in Japan, especially, with some of our products. The GATT agreement is critical to that. If we beat NAFTA, then other countries who are reluctant to support GATT will say, "Well, look at America. They're becoming more protectionist. Why shouldn't we?" On the other hand, if we pass NAFTA, it will dramatically increase our credibility in the GATT negotiations. And it will reinforce our commitment and, I think, give a lot of courage to people in the Euro-

pean countries who want to do the same thing. The truth is that we've had so many hard economic years that nearly everybody thinks we're in a sort of a win-lose situation, that there's no such thing as a win-win trade agreement. But no wealthy country, whether it's the United States or the European countries or Japan and Asia, can grow and increase incomes unless you increase the volume of world trade. That's the only way we can do it today.

So we need the GATT agreement. It will help us in the short run, in terms of jobs, even more than NAFTA because it involves so many more people. Over the long run, NAFTA's going to help us because it will bring in all of Latin America. But if we don't adopt NAFTA in November, it's going to be hard to get the GATT done in December. And I can't promise that every country is going to agree in December, regardless. But we will have a much, much better chance to pass that GATT deal if Congress will adopt NAFTA. And that's a huge thing for America's jobs and incomes.

Q. Mr. President, it looks like it would be really tough on Mickey Kantor if he has to go back to Brussels without a NAFTA deal.

The President. It will be tough on him. Right after the NAFTA vote, I'm going out to Washington State to meet with the leaders of many of the Pacific countries, trying to convince them to buy more of our products and trying to work out a new trade relationship there. And again, if NAFTA passes, I'll have a lot of leverage in dealing with that. If it doesn't pass, it will make it more difficult for me to argue that the United States is trying to lead a big, broad-based coalition of trading nations. And after all that we've been through in the 1980's with our industries changing and restructuring, we now in agriculture and in industry are the most productive country in the world. We can sell anywhere. We can do well even in the countries with wages much lower than ours if we just have access to the markets.

So this GATT thing is a big deal. And if we pass NAFTA, I'll have a lot better chance of bringing home that bacon along with Ambassador Kantor.

The next person is, I think, Max Armstrong in Chicago.

Q. Hi, Mr. President.

The President. How you doing?

[*Mr. Armstrong asked if Mexican producers would be held to the same standard as American producers in areas such as pesticides and food safety requirements.*]

The President. Yes. Absolutely. And I might say a related thing, since you're calling me from Chicago and we've got a lot of teamsters in the upper Middle West and a lot of trucking enterprises: If a Mexican truck driver under this agreement stays with a load of produce, agricultural produce, or an industrial product or anything else, crossing from Mexico into the United States, then that truck driver must meet all the same standards that an American driver would have to meet on an American highway.

Our standards control, whether it's on the safety of food or on the safety on our highways. And that's very important. That's one of the things that we worked hard—and the flip side is true, too. We have to comply with their standards when operating in their country or when selling food into their country. And one of the biggest problems we had, one of the reasons that I insisted on these side agreements before I would agree to present this trade agreement to Congress is that Mexico, historically, has had some good laws on the books that weren't vigorously enforced. And so what we wanted to make sure of was that, not only would our laws be observed on food coming into our country but that they would observe their own laws, just as we have to observe ours.

So I think that, overall, the quality of all of these operations will go up if we honor that.

Q. So there should be no concern among U.S. consumers about quality?

The President. Absolutely not. No. We are not going to permit food to be sold here which does not meet the standards that American food has to meet.

And, by the way, we import other food from a lot of other countries now, and it's the same thing there. We didn't change that at all, and we wouldn't think of it.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Is Taylor Brown next?

Q. Yes, Mr. President, thank you.

The President. And you're from Billings, Montana?

Q. Sure am. I'm a long way from Bill Wheeler, but we're in the same State.

The President. You sure are. I've been to Billings, too. It's the third biggest State, isn't it?

[*Mr. Brown asked if the President planned to act on the issue of Canadian grain imports.*]

The President. Let me tell you what I think I should do first. And let me remind you, when I came into office, I raised this issue. I acknowledged it. Our Trade Representative embraced it. To send a signal to the Canadians that we were serious about this, we used the export enhancement program to give our own wheat an advantage down in Mexico. We also did it with barley. So I know this is a problem, and I've tried to send a clear signal to the Canadians that we intend to see it addressed.

If you've been following this in the last few days, you know they've got some issues that they want to discuss with us, also, that don't have anything to do with the NAFTA agreement, but two-way trade agreement between the United States and Canada. So I have asked the Secretary of Agriculture to go up there, and before we take any further action, at least sit down face to face with the new government, hear them out, and have them hear us out.

The reason I want to do that is because we do have, still, a significant trade surplus in agriculture with Canada through bread, pasta, and other processed foods, including products that contain American wheat. I've always followed the policy that before I put another person I'm dealing with in a position of retaliating, at least they have to know where we're coming from and why. So I want the Secretary of Agriculture to go up there and sit down and try to work through this.

But there is no question that when the last agreement was made several years ago with Canada, we did not reach to the subsidies that relate to their transportation and to the unique way in which the Canadian Wheat Board operates, which every wheat farmer in America now understands and which puts our folks in a difficult position.

I will say again, on the NAFTA agreement, whatever you think about that, this is a net advantage to an American wheat farmer because it opens more products, more markets to American wheat. And so it'll certainly help, and it'll help to get the price up.

Mike, do you want to say anything else about what you're going to do?

[Secretary Espy stated that he would continue to work to find solutions to these problems.]

The President. Is George Lawson on the phone?

Q. Yes, Mr. President.

The President. Are you calling from Wichita?

Q. Yes, sir. Can you hear me okay?

The President. I can hear you fine.

Q. Mrs. Clinton and Vice President Gore were in Wichita during the campaign. I hope you'll get a chance to visit our all-American city at some point.

The President. I'd like to. I was there a couple of years ago, and I really enjoyed it. It's a beautiful town.

Q. Can you explain for us how NAFTA will be able to add jobs to the U.S. agriculture sector?

The President. Yes, and let me say since you're in Wichita, I might just mention we talked a lot about wheat and grains and how the markets will grow there as the tariffs go down. But I also think, given where you are and the people that listen in mid-America AgNet, I ought to emphasize that Mexico is also one of the fastest growing markets for American wheat—I mean American meat, especially processed meat products. And all these exports will increase with NAFTA because the tariff on beef will be phased out to zero.

Mexico already accounts for about a quarter of U.S. pork exports, and as the tariffs go down, incomes go up, we'll expand those exports to Mexico. Poultry exports have increased from \$16 million in 1987 to over \$153 million in 1992, and that demand is just growing like wildfire. And interestingly enough, it's a nice compliment to the American consumption habits, because of the preference for different kinds of meat. So, I think you're going to see obviously more grains, just pure and simple, because the tariffs are

coming down and because we've got access to the market and we can get the grain there in a hurry and efficiently. But I also want to emphasize there's going to be a big increase in meat exports, too.

[Secretary Espy added that the increase in exports to Mexico will lead to the creation of jobs in the United States.]

The President. Is Rodney Peeples—Roddy Peeples?

Q. That's correct, Mr. President.

The President. San Angelo, Texas?

[Mr. Peeples expressed his concern that the President has turned over the NAFTA debate with Ross Perot to the Vice President.]

The President. I thought I elevated the debate by allowing the Vice President to debate with him. I don't consider Ross—first of all, in the Congress Ross Perot is not the primary problem we've got. The primary problem we've got in the Congress is the united, intense, and sometimes vociferous endorsement—efforts of the labor movement to beat this and to convince Republicans that they basically like, they'll get them opponents, and Democrats, if they like, they'll never give them money again. So that's the big problem we've got.

Mr. Perot's arguments have been largely discredited when he's been questioned on them and when the evidence has been examined. But it was the Vice President's idea all along to challenge him to a debate. So I debated him three times last year, and the more we got to talk about the issues, the better it got. So I think the Vice President will do just fine. I've got a lot of confidence in him.

Q. And the follow-up question to that one, sir—and this one's probably a minor point except for those who are affected by it—watermelon producers in Texas. Can you take a watermelon question?

The President. Yes. You know I was born in a town that grows big watermelons, so I can do that.

Q. [Inaudible]—and under the yoke of a lot of labor and wage and environmental regulations that Mexican producers do not have.

The President. Yes.

Q. The question is, is there any chance that the phaseout period for the present 20

percent tariff on imported watermelons could be extended from the proposed 10 years to 15 years, since the phaseout on the tariffs on some of the other crops I'm told are going to be that long?

The President. I don't think so. We think it's enough for our folks to be okay under it. Keep in mind, one of the things that's going to happen—and I want to emphasize this very strongly because—and this relates to another question that was raised earlier—one of the things that's plainly going to happen in this trade with agriculture, even though the agreement streamlines customs and inspection procedures, is that we're going to have a very vigilant oversight of safety standards and quality. And I believe what you're going to see, when you've got a 10-year phaseout period with Mexican incomes rising more rapidly across the board because of this trade, is that you are not going to see the kind of economic disadvantage at the end of this phaseout period to a lot of the agricultural products that some fear now because the cost of production in Mexico, in terms of sheer labor, is lower. I mean, I really believe that we're going to do a lot better on some of these things than we think. Now we have in the agreement—I want to emphasize this—there is a provision in the agreement that allows us to slow anything down if there is a so-called surge, that is, if there is a totally unforeseeable development that threatens to take out some sector of our economy.

By the way, the Mexicans have the same thing if we do that to them, if there's some totally unpredictable or unforeseen economically adverse development here in the term of—in the businesses—the surge—that there is provision in this agreement to slow that down and take another look at it. So there is sort of a safety hatch here. And I think that, plus the fact that we're going to be quite vigilant in making sure that the safety standards are going to be observed for the production and the delivery of our food, will provide the protection that we need.

The Secretary of Agriculture just passed me a note and reminded me, too, that just last—we are this week, we got an agreement from the Mexicans to do a yearly review of the impact of this trade agreement on all vegetables. So there may be an argument

about what a watermelon is, but it's included in the agreement.

Secretary Espy. Yeah, Mr. President, as you said, we are conscious of impact on commodities across the board, and we've made improvements when it comes to sugar and citrus, but also when it comes to fruits and vegetables. There will be a yearly review of impact on fruits and vegetables, and if we think that there is deleterious and a huge negative impact on American vegetable industry then these agreements allow for consideration of a snapback.

Q. Thank you very much, Mr. President and Secretary Espy.

The President. Thank you. I want to thank all the farmers and all the broadcasters for their questions today and for listening. And for those of you who support this agreement, I want to tell you I'm very grateful. I think it's a very, very important part of our attempt to open America to the rest of the world, to take advantage of the high productivity of our farmers and our manufacturing workers, our service industries, and to build bridges to the rest of Latin America and to get this GATT agreement done. And I know that every active farmer in this country understands what it could mean to us if we can pass this GATT agreement by the end of the year. I believe that passing NAFTA is a big first step to getting that done. It will plainly put America on the side of expanded trade and give us some leverage as we go down the road.

So I hope you'll do whatever you can to tell your Members of Congress, without regard to party, that you're for this, that this is good for America. And meanwhile the Secretary of Agriculture and I will keep working on the problems that all of you outlined today. We won't forget them. We've taken the steps that we thought we could to date. And the Secretary is going up to Canada soon.

Mike, would you like to say anything before we get off the phone?

Secretary Espy. No, sir, I think you've said it all. Thank you.

The President. Thank you for your hard work. Thanks, appreciate it, fellas.

[At this point, the teleconference ended, and the President answered reporters' questions.]

Interest Rates

Q. Mr. President, are you concerned about interest rates creeping up?

The President. No. I mean, what's happened is, the economy's getting much healthier. And you've had huge increases in home sales. We've had big increases in other economic activity. And when that happens, when the economy really begins to show signs of recovery, it's hard to keep interest rates at a 25- or 30-year low.

Because there is no inflation apparent in this economy, I don't expect a big increase in the rates. And we're going to watch it very closely obviously. But we've had an awfully good run with low interest rates, and a lot of people have taken advantage of them. From the time we announced the intention to have a serious effort to reduce the deficit, until I introduced my economic plan, until it passed, the interest rates dropped dramatically. And they've stayed down.

I was on a plane the other day coming back from one of my NAFTA meetings, and two of the people riding with me told me they've refinanced their homes this year. And one was saving just under \$300 a month, the other was saving about \$500 a month on the refinancing. These things have happened to millions of people around the country, and there's still good opportunities there for home mortgages, both for new ones and for refinancing.

But if the economy really picks up, there will have to be some movement in the interest rates. I don't think there will be a lot because—as long as we can keep inflation down. And I wouldn't be surprised, by the way, to see, as one of the experts reported in the press today, I wouldn't be surprised to see them drop again. I was kind of concerned when we had this big surge in housing and big surge in new investments that there might be a little pickup in it. But I'm not alarmed by it right now.

NAFTA Debate

Q. Mr. President, Ross Perot says he doesn't like the idea of the debate forum that the Vice President suggested. He says the Vice President ought to bring you and some of your spin doctors to his event. Is there any chance you'd agree to that?

The President. No, what Ross Perot wants, as always, is a show, not a debate. I mean, he basically wants Al Gore to show up at a rally that he's paid for with a crowd full of people that don't like NAFTA in the first place so they can shout at Al Gore, and in the hope that the shouting will obscure the arguments and the evidence and the facts. And that's not a debate or a discussion. What we suggested, and what Al did—it was all his idea, was that he call Larry King—Larry King host an honest and quiet and straightforward discussion that the American people could watch in their living rooms, one that would shed light and not heat. And I could understand why that's not Mr. Perot's preferred format. I mean, he'd rather have a rally where he's paid for it, has organized all these people to come, they're all against it anyway, and they shout at Al Gore. I don't blame him, but no sensible American would expect that to substitute for a debate. I mean, I think everybody can pretty well figure out—

Q. Do you think he's trying to wimp out?

The President. Win what?

Q. Wimp out of a head-on-head debate?

The President. You know, you all get into that name-calling character. I'm not going to do that. I think he's trying to negotiate the best possible position for himself. But it wouldn't be a credible debate for us to show up at his rally.

NOTE: The teleconference began at 1:23 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the Cyprus Conflict

November 5, 1993

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. Chairman:)

In accordance with Public Law 95-384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I am submitting to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous report covered progress from the remainder of February, through July 15, 1993. The current report covers the remainder of July through September 15, 1993.

Shortly after the visit of U.S. Special Cyprus Coordinator Maresca, Special U.N. Representative for Cyprus Joe Clark visited Ankara July 21–22, where he met with Turkish Prime Minister Ciller, Deputy Prime Minister Inonu, Foreign Minister Cetin, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs Cyprus Expert Ambassador Ulucevik. Like Maresca, Clark stressed the need for public Turkish support for the confidence-building measures (CBMs) and was reassured by the Turkish side of its commitment to support the package.

Also on July 22 Mr. Clark met with U.S. Ambassador to Turkey Richard Barkley. Ambassador Barkley welcomed Mr. Clark's visit to Ankara, and noted the continuing high-level U.S. support for his mission. Both Mr. Clark and Ambassador Barkley welcomed the fact that there is now a more open and informed debate within Turkey about the Cyprus issue.

On July 26 in Nicosia, the U.N. Secretary General's Deputy Special Representative for Cyprus, Mr. Gustave Feissel, met with President Clerides of Cyprus. This was followed by a meeting on July 27, also in Nicosia, between Mr. Feissel and Turkish Cypriot leader Mr. Rauf Denktash. At both meetings, Mr. Feissel stressed the importance of overcoming the lack of information on the CBMs among the Turkish Cypriots.

U.S. Ambassador to Cyprus, Robert Lamb, met with Mr. Denktash on July 30 and reiterated the U.S. position that the CBMs offer the one feasible route toward cooperation. Mr. Denktash stated that he was preparing a list of technical questions on the CBMs, but saw no prospect of movement on the U.N. process, including the CBMs, until after the Turkish-Cypriot elections scheduled for November 28.

Although it was expected that Mr. Denktash would present his technical questions at his meetings with Mr. Feissel on August 6 and 7, he failed to do so. At those meetings, he told Mr. Feissel that any movement would have to wait for the scheduled elections to take place in the north.

On Friday August 13, Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs Stephen Oxman met with Turkish Foreign Minister Cetin in Washington. Mr. Oxman

reminded the Foreign Minister that the United States attaches great importance to a resolution of the situation in Cyprus. While noting that the Turkish Cypriots are in the midst of their election process, he stressed that it is of the utmost importance to maintain the momentum on the CBMs. Mr. Oxman said that the Turkish Cypriots now face the choice of either moving toward the CBMs package or being further isolated. Mr. Oxman also used this opportunity to urge the Turkish Foreign Minister to use Turkey's considerable influence with the Turkish Cypriots to move the process along—specifically, by publicly announcing Turkish support for the CBMs package, by encouraging early elections, and by urging the Turkish Cypriots to communicate promptly with the United Nations with regard to outstanding questions on the CBMs package.

Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs Under Secretary Ulucevik travelled to northern Cyprus August 24–26. While there he met with Turkish Cypriot leaders and privately relayed Turkey's support for the CBMs.

Mr. Clark visited Washington on August 26 and met at the National Security Council with National Security Advisor Anthony Lake, and at the State Department with Under Secretary Peter Tarnoff, European and Canadian Affairs Acting Assistant Secretary Alexander Vershbow, and U.S. Special Cyprus Coordinator Ambassador Maresca. In all three meetings, Mr. Clark expressed appreciation for U.S. initiatives in Cyprus and urged continued U.S. support to maintain progress on the CBMs. Mr. Clark emphasized that the status quo cannot continue and was costly to all involved. He also requested that the United States discuss with the Turkish government the need for the Turks to reiterate their support for the U.N. "set of ideas." Under Secretary Tarnoff reiterated the United States unwavering support for the CBMs and for Mr. Clark's role in promoting them. Ambassador Maresca agreed with Mr. Clark that we had to press for the promised list of specific Turkish-Cypriot questions about the CBMs package.

On August 26, Ambassador Maresca met with Mr. Sahinbas, Deputy Chief of Mission at the Turkish Embassy in Washington. Ambassador Maresca told Mr. Sahinbas that it

was important that all interested parties work to maintain the viability of the CBMs package past the election period in northern Cyprus. Ambassador Maresca and Mr. Sahinbas agreed that progress would be difficult until after the elections of November 28.

The final meeting during the period covered by this report was Ambassador Maresca's meeting with Under Secretary Ulucevik in Ankara on September 2. Ambassador Ulucevik spoke highly of the work of Mr. Clark and looked forward to presenting Turkish views to Mr. Clark in late September. Ambassador Maresca stressed the need to make positive progress on the CBMs package and supported Mr. Clark's efforts to develop understanding and sympathy for the package in the Turkish-Cypriot community.

Finally on September 14, the Secretary General issued his "Report on his Mission of Good Offices in Cyprus." The Secretary General noted that the President of Cyprus, Mr. Clerides, had reaffirmed his community's willingness to move forward with the provisions in the CBMs package proposed for Varosha and for Nicosia International Airport. The Secretary General also noted that the Turkish Cypriot leader, Mr. Denktash, continued his criticism of the package. The report stated that inaccurate and incomplete information had been presented on the impact of the Varosha/Airport provisions, thus causing confusion for the Turkish Cypriots. In addition, it said that the Turkish Cypriots looked to Turkey for guidance, but the Turkish government had not yet sufficiently conveyed its support for the package to the Turkish Cypriots. In the report, the Secretary General also proposed to send a team of senior experts to Cyprus in early October to address questions, which have been raised concerning the effects of the CBMs package.

The Secretary General's report ended on a cautionary note. He stated that it is not possible to continue the current effort indefinitely. He stressed that it is essential that he receive the full cooperation and support of the Turkish Cypriots. If the current efforts do not succeed soon, he continued, he would have to invite the members of the Security Council to consider alternate ways to promote the effective implementation of the United Nations many resolutions on Cyprus.

Despite the lack of progress during the period this report covers, we are still working for the approval of the CBMs. As I stated in my August 12 letter to Prime Minister Ciller, the United States seeks Turkey's support in helping to achieve a settlement. The Turkish-Cypriot community must recognize that if it rejects this proposal, which is viewed by the rest of the world as fair and constructive, it risks even greater isolation than it presently faces. I hope that this can be avoided. In the meantime, I will continue to lend full support to the U.N. efforts.

I will continue to use all my energies in assisting in finding a solution to the Cyprus problem and look forward to your support in this effort.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Claiborne Pell, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Republic of Korea- United States Fishery Agreement

November 5, 1993

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-256; 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), I transmit herewith an Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Extending the Agreement of July 26, 1982, Concerning Fisheries off the Coasts of the United States, as extended and amended. The agreement, which was effected by an exchange of notes at Washington on June 11, 1993, and October 13, 1993, extends the 1982 agreement to December 31, 1995. The exchange of notes together with the 1982 agreement constitute a governing international fishery agreement within the requirements of section 201(c) of the Act.

In light of the importance of our fisheries relationship with the Republic of Korea, I

urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this agreement at an early date.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 5, 1993.

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 30

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton attended the Presidential gala at Ford's Theatre.

The White House announced the President has invited President Fidel V. Ramos of the Philippines to the White House on November 22.

November 1

The White House announced the President sent to the Congress a package of \$2 billion in fiscal year 1994 spending cuts and reform measures.

November 2

The White House announced the President has invited Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel to the White House on November 12.

The White House announced the President awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom to entertainer and humanitarian Martha Raye.

November 3

In the late morning, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Ambridge, PA, where they presented a copy of "Health Security: The President's Report to the American People" to Laughlin Memorial Library, and returned to Washington, DC, in the early evening.

The White House announced the President has signed the United States instrument of ratification of the Treaty on Open Skies.

November 4

In the morning, the President met with Members of Congress on NAFTA. Following

the meeting, the President traveled to Lexington, KY, where he toured the laser printer manufacturing facilities at Lexmark International, Inc., and then returned to Washington, DC, in the early evening.

November 5

In the afternoon, the President met with Gen. Colin L. Powell, USA, Ret.

The President announced his intention to nominate four individuals for administration positions. They are:

- Greg Farmer, Under Secretary of Commerce for Travel and Tourism;
- Henry F. Graff, member, Assassination Records Review Board;
- Mary Lucille Jordan, member, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission; and
- T.R. Lakshmanan, Director, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Department of Transportation.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

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

Submitted November 2

James J. Molinari,
of California, to be U.S. marshal for the Northern District of California for the term of 4 years, vice Glen E. Robinson.

Joe Russell Mullins,
of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal for the Eastern District of Kentucky for the term of 4 years, vice Sherman L. Hansford.

John Patrick McCaffrey,
of New York, to be U.S. marshal for the Western District of New York for the term of 4 years, vice Daniel B. Wright.

Phylliss Jeanette Henry,
of Iowa, to be U.S. marshal for the Southern District of Iowa for the term of 4 years, vice Warren D. Stump.

Charles M. Adkins,
of West Virginia, to be U.S. marshal for the Southern District of West Virginia for the term of 4 years, vice James P. Hickman.

Submitted November 5

Edmund T. DeJarnette, Jr.,
of Virginia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Angola.

Don Carlos Nickerson,
of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Iowa for the term of 4 years, vice Gene W. Shepard, resigned.

Stephen John Rapp,
of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Iowa for the term of 4 years, vice Charles W. Larson, resigned.

Donald Kenneth Stern,
of Massachusetts, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Massachusetts for the term of 4 years, vice Wayne A. Budd, resigned.

G. Ronald Dashiell,
of Washington, to be U.S. marshal for the Eastern District of Washington for the term of 4 years, vice Paul R. Nolan.

Nancy J. McGillivray-Shaffer,
of Massachusetts, to be U.S. marshal for the District of Massachusetts for the term of 4 years, vice Robert T. Guiney.

Donald R. Moreland,
of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the Middle District of Florida for the term of 4 years, vice Richard L. Cox, 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 November 1

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Announcement of nomination for three U.S. attorneys

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on transmittal to the Congress of \$2 billion in spending cuts and reform measures for fiscal year 1994

Released November 2

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers releasing statements by former Presidents George Bush, Ronald Reagan, and Gerald Ford endorsing the North American Free Trade Agreement

Announcement of the President's awarding of the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Martha Raye

Released November 3

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the administration's intent to seek an international legal prohibition of ocean disposal of low-level radioactive waste

Announcement of nomination for five U.S. marshalls

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's signing of the instrument of ratification of the Treaty on Open Skies

Released November 4

Announcement of further details on the upcoming meeting of Organization of Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) leaders in Seattle, WA

Released November 5

Fact sheet on the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform

Fact sheet on participants in the teleconference with the Midwest agricultural community on NAFTA

Text of a letter from Jack Quinn, Chief of Staff to the Vice President, to broadcast journalist Larry King regarding arrangements for a debate on NAFTA between the Vice President and Ross Perot

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on release of unclassified and declassified

sified documents relating to Salvadoran human rights cases

Announcement of nomination for three U.S. attorneys and three U.S. marshalls

**Acts Approved
by the President**

Approved November 1

H.R. 3123 / Public Law 103-129
Rural Electrification Loan Restructuring Act of 1993

S. 1548 / Public Law 103-130
To amend the National Wool Act of 1954 to reduce the subsidies that wool and mohair producers receive for the 1994 and 1995 marketing years and to eliminate the wool and mohair programs for the 1996 and subse-

quent marketing years, and for other purposes

S.J. Res. 78 / Public Law 103-131
Designating the beach at 53 degrees 53'51"N, 166 degrees 34'15"W to 53 degrees 53'48"N, 166 degrees 34'21"W on Hog Island, which lies in the Northeast Bay of Unalaska, Alaska as "Arkansas Beach" in commemoration of the 206th regiment of the National Guard, who served during the Japanese attack on Dutch Harbor, Unalaska on June 3 and 4, 1942

Approved November 2

H.R. 328 / Public Law 103-132
To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the town of Taos, New Mexico

H.J. Res. 228 / Public Law 103-133
To approve the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to the products of Romania