

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, May 9, 1994
Volume 30—Number 18
Pages 941–1005

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Bill Signings
American Indian and Alaska Native tribal leaders—941
Americans with disabilities—953
Andrew W. Mellon dinner—990
Assistance to South Africa—993
Atlanta, GA—960, 962
Cinco de Mayo celebration—996
Congressional elections—962
Housing and Urban Development Department crime briefing—984
Legislation to ban assault weapons—957, 991, 994
Radio address—947
Situation in Rwanda—948
Small Business Person of the Year, award presentation—979
Women's health care—998

Appointments and Nominations

Commodity Futures Trading Commission Chair—979
Commissioner—979
National Transportation Safety Board, Vice Chair—946
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Assistant Directors—946
U.S. District Court, judges—998
U.S. Representatives to Coral Sea Week—946

Bill Signings

Foreign Relations Authorization Act, statement—948
School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994
Remarks—985
Statement—988

Communications to Congress

Budget deferrals, message—959
District of Columbia, message transmitting budget—990
Federal Advisory Committees, message transmitting report—997
General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, letter—978
National Endowment for Democracy, message transmitting report—997

Communications to Federal Agencies

Migration and Refugee Assistance Act, memorandum—978

Executive Orders

Amendment to Executive Order No. 12878—945
Revocation of Executive Order No. 12582—959

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Atlanta, GA—962, 963
Oval Office—1000
Rose Garden—991, 994
South Lawn—959
Interview on CNN's "Global Forum With President Clinton"—964

Letters and Messages

Americans with disabilities—945
Hunters and sportsmen—945

(Continued on the inside 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

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

See also Statements Other Than Presidential
Prime Minister Mahathir of Malaysia—1000

Proclamations

Law Day, U.S.A.—951
Loyalty Day—952
Mother's Day—1001
Public Service Recognition Week—979
Small Business Week—952

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations; Bill
Signings
Agreement to withdraw Russian military
forces from Latvia—953
Implementation of the Israel-Palestinian
Declaration of Principles—989

Statements Other Than Presidential

Counterintelligence effectiveness—978
President's meeting with Vice Premier Zou of
China—959
Reforming multilateral peace operations—998
President's telephone conversation with Prime
Minister Papandreou of Greece—1002

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1005
Checklist of White House press releases—
1004
Digest of other White House
announcements—1002
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1003

Week Ending Friday, May 6, 1994

**Remarks to American Indian and
Alaska Native Tribal Leaders**

April 29, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, very much Chief Wilma Mankiller and to all the other distinguished leaders here today. Let me first welcome you here on behalf of the First Lady and Vice President and Mrs. Gore. All of us are honored by your presence. I also wanted to especially thank those who have spoken and participated to this point and those who will participate in the remainder of this program. I have listened carefully and learned a lot.

This is, as all of you know, a time of great challenge and transition for our beloved country and for the world. As I travel across this country and talk to the people about the problems that all Americans share, whether it's crime or health care or the economy, I find a concern that goes deeper even in these specific matters.

There is a great yearning in this Nation for people to be able to reestablish a sense of community, a sense of oneness, a sense of cooperation, of shared values and spirit. Americans are searching for the chance to come together in friendship, instead of coming apart in anger and distrust. There is a yearning for us to be able to live together so that all of us can live up to our God-given potential and be respected for who and what we are.

It is in that spirit and with great humility I say to the leaders of the first Americans, the American Indian and Alaska Natives, welcome to the White House. Welcome home.

So much of who we are today comes from who you have been for a long time. Long before others came to these shores there were powerful and sophisticated cultures and societies here: yours. Because of your ancestors, democracy existed here long before the Constitution was drafted and ratified.

Just last week, people all around the world celebrated the 24th annual Earth Day. Yet for thousands of years, you have held nature in awe, celebrating the bond between Earth and the Creator. You have reminded people that all of us should make decisions not just for our children and their grandchildren but for generation upon generation yet to come.

I believe in your rich heritage and in our common heritage. What you have done to retain your identity, your dignity, and your faith in the face of often immeasurable obstacles is profoundly moving, an example of the enduring strength of the human spirit.

We desperately need this lesson now. We must keep faith with you and with that spirit and with the common heritage so many of us cherish. That is what you came to talk to me about and what I would like to respond to today.

In every relationship between our people, our first principle must be to respect your right to remain who you are and to live the way you wish to live. And I believe the best way to do that is to acknowledge the unique government-to-government relationship we have enjoyed over time. Today I reaffirm our commitment to self-determination for tribal governments. I pledge to fulfill the trust obligations of the Federal Government. I vow to honor and respect tribal sovereignty based upon our unique historic relationship. And I pledge to continue my efforts to protect your right to fully exercise your faith as you wish.

Let me speak for a moment about religious freedom, something precious to you, something deeply enshrined in our Constitution. For many of you, traditional religions and ceremonies are the essence of your culture and your very existence. Last year, I was pleased to sign a law that restored certain constitutional protections for those who want to express their faith in this country.

No agenda for religious freedom will be complete until traditional Native American

religious practices have received all the protections they deserve. Legislation is needed to protect Native American religious practices threatened by Federal action. The Native American free exercise of religion act is long overdue. And I will continue to work closely with you and Members of Congress to make sure the law is constitutional and strong. I want it passed so that I can invite you back here and sign it into law in your presence.

And to make certain that you can obtain the ritual symbols of your religious faith, in a moment I will sign a directive to every executive department and agency of Government, not just the Department of Interior, instructing them to cooperate with tribal governments to accommodate wherever possible the need for eagle feathers in the practice of Native American religions.

This then is our first principle: respecting your values, your religions, your identity, and your sovereignty. This brings us to the second principle that should guide our relationship: We must dramatically improve the Federal Government's relationships with the tribes and become full partners with the tribal nations.

I don't want there to be any mistake about our commitment to a stronger partnership between our people. Therefore, in a moment, I will also sign an historic Government directive that requires every executive department and agency of Government to take two simple steps: first, to remove all barriers that prevent them from working directly with tribal governments and, second, to make certain that if they take action affecting tribal trust resources, they consult with tribal governments prior to that decision. It is the entire Government, not simply the Department of the Interior, that has a trust responsibility with tribal governments. And it is time the entire Government recognized and honored that responsibility.

Part of being better partners is also being better listeners. The Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice have never before joined together to listen to the leaders of the Indian nations. It's time to change that. Next week, in Albuquerque, New Mexico, both Attorney General Reno and Secretary Babbitt and many of their sub-

Cabinet officials will meet with you for 2 days at the first National American Indian Listening Conference. I'm looking forward to hearing their specific ideas from the conference on ways to move our nations forward together.

The same applies to the unprecedented series of 23 meetings that the Department of Housing and Urban Development, under Secretary Cisneros, will have with tribal governments by September to improve housing and living conditions in tribal communities and to listen to you about how you can take the lead in doing it.

All governments must work better. We must simply be more responsive to the people we serve and to each other. It's the only way we'll be able to do good things with the resources we have. I know that you agree with that. More and more of you are moving to assume fuller control of your governments. Many are moving aggressively to take responsibility for operating your own programs. Each year the Bureau of Indian Affairs is providing more technical services and fewer direct services.

One avenue for greater tribal control is through self-governance contracts. There are about 30 self-compacting tribes today. We're working with Congress to raise that number by 20 tribes every year. We'd like self-governance to become a permanent program. But we must ensure services will still be provided to the smaller tribes that do not choose to participate.

What is the goal of a better and more equal partnership, and more empowered tribes and more efficient government? Ultimately it must be to improve the living conditions of those whom we serve. And that must be our third and final principle.

Together we must position American Indians and Alaska Natives to compete economically as we move toward the 21st century. I invited the leaders of every recognized tribe here today. But I'll be the first to acknowledge that not all have been able to join us because they simply don't have the resources to come. And I know well that many of you have come here at great personal sacrifice to yourselves and the members of your tribes. That only underscores the importance of our work. Let us dedicate ourselves to making

certain that the next time we all meet together, conditions will be different and better and all of our brothers and sisters will be able to join us.

We must do more to create jobs, raise incomes, and develop capital for new businesses. I know there are more success stories in Indian country every year but not nearly enough as the people who bore witness to your conditions here today so eloquently said. Strengthening tribal economies will require new thinking and the courage to change. It will require investing in the health, the education, and the skills of American Indians and Alaska Natives, as we must do for all Americans.

To the extent that some of the building blocks can be put in place here in Washington, we are working to do that. Our empowerment zone legislation, for example, contains at your request special new incentives for investing in reservations. This is only part of the solution. We can continue to enforce the regulations of the Community Reinvestment Act to make sure local banks invest and lend in Indian communities. We've brought more tribal leaders than ever together with bankers to improve mortgage loans, financial services, and to cut regulations. We must make these efforts permanent and more effective. And we know a more comprehensive approach is necessary.

At my direction, the Vice President has established a working group on Indian economic development as part of our Community Enterprise Board. I've asked them to study the recommendations from last year's National Indian Economic Summit and to consult fully with you every step of the way. Our goal is clear: to work with you to enhance economic development in every tribe. I'd like to emphasize that what I have asked them to do in this issue, I asked them to do on all issues. This great, historic meeting today must be the beginning of our new partnership, not the end of it.

I'd like to make a point about economic development that has to do with gaming. As a former Governor, I understand some of the concerns that the Governors have raised. But as President, I know that gaming gives you a competitive edge when you've had precious few. And the benefits often extend to sur-

rounding communities in full measure. Some of you are now able to invest more in housing and health care and child care and infrastructure and taking care of your elders. I know that gaming is controversial, even among tribes. As many of you have acknowledged, it's also important that tribal governments continue to diversify their economies. Many of you are working with congressional leaders, Governors, and Secretary Babbitt to resolve tough issues.

My goal is this: I want the tribes to continue to benefit from gaming, and I want current disputes over the 1988 Gaming Regulatory Act to be worked out. I strongly support the process now underway to achieve that goal. But just as with the national economy, we know we can't solve every problem overnight. The important thing is to create policies that give every tribe the chance to have a strong economy in the long run, to develop the will and the consistency to stick with those policies over time, and to keep working and talking together.

Last year, you were kind enough to invite the First Lady to the Indian Health Summit. You asked her to make certain your treaty rights to health care and your rights under the Indian Health Service be preserved and made a part of our health care proposal. Because we work together and because of you and your input, only one of the health care plans now before the Congress addresses these issues and ensures that tribal members will receive the same high-quality health care as everyone else. That is our plan, thanks to you.

There has been a great deal of debate this year about the budget of the Indian Health Service. It was mentioned earlier. The fact is that we are operating under the tightest spending limits in memory. In our efforts to bring the deficit down, I have recommended the total elimination of 100 programs and cuts in 200 others. And that is contributing to the country's economic revival. But I believe the health needs of tribal communities and families and children clearly require special attention. Therefore, I have amended next year's budget to restore more than \$120 million in funding for the Indian Health Service.

Finally, as we heard so eloquently today, there is in America, across the lines of race and class and region, a profound concern for our children. Too many are poor or sick or unsupervised. Too many are likely to use violence or be the victims of violence. Too many are unprepared intellectually for life or work. Yet nothing is so striking in tribal communities as your love of family and extended family and your devotion to your children. Every segment of our society could well take a lesson from you. But in spite of your best efforts, too many of your children also suffer from poor health and inadequate education. And we are trying hard to address these problems. You mentioned Head Start; our budget calls for continued, substantial increases and expansions of the Head Start program, as well as the Women and Infants and Children program.

Our education plan, called Goals 2000, for the first time sets world-class education standards for every school and all our children and gives local communities the grass-roots support they need to achieve those goals. Goals 2000 contains millions more next year for BIA-funded schools and schools serving Native Alaskans. And these funds cannot be spent until the education goals of your community are considered.

In the 1980's, our Nation fell behind many Third World countries in the rate at which we immunized children against communicable diseases. I know the Indian Health Service does a good job of immunizing children. Beginning this year, under the Vaccine For Children program, every Indian child, no matter where he or she lives and regardless of whether they are fortunate enough to live near an IHS facility, will be eligible for free vaccine.

The Great Law of the Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy contained this advice: "In our every deliberation, we must consider the impact of our decision on the next seven generations." We are stewards; we are caretakers. That standard will keep us great if we have the vision of your forefathers.

As we look back on the American journey, the test ahead is always whether we are moving in the right direction of more tolerance, wider justice, and greater opportunity for all. It is the direction that counts, always the di-

rection. And our choices will set that direction.

Of course, as you well know, our history has not always been a proud one. But our future can be, and that is up to us. Together we can open the greatest era of cooperation, understanding, and respect among our people ever. I know that we will. And when we do, the judgment of history will be that the President of the United States and the leaders of the sovereign Indian nations met and kept faith with each other and our common heritage and together lifted our great nations to a new and better place.

Thank you all.

[At this point, the President signed the memorandum. The President and Mrs. Clinton and the Vice President and Mrs. Gore were then presented gifts.]

The President. Before we go, I wanted to make a brief announcement to thank you, on behalf of the First Lady, the Vice President, Mrs. Gore, and our Cabinet for being here and for giving us a chance to be with you and for the wonderful gifts we have received.

In keeping with a tradition that goes back to the early days of our Republic, I want each of you, in leaving, to receive a miniature replica of the Jefferson Indian Peace Medal. On the front is a picture of our third President, Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence and one of the chief architects of our democracy. When you receive your medal, you will see on the back two hands clasped, one with a cuff showing three stripes and three buttons, the other wearing a bracelet engraved with an eagle. The hands join with the inscription "Peace and Friendship."

As we pray and as we leave, let us hope that this is the beginning of true peace, true friendship, and true progress.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:40 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Chief Wilma Mankiller of the Cherokee Tribe in Oklahoma. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Executive Order 12912—
Amendment to Executive Order No.
12878**

April 29, 1994

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 extend the reporting period of the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform from May 1, 1994, to December 15, 1994, it is hereby ordered that section 2(a) of Executive Order No. 12878 is amended by deleting the date “May 1, 1994” and inserting the date “December 15, 1994” in lieu thereof.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 29, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:27 a.m., May 2, 1994]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on May 3. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Letter to Americans With Disabilities
April 29, 1994

Greetings to everyone gathered in our nation’s capital to voice your support for providing health security to all Americans. I am delighted that so many of you have come together for this exciting event.

Now is the time to act on our awareness that disabilities are a natural part of the human experience. Having a disability does not diminish one’s right to participate in any aspect of mainstream society. With the shared strengths of all those participating in this rally, you send a powerful message—the key to improving the quality of life for millions of Americans with disabilities and their families is passing a comprehensive health care plan that meets the needs of each one of our citizens.

The active participation of groups like ADAPT, the National Council on Independent Living, and the Consortium of Citizens with Disabilities is essential in meeting this crucial goal. I commend you for working to-

ward making health care reform a reality. Your knowledge and expertise are helping to advance the rights of and services for all Americans, especially those persons with disabilities, and I thank you for your leadership and dedication. Working together, we can build a health care system that moves our nation from exclusion to inclusion, from dependence to independence, and from paternalism to empowerment.

Hillary joins me in extending best wishes to all for a successful rally.

Bill Clinton

NOTE: This letter was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary but was not issued as a White House press release. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Letter to Hunters and Sportsmen
April 29, 1994

An Open Letter to Hunters and Sportsmen:

I have been a hunter since I was 12. Where I come from, it’s a way of life. And I will not allow the rights of hunters and sportsmen to be infringed upon.

But I know the difference between a firearm used for hunting and target shooting and a weapon designed to kill people. The 19 specific types of assault weapons that would be banned by the proposal currently being considered in Congress have no place on a deer hunt, in a duck blind, or on a target range—and they certainly don’t belong on our streets, in our neighborhoods, or on our schoolyards.

But they are on our streets, in our neighborhoods, and on our schoolyards—they’re the weapons of choice for drug dealers, gangs, and terrorists. And every year they kill children and police officers, mothers, and fathers.

Our crime bill will make a big difference in stopping the violence in our neighborhoods, by putting 100,000 new police officers on the streets and putting tough penalties like three-strikes-you’re-out on the books. But we’ve got to keep Uzis and Street Sweepers out of the hands of criminals. Every major police organization wants us to—and nearly

80 percent of the American people feel that way too.

High-paid lobbyists argue that the assault weapons ban will infringe on our right, as hunters and sportsmen, to own guns. But what they don't tell you is that the proposal I support specifically safeguards hunters' rights. It explicitly protects more than 650 hunting and recreational rifles from the ban.

So that's why I'm writing you for your help. Call your representatives, and tell them that you know the difference between a hunting rifle and a weapon that was designed for the battlefield. Tell them you support the proposed ban on assault weapons—because it protects your rights and it doesn't protect criminals.

Thank you.
Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: This letter was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary but was not issued as a White House press release. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Nomination for Assistant Directors of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

April 29, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Michael Knacht, Amy Sands, and Lawrence Scheinman as Assistant Directors for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA).

The President said, "I am pleased to name experts of the caliber of Drs. Sands, Knacht, and Scheinman to work on arms control and nonproliferation, issues to which I am personally committed. I believe they will help a revitalized ACDA play a leading role in building a safe and more secure world."

NOTE: Biographies of the nominees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Appointment of Vice Chair of the National Transportation Safety Board

April 29, 1994

The President today appointed Jim Hall to be Vice Chair of the National Transportation Safety Board. Mr. Hall was previously confirmed by the Senate a member of the National Transportation Safety Board on October 14, 1993.

"Jim Hall has had a distinguished career in government and in the private sector," said the President. "I am very glad to be appointing him as Vice Chair of this board today."

NOTE: A biography of the appointee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Appointment of United States Representatives to Coral Sea Week

April 29, 1994

The President today announced the appointment of Jack H. Watson, Jr., and Ambassador Edward J. Perkins to represent the United States in Australia during the celebration of Coral Sea Week.

"I am pleased to appoint Jack Watson to join Ambassador Perkins as the U.S. representatives on this momentous occasion," the President said. "I have known Jack for many years. As President Carter's former Chief of Staff, he understands particularly well the important relationship between the United States and Australia, and I am confident he will represent the United States well. We join them in celebrating our friendship with Australia and look forward to continuing our excellent relations across a range of economic, political, and global issues."

NOTE: Biographies of the appointees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

April 30, 1994

Good morning. This week all of us watched with wonder as South Africa was reborn. Young men carried their elderly fathers on their backs to the polling booths; black voters came on crutches and in wheelchairs, traveling for miles and waiting for hours in this great march to freedom. The miracle of South Africa's rebirth as a nonracial democracy is an inspiring testament to the courage and vision of its citizens. And I'm proud of America's role in helping to make the miracle happen.

Private citizens, religious leaders, and Members of Congress worked for years to rally public opinion and impose economic sanctions against Johannesburg. When Nelson Mandela and F.W. de Klerk reached their agreements to dismantle apartheid, we were one of the first countries to lift sanctions so we could help fuel the recovery of a new South Africa. Just in the last year we have supported unprecedented voter education and election monitor training programs. And this week I'll be announcing a substantial increase in our aid to South Africa to help it navigate a new course for all of its people.

This morning I want to talk about why this kind of vigorous American engagement and leadership remains vital not only in South Africa but around the globe. Consider the former Yugoslavia, where American engagement today is essential. The breakup of that country, inflamed by Serbian aggression, has resulted in 3 years of bloodshed and ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and elsewhere.

We have clear interests at stake in helping to bring a peaceful end to the Bosnian conflict, an interest in preventing a wider war in Europe, an interest in preventing a flood of refugees, an interest in maintaining the credibility and effectiveness of NATO as a force for peace in the new post-cold-war era, and clearly an interest in helping to stop the slaughter of innocent civilians. That's why we've been working to spur negotiations among the warring parties, and it's why we've harnessed NATO's power in the service of diplomacy.

In February, at the initiative of the United States, NATO issued an ultimatum to Bosnian Serbs against the further shelling of the Bosnian capital of Sarajevo. Today, Sarajevo is relatively quiet. It's citizens are emerging from the rubble to begin rebuilding their lives.

Just last week, we and our NATO allies extended a similar ultimatum to the besieged town of Gorazde and to five other Muslim majority towns the U.N. has designated as safe areas. After weeks of relentless shelling, the Serbs have backed off and withdrawn their guns from around Gorazde. While new challenges lie ahead in Bosnia, our determination to take action along with our NATO allies in support of the U.N. mission there clearly generated new progress toward peace.

In March, Bosnian and Croat leaders came to the White House to sign a peace agreement. Since then we've stepped up our diplomatic efforts to engage the Serbs as well. As I've said, if the parties in Bosnia can negotiate a viable settlement, I will work with the Congress to deploy U.S. troops through NATO to help enforce that peace.

There are other threats today that also demand our active engagement, from North Korea's nuclear program to the efforts of Iran and other backlash states to sponsor terrorism. We're meeting those threats with steadiness and resolve.

At the same time, we recognize we've entered an age of historic opportunity. South Africa's elections offer vivid proof. In the Middle East age-old enemies have extended handshakes of reconciliation. In the former Soviet Union we're helping to dismantle nuclear weapons once aimed at us. And just today, Russia and Latvia signed an historic agreement to withdraw remaining Russian military forces from Latvian territory by the end of August. These and other promising developments were made possible in part by American support and resolve.

But such engagement requires resources commensurate with our challenges. With the cold war behind us, we've been able to reduce spending on defense and foreign affairs. We've put those programs under tight budgetary constraints. But now we're at the razor's edge of a resource crisis. We cannot afford to shortchange our national security. That's

why I'm working hard against further cuts in our defense budget and why I'm working with Congress to make sure we adequately fund peacekeeping and other international efforts that promote the security and prosperity of our own people.

As we approach the 50th anniversary of the D-Day invasion this June, we should recall the spirit of sacrifice and common cause that mark that great crusade for freedom in World War II. In 5 weeks I'll travel to Europe to commemorate D-Day and to honor those in the Second World War who fought to defend our democratic way of life. The world is different now, better because of their courage. And we owe it to them to build a better future for the next generation.

As we salute the veterans who will be landing by the thousands in Normandy this June and as we celebrate South Africa's elections today, let us remember that American leadership in a changing world requires sustained commitment. Together, let us shape this new world to our lasting benefit.

Thanks for listening.

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

Remarks on the Situation in Rwanda

April 30, 1994

The horrors of civil war and mass killings of civilians in Rwanda, since the tragic deaths of the Rwandan and Burundian Presidents 3 weeks ago, have shocked and appalled the world community.

On behalf of all of the American people, I call on the Rwandan army and the Rwandan Patriotic Front to agree to an immediate cease-fire and return to negotiations aimed at a lasting peace in their country.

I applaud the efforts of regional leaders actively engaged in the quest for peace. I reaffirm the American commitment to participate in renewed negotiations under the Arusha framework.

The pain and suffering of the Rwandan people have touched the hearts of all Americans. It is time for the leaders of Rwanda to recognize their common bond of humanity and to reject the senseless and criminal vio-

lence violence that continues to plague their country.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:12 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. His remarks were made available for broadcast on nationwide radio.

Statement on Signing the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995

April 30, 1994

Today I have signed into law H.R. 2333, the "Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995." This Act authorizes critically needed appropriations and provides important authorities for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency (USIA), the Peace Corps, and the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (USACDA). I appreciate the Congress' cooperation in passing a bill that maintains many of the Administration's requests and provides management authorities that will improve the operations of the Department of State and related agencies during a period of fiscal constraint.

I am especially pleased that this legislation includes language authorizing implementation of the Administration's international broadcasting reorganization plan. The plan, to be implemented over 2 fiscal years, will achieve projected savings of approximately \$400 million over 4 years, while preserving and enhancing the program quality, effectiveness, and professional integrity of U.S.-funded broadcast services. These services include the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, Radio and Television Marti, WorldNet, and a new Radio Free Asia operation.

I very much appreciate that the funding authorizations for the Department of State, USIA, and other agencies are sufficient to cover appropriations for this fiscal year, and for the levels requested by the Administration for fiscal year 1995. I also appreciate the authorizations for Contributions to International Organizations and Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities, which are at the Administration's request level, plus an additional \$670 million in authorization provided for a portion of the anticipated

shortfall in fiscal year 1994 peacekeeping funds.

However, earmarks in the Department of State's main operating accounts for activities not requested by the Administration will severely restrict the Department's ability to meet planned levels for critical investments in its information system and other infrastructure improvements. As part of the Department's streamlining efforts, and with a constrained budget, the Secretary of State needs the flexibility to allocate scarce resources where they are needed most.

I am pleased at the inclusion of authorities necessary to implement the Department of State's reorganization plan. I regret, however, the provision that interferes with the Secretary's plan to merge the Office of the Coordinator for Counter-Terrorism into the proposed Bureau of Narcotics, Terrorism, and Crime, where this activity would receive the coordinated, high-level attention that I believe would be the most effective in fighting terrorism.

The bill also contains many useful authorities that will assist the Department in improving the efficiency of its operations both domestically and overseas. These include a new visa fee to be used for upgrading consular systems and expanded authority to hire U.S. citizens at posts abroad. Despite these and many other useful authorities contained in this bill, I have serious reservations concerning a number of its provisions.

Section 141 would require the Department of State to allow local guard contracts awarded to U.S. firms to be paid in U.S. dollars in certain countries. Because many countries require that payment for services rendered locally be paid in local currency, this provision could force the United States to violate both host country law and its obligations under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. I will seek to implement this section in the manner most consistent with U.S. obligations under international law.

Other provisions raise constitutional concerns. Article II of the Constitution confers the Executive power of the United States on the President alone. Executive power includes special authority in the area of foreign affairs. Certain provisions in H.R. 2333, however, could be construed so as to interfere

with the discharge of my constitutional responsibilities.

For example, section 412 (reforms in the World Health Organization), section 501 (protection of refugee women and children), section 527(b) (loans by international financial institutions to governments that have expropriated property of U.S. citizens), and section 823 (loans or other payments by international financial institutions for the purpose of acquiring nuclear materials by non-nuclear states), purport specifically to direct the President on how to proceed in negotiations with international organizations. These provisions might be construed to require the Executive branch to espouse certain substantive positions regarding specific issues. I support the policies underlying these sections. My constitutional authority over foreign affairs, however, necessarily entails discretion over these matters. Accordingly, I shall construe these provisions to be precatory.

Section 221 (the establishment of an office in Lhasa, Tibet), section 236 (an exchange program with the people of Tibet), and section 573 (an Office of Cambodian Genocide Investigation, the activities of which are to be carried out primarily in Cambodia), could also interfere with the President's constitutional prerogatives. I am sympathetic to the goals of these provisions. However, they could be construed to require the President to negotiate with foreign countries or to take actions in those countries without their consent. I will, therefore, implement them to the extent consistent with my constitutional responsibilities.

As with the resources allocated to the Department of State, I appreciate the appropriations authorizations provided for USIA for fiscal years 1994 and 1995. There are, however, certain earmarks, particularly in the exchange programs, that inhibit the flexibility that USIA needs to meet changing priorities. In addition, I understand that the 1994 appropriations authorizations provided for USIA for salaries and expenses includes the authorization for administrative and staff costs for the "Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs."

I regret the repeal of the Voice of America broadcast charter language (P.L. 94-350).

My Administration will work with the Congress to address this issue further.

Section 401 requires certain withholdings from U.S. assessed contributions for the United Nations (U.N.) regular budget, and from the fiscal year 1994 supplemental until the President makes the requisite certification that the U.N. has established an office of and appointed an Inspector General, empowered with specified authorities. Section 404 also sets forth ceilings on assessments on the United States for peacekeeping contributions. Although I share the Congress' goal of encouraging U.N. reform and broader cost sharing, I cannot endorse the method proposed by these provisions because they could place the United States in violation of its international treaty obligations if reform is not achieved within the stated time.

Section 407 sets forth new reporting and notification requirements, including a requirement for 15-day advance notification (with no waiver provision) before the United States provides certain in-kind assistance to support U.N. peacekeeping operations. It is understood that the Congress, however, does not consider this provision to be subject to the regular procedures on reprogramming notifications. It is imperative at times to provide such assistance on an urgent basis to further U.S. foreign policy interests. I will, therefore, construe these reporting and notification requirements consistent with my constitutional prerogatives and responsibilities as Commander in Chief and head of the Executive branch. I also note the understanding reached with the Congress that this notification process will not include congressional "holds" on assistance when notification does occur.

The conference report accompanying H.R. 2333, with respect to section 525(a), Free Trade in Ideas, purports to describe the Administration's policy with respect to restrictions on travel or exchanges in the context of economic embargoes. We will carefully consider the sense of the Congress as we complete our review of the standards for general and specific licenses under embargo programs. We have not, however, committed as a matter of policy to broad regulatory or administrative changes to remove restrictions affecting travel or exchanges for informa-

tional, educational, religious, cultural, or humanitarian purposes or for public performance or exhibitions. Nor have we initiated any action with respect to visa or currency restrictions.

Title VII, the Arms Control and Nonproliferation Act of 1994, reflects the principle that the USACDA must be a key participant on arms control and nonproliferation matters. The conference report accompanying H.R. 2333 calls for a presumption that the President should direct the USACDA to have primary responsibility for nonproliferation matters absent compelling reasons to do otherwise. It also suggests specific areas of responsibility in the nonproliferation field that should be shifted to the USACDA. I do not accept either the stated presumption or the suggested shift, since such limitations would infringe on the discretion of the President in carrying out foreign affairs.

Title VIII contains provisions that raise significant constitutional concerns. Section 824 would require an "opportunity for a hearing on the record" prior to a Presidential determination to impose sanctions on any person contributing to nuclear proliferation through financial transactions. It would also subject this determination to judicial review under the Administrative Procedures Act. These are extraordinary and unwarranted procedural requirements for a Presidential determination in the area of foreign affairs, and they raise serious constitutional concerns. The delay in holding hearings and the possibility of delay pending judicial review would severely undermine the effectiveness of these sanctions. They would also eliminate the flexibility needed to impose sanctions quickly to address urgent foreign policy problems and interfere with our nonproliferation efforts. Nor is it clear how these procedures could function in view of the classified nature of much of the material involved. In addition, the broad reach of section 824 (which covers any person, not just financial entities) would complicate Federal enforcement of the proposed sanctions and raises additional constitutional questions when coupled with the extent of the specified sanctions (i.e., a complete prohibition on the conduct of any new business activities).

The juxtaposition of these elements in section 824 makes the provision essentially unworkable. I have been assured that this provision will be corrected in a manner acceptable to the Administration at the earliest possible date. Pending these corrections, and particularly in light of the constitutional problems, I will interpret the statute as providing me discretion to make the determinations provided for in this section.

Finally, section 134 provides that whenever the Department of State enters into a lease-purchase agreement involving foreign countries, the Department shall account for such transactions "in accordance with fiscal year obligations." The Administration's interpretation is that this provision does not waive the scoring rules governing lease-purchases under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 30, 1994.

NOTE: H.R. 2333, approved April 30, was assigned Public Law No. 103-236.

**Proclamation 6679—Law Day,
U.S.A., 1994**

April 30, 1994

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

In 1961, when President John F. Kennedy first proclaimed Law Day, U.S.A., he urged "Americans to rededicate themselves to the ideals of equality and justice under law in their relations with each other and with other nations. . . ."

President Kennedy's challenge is no less urgent today. We live in a time when nations around the globe are struggling to break free from the darkness of oppression into the light of law and justice. To many of the people of these countries, the American rule of law stands as a bright beacon guiding the way to a hopeful future. Law Day, U.S.A., offers every American the opportunity to reflect upon our Nation's proud example of respect for the rights of individuals. More than that, this day demands that we reaffirm our com-

mitment to maintaining a just and civil society in a rapidly changing world.

With the triumph of democratic governments and judiciaries around the world, it seems particularly disturbing that our own legal system is tested daily by the epidemic of crime and violence here at home. In America today, too many children must pass through metal detectors to go to school. Too many are approached by drug dealers in public parks, or worry that they will be victims of drive-by shootings. The primary responsibility of government is to protect the freedom of its citizens and to keep them safe from harm. Our tradition of jurisprudence is the powerful embodiment of this ideal. But it is up to each of us to help ensure that this system remains true to its essential mission—freeing our people from fear while protecting the liberties and rights of all.

On this day, I urge every American to support those who fight to promote respect for the law, from police officers, judges, and other members of the legal system to parents, teachers, and clergy. Let us find the strength to insist that law prevails over disorder, equality over discrimination, and justice over crime and prejudice. Let reverence for the laws, in the words of President Abraham Lincoln, "be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in the courts of justice. . . ."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, in accordance with Public Law 87-20 of April 7, 1961, do hereby proclaim May 1, 1994, as "Law Day, U.S.A." I request the people of the United States to observe this day with such ceremonies and observances as will suitably signal our heritage of freedom, our rights under law, and our abiding commitment to assist others in vindicating their rights.

I urge members of the legal profession, civic associations, and the media, as well as educators, librarians, and public officials, to promote this observance through appropriate programs and activities. I further call upon all public officials to display the flag of the United States on all government buildings on

Law Day, U.S.A., as a symbol of our dedication to the rule of government under law.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:37 p.m., May 2, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on May 4.

Proclamation 6680—Loyalty Day, 1994

April 30, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Each year, at the height of spring's renewal, Americans take the time to reaffirm our allegiance to our country and to the ideals upon which it was founded. On this "Loyalty Day," we pledge to defend the blessings of American democracy.

Ours is still a relatively young Nation, but even in our brief history, we have seen many other forms of government come and go. We have witnessed the collapse of dictatorial regimes, while our brand of democracy has continued to evolve and flourish. Rather than establishing government control through the deprivation of basic human rights, our founders realized that individual freedom and the right to self-determination are the most powerful sources of national strength. This philosophy forms the bedrock upon which our Nation is built, and we continue to expand and enforce its wise mandate to this very day.

Generations of Americans have demonstrated their loyalty and devotion to this country, many risking their lives for the sake of defending the common good. To ensure that this loyalty and love of country remain a vibrant part of each new generation, the Congress, by a joint resolution approved July 18, 1958 (72 Stat. 369; 36 U.S.C. 162), has

designated May 1 of each year as "Loyalty Day."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim May 1, 1994, as Loyalty Day. I call upon all Americans to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities, including public recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States. I also call upon government officials to display the flag on all government buildings and grounds on this day.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:37 p.m., May 2, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on May 4.

Proclamation 6681—Small Business Week, 1994

April 30, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Small businesses create many new jobs in the United States and are an important part of our Nation's international competitiveness. Today, America's 20 million small businesses remain at the heart of our economy. These companies are the engines of growth, and it is in small business that people continue to find opportunity, pride, and dignity.

Indeed, small business is the lifeblood of America's free enterprise system. This is the sector that creates two of every three new jobs in our country, putting the American Dream within reach of hundreds of thousands of men and women who provide the variety and ingenuity that are our greatest natural resources. Small businesses employ more than 57 percent of the private U.S. work force, account for 54 percent of all

sales, and generate half of the domestic private sector output.

As we move forward in a spirit of renewal and change, there is one constant that must prevail in the economy of the United States. Small business must continue to provide the solid foundation upon which this Nation builds its economic strength and maintains its character. Government, working hand in hand with entrepreneurs, must recognize these contributions and help small business create jobs and increase incomes.

We must support and honor small business for the contributions this sector makes to the economy. And just as important, we should remember that it is in small business that the United States finds energy, faith, and confidence in our system of democracy and free enterprise. Only by fully developing our technological and human resources can we expect to be leaders in the global marketplace.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim the week of May 1 through May 7, 1994, as the 31st "Small Business Week," and I call on every American to join me in this tribute.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:38 p.m., May 2, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on May 4.

**Statement on the Agreement To
Withdraw Russian Military Forces
From Latvia**
April 30, 1994

I applaud today's agreement signed by Latvian President Guntis Ulmanis and Russian President Boris Yeltsin that will lead to the withdrawal of Russian military forces

from the territory of the Republic of Latvia by August 31, 1994. I have contacted both leaders to offer my personal congratulations for their vision and statesmanship in concluding this historic accord.

Since the early days of my administration, among my highest foreign policy priorities has been promoting agreement on an orderly withdrawal of Russian forces from the Baltic countries. I discussed this frequently with President Yeltsin and President Ulmanis. The United States has played an active role with both parties during the course of the Latvian-Russian negotiations. I believe that our engagement with both sides, along with the support provided by other countries, in particular Sweden, has played a constructive role in bringing this agreement to a successful conclusion.

Over the course of their negotiations, both the Latvian and Russian Governments displayed a pragmatic approach to resolving their differences. The understandings that this document embodies, including the continued operation of the radar installation at Skrunda as a civilian facility, are testimony to the determination of both sides to conclude an agreement that responds to Russian concerns while affirming Latvia's full and unrestricted sovereignty and promoting its integration into the world community.

The agreement between Latvia and Russia now opens the door to a more normal relationship between the two countries. It constitutes an important contribution to overall stability in the Baltic region and to European security as a whole. I hope that this agreement also will help stimulate a speedy conclusion of the troop withdrawal negotiations between Estonia and Russia.

**Remarks to Americans With
Disabilities**
May 2, 1994

Well, thank you, Stephanie and Denise, and thank you all for being here. I want to thank ADAPT; the National Council for Independent Living; the Consortium of Citizens With Disabilities; recognize my good friend Tony Coelho; Marca Bristo, the Chair of the National Council on Disabilities, pend-

ing confirmation. I'm honored to be given this book of signatures of genuine American heroes who are fighting every day for their own rights and for genuine health care reform for all Americans. I want to say a special word of thanks to Justin Dart, who has risen above partisanship to provide an example for all of us about what it really means to keep fighting the good fight—not only for Americans with disabilities. This is a fight for all Americans who are touched by these problems. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Kate Miles and her family for being here today, for her determination, her courage, her love, and for her ability to get up here and tell their very moving personal story.

I say this to make a special point. The issues affecting Americans with disabilities—they say, “Well, there are 49 million Americans with some sort of disability, and there are 255 million of us total.” But if you consider all the family members of all of the Americans with disabilities, you're getting very close to a majority of us who would be affected in a positive way by the provisions of the health security act that help Americans with disabilities, just those provisions. And in a very, moving and human way, Kate Miles and Robert and their children—husbands, all the families they stand for all across America, they have reminded us what this is all about.

The theme of your rally today is “Bridge to Freedom,” and I want to talk a little about that. The Americans with disability law was a bridge to freedom. But it's only part of the equation. It's only part of the equation. What about economic freedom? How many Americans with disabilities are denied the chance to do work they are able to do not because of discrimination per se but because of the way the health care system works. This is not just a health care issue, it's a work issue. How much better off would the rest of us be if every American with a disability who was willing to work, could work because of changes in the health care system? It's self-defeating to say to the Americans with disabilities, “You can have health benefits, but only if you spend yourself into poverty, and above all, you must not work.”

Forty-nine million Americans with disabilities, 24 million with severe disabilities, half

with no private health insurance—the health care system is failing Americans with disabilities, but in so doing is failing us all, is making us less productive than we would otherwise be, less strong than we would otherwise be. It is costing more tax dollars and robbing us of taxes that would come to America's treasury, not from higher tax rates but from more Americans working and paying taxes in the ordinary course of their lives. We had better fix it now.

After all of the incredible debates, after all of the amazing ads where—and Justin just referred to one of them—you know, these ads where they say—somebody calls up and says, “Well, we'll have to call the Government and see if you can get your doctor,” all these incredibly bogus ads. We had better do this now. We had better do this now. Otherwise, the forces of disinformation, organized disinformation, will think that the American people actually prefer to have the most expensive, wasteful, bureaucratically cumbersome health care insurance financing system on the entire face of the Earth, that they prefer that as opposed to giving a decent break to this fine family and to all of you. I don't believe the American people prefer that, and we had better make sure that no one draws that historic lesson from this health care debate.

There's a lot of talk today about the whole term “empowerment”. It risks becoming a buzzword. There is an empowerment television network. But frankly, I like it. It encaptures something that is uniquely American: the idea that people ought to be able to live up to the fullest of their God-given abilities and that the Government should facilitate people fulfilling themselves, not just be a paternalistic Government doing things for people. I have believed in that for years. Long before I ever became President, I worked on things that I thought would promote empowerment: more choices for parents and children in education, tax breaks for lower income working people, some of the things that we've also promoted here in Washington. The family and medical leave act here in my Presidency was an empowerment bill that enables people to be good parents and good workers at the same time, the empowerment zone concept that

we passed through the economic program last time, lower student loans—lower interest rates for student loans and better paybacks—is an empowerment notion. National service is an empowerment notion: let people have the strength at the grassroots level to solve their own problems.

Empowerment involves work and family and self-fulfillment in a responsible way. How can we empower the American people when 81 million of us live in families with preexisting conditions; when the average American, in the normal course of an economic lifetime, now will change jobs eight times; when this fine man cannot change a job, even if he gets a better job offer, because he can't insure his child? Is that empowerment? No, it is the very reverse. So when we try to fix it, what do our adversaries say? "They're trying to have the Government take over the health care system." False. Private insurance, private providers, empowerment for this man, this woman, these children, their families, and their futures. [Applause] Can you stay around here until this is over? [Laughter] You're great.

Now, they say—let's not kid ourselves, if this were easy, it would have been done already, right? Somebody would have been—people have been trying to do it for 60 years. What is the nub of this? The nub is the question of how to cover everybody and then how to give small businesses the same market power in buying insurance that big business and Government have. Because all across America, Government and big business are downsizing, and small businesses are growing. I might say, that means we better fix this now, because 10 years from now you'll have a smaller percentage of people working for Government and big business and a larger percentage of people working for small business. And if we do not fix this now, this is going to get worse, not better.

We already have about 100,000 Americans a month losing their insurance permanently. In the future, if we're going to be caught up in the kind of a world that I want, where we have open borders and we trade and we have these churning, fascinating, ever-changing economies, we had better fix it now, because people will change jobs more often, not less often.

This is a profoundly important issue. But we cannot do it unless we find a way for everyone to have access and actually be covered by insurance. Nine out of 10 Americans who have private insurance today have it at work. Eight out of 10 Americans who don't have insurance, like this fine young man here, are in families where there is at least one working person. Therefore, it makes logical sense to say that people who do work should be covered through work with a combination of responsibility, just as this family has, from employers and the employee. And then people who are not working should be covered from a public fund. That is our plan; hardly a Government takeover of health care.

And it makes sense for the Government to empower small business to be able to afford this by providing the opportunity to be in buyers' co-ops so that small businesses, self-employed people, and farmers can buy insurance on the same term big business and Government can, and thereby can afford to hire persons with disabilities. Because they will be insured in big pools so that if there is one big bill for this young man here, the insurer does not go broke.

And furthermore, it makes sense to give small businesses a discount because a lot of them have financial burdens and lower profit margins, and so we do that. That is the role of the Government in this: require people who don't provide insurance to their employees to do it in partnership with their employees; let small businesses go into big buyers' co-ops so they can buy insurance on the same terms that the President and the Congress can and people who work for big companies can; eliminate discrimination so that people can move from job to job by removing the problems of preexisting conditions; and finally, face the fact that if you look at the aging population and the disabled population, we must do something to support long-term care that is community-based and home-based.

This is empowerment. This plan helps a person with a disability to be able to take a job by including a tax credit for personal assistance services worth 50 percent of what he or she earns. That's empowerment. But home and community based long-term care is also empowerment. And it also, over the

long run, will be less expensive. Does it cost more in the short run? Yes, it costs some extra money. But if you look at the population trends in this country, if you look at the people with disabilities who are surviving and having lives that are meaningful, if you look at the fastest growing group of Americans being people over 65, and within that group the fastest growing being people over 80, this is something we have to face as a people. We will either do it now in a rational way, or we will be dragged kicking and screaming into it piecemeal, Band-Aid-like, over the next 10 years. But, make no mistake about it, we cannot run away from this, because we cannot afford either to have everybody in the world forced into a nursing home or living in abject neglect. We can't do one of the two things.

So I say to you, all of you know that there is no perfect solution, no easy solution. All of you know that our bill, in order to pay for it, phases some of these services in. But it recognizes the reality of who we are as a people and what we need. We need the work of every American who can work. We need the respect, the dignity of every American. And we need to provide the opportunity for every American to live up to his or her capacity in the least restrictive environment that that person might choose. We need to secure for the American economy the services of every person who wishes to be and is capable of being a successful worker. We need to stop seeing Government health care expenditures go up 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation every year to pay more for the same health care. We need to stop spending more money on paperwork and administrative costs, because of the health care financing system in this country, than any other country in the world.

We can do all of that and keep the doctors, the nurses, the health care system we have. That's why there are so many thousands and thousands, indeed millions now, of nurses, health care providers, and physicians who have supported our cause.

And so I ask you, the real problem with this, I am convinced, is that there is no way, to use the political vernacular, to "kiss" it, to "keep it simple, stupid." That's what people always tell me, you know. [*Laughter*] The real problem here is that we bear the burden

of every move, those of us who want change, because we live in a system that is complicated. So it is not simple to fix it.

So I plead with you, a lot of you will contact Members of Congress who voted for the Americans With Disabilities Act who are not yet prepared to vote to make sure every American has health insurance and who do not understand yet that you cannot eliminate preexisting conditions and you cannot eliminate other discriminatory practices and you cannot afford to begin to provide long-term care that is community-based and home-based unless you set up a system where everybody has health care insurance, where small businesses can buy on the same terms big business and Government can and where insurers insure in big enough pools so that nobody goes broke when they do insure a family where a member has a disability and where small businesses get a discount. Those are the things we try to do with the power of Government.

It is a legitimate thing to do, but when you strip it all away, what we're really trying to do is to empower the families of this country to live in dignity, to work in dignity, and to fulfill themselves. And in a strange way, this is a battle that the disability community, known so well to the Members of Congress, being so successful in the passage of the Americans With Disabilities Act, this is a battle that you may be able to lead for the rest of America that they do not understand.

So I ask you to do that, be an agent of change, an agent of empowerment, never forget that you are carrying on your shoulders now not only your own cause but ours as well. We cannot, in the end, fully unleash the forces of all human Americans until we do this. And we cannot do this with all the resistance and all the organized opposition, with the sheer intellectual difficulty of the tasks, unless people like you can break through. You can break through to those Members of Congress. You can do it. You can do it. And we need you, all the rest of America, we need you to do it.

Good luck, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:55 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Stephanie Thomas, co-operator of the Austin, TX, chapter, American Disabled for

Attendant Programs Today; Denise Figueroa, president, National Council on Independent Living; Tony Coelho, Chair, and Justin Dart, former Chair, President's Committee on the Employment of People With Disabilities; and Kate Miles, mother of a disabled son and advocate for long-term care and health care reform.

Remarks on Legislation To Ban Assault Weapons

May 2, 1994

Thank you very much, Chief. He's come a long way from Wisconsin to bring a little Middle Western common sense to the Nation's Capital.

When the House of Representatives votes this week on Thursday, they shouldn't forget the tragedy that the Chief just talked about. Think about it, a 30-year veteran of the police department killed by an M1-A1 assault rifle after a bank robbery, two other police officers and a hostage also wounded. These things can be prevented.

I also want to thank John Magaw for what he's said. He's done a fine job as Director of the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Division. And before that he was the Director of the Secret Service. I think you could tell his heartfelt concern there. He has two sons and a son-in-law, all in law enforcement. They deserve a chance to do their job with less danger, not more.

I thank Secretary Bentsen for his sterling leadership. We joked a lot of times about whether there will be somebody blocking his entrance to his ranch when he goes quail hunting this fall—[laughter]—but I don't really think so.

One of the things that I've learned since I've been here, even more than when I was a Governor, is that very often a lot of these organized interest groups don't always represent the members, their unorganized members, and what they really feel in their heart of hearts.

I want to thank the leaders of the law enforcement organizations that are here today: Bob Scully, the Director of the National Association of Police Organizations; Sylvester Daughtry, the President of the International Association of Chiefs of Police; John Pitta, the Vice President of the Federal Law En-

forcement Association; Mark Spurrier, the Director of the Major City Chiefs; and Chuck Wexler, who's with the Police Executives Research Forum.

I want you all to think about what all you've heard. There are a lot of people in this audience today who have experienced a loss of life in their own family. And I realize that here today, in a fundamental way, we're sort of preaching to the saved. But what we hope to do here is to energize you to talk to those last few Members of the House. We need to put this bill over the top, to tell them this is not about gun control; it's about crime control.

You know, I would never do anything to infringe on the rights of sportsmen and women in this country. I have—I guess I was 12 years old the first time I fired a .22 or a .410. But I think to hide behind the rights of sports people to justify the kind of unconscionable behavior that takes place every single day on the streets of this country is an unforgivable abuse of our common right to be hunters. It is an abuse of that.

All over the world today, all you have to do is pick up the newspaper, any given day, and you see how we are worried about the disintegration of civic life in other countries. We read about the horror of Bosnia, and we say, my God, why can't the Muslims and the Serbs and the Croats just get along? We read about bodies being thrown into the river in Rwanda and say, Good Lord, why are those people doing that to each other? We read now about the rise of organized crime in Russia, and it breaks our heart. They finally get rid of communism and they try to go to a more entrepreneurial society, and a new group of dark organizations springs up and commits murder. We worry about what's happening in our neighboring country south of our border, especially to our friends in Mexico, when we hear about what's being done there by people running drugs.

And we worry, we worry, we worry, and we don't look around and see we have more people behind bars already in this country, a higher percentage of our population, than any country in the world, already. And when we come up with a bill like this, they say you ought to put more people in jail and keep them there longer. Well, some people ought

to go to jail longer, and our crime bill does that.

But our disintegration, my fellow Americans, is in the streets of our cities where, as John Magaw says, we have suffered a breakdown of family and work and community, and where that vacuum has been filled by guns like this and people who use them in a very well organized way.

Will this solve all of the problems in America? No. Like John said, this is a puzzle. We're trying to fill in the puzzle with the crime bill. And in the end, the puzzle has to be filled by people like this fine chief out there on the streets of our cities, and whether the people who live in his community will work with it to take their streets back. But I'm telling you: This is an amazing—it's amazing to me that we even have to have this debate. I mean, how long are we going to let this go on?

San Francisco last summer, a gunman carrying two TEK-9's killed eight people and wounded six others. Last week, when we had an event for this bill, I'm sure a lot of you saw the husband of one of the women who was killed in that tragedy, Steve Sposato, who now is raising his beautiful daughter by himself.

Yes, that guy was crazy, and maybe he'd have gone in there with that old six-shooter and killed somebody, but Steve Sposato would like to have his wife's chances back.

Five years ago, a gunman using an AK-47 killed five elementary school kids. This happens every day. We lost two people and had three more wounded outside the CIA headquarters last year. Remember that, with a gunman with an AK-47.

So I say to you, I'm sorry to be so frustrated, but sometimes it seems that the President's job ought to be dealing with things that are not obvious. I mean, at least health care is a complex subject. It's obvious we need to do something about it, but it's complicated. I concede that; I welcome these debates.

How can we walk away from this? Especially when this bill protects over 650 specific hunting weapons? I mean, I don't understand why the organizations aren't saying, "Well, hallelujah, this is the first Federal explicit

protection we ever had for the means of hunting."

And I really—I was proud of what Mr. Magaw said, talking about the only color—I mean, I have heard people with a straight face saying, "Well, there are some adults that like to go target practice with these things." Well, they need to read a good book—*[laughter]*—or take up bowling or just follow—or, you know, you can hunt nearly 12 months out of the year if you hunt everything. *[Laughter]* This is—it is imperative. We just have a few days left.

And I urge you to spend less time with each other and more time putting the hammer of your feelings into the deliberations in the House of Representatives. And something else: No good Member of the House or Senate, no Republican or Democrat, no rural legislator should ever fear losing their seat for voting for this bill. And something else you ought to do is tell every office you call: "If you do this, I will fight for you for voting for this; I will—there may be differences over other issues, but I will do everything I can to see that nothing diminishes your standing because of this."

This is not a complicated issue. And we will have more issues like this. Every great society is going to face, for the foreseeable future, these incredible tensions between our freedom and our abuse of our freedom, between the need for liberty and the need for order, between our desire to have an entrepreneurial, free-flowing society and the absolute need for some discipline that enables us to live as human beings civilly together and give our children a chance to grow up.

And some of the decisions we'll have to make will be more difficult than this. But this is a lay-down no-brainer—*[laughter]*—and the Congress must not walk away from it. Please help us to pass it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:37 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Chief David Steingraber, head of the Wisconsin Police Chiefs Association.

Executive Order 12913—Revocation of Executive Order No. 12582

May 2, 1994

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America, including section 1440 of title 8, United States Code, and in consideration of *Matter of Reyes*, 910 F.2d 611 (9th Cir. 1990), I hereby order as follows:

Section 1. Executive Order No. 12582 is revoked and shall be treated as void, effective February 2, 1987.

Sec. 2. Revocation of Executive Order No. 12582 is not intended to affect the status of anyone who was naturalized pursuant to the terms of that order prior to the date of publication of this order in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 2, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:40 a.m., May 3, 1994]

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

Message to the Congress Reporting a Budget Deferral

May 2, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral of budget authority, totaling \$7.3 million.

The deferral affects the Department of Health and Human Services. The details of the revised deferral is contained in the attached report.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 2, 1994.

Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's Meeting With Vice Premier Zou Jiahua of China

May 2, 1994

Haiti

President Clinton met today in the Oval Office with Chinese Vice Premier Zou Jiahua. The meeting, which lasted 40 minutes, provided both sides with an opportunity to exchange views on the current state of U.S.-China relations.

President Clinton told the Vice Premier that the United States wants to see a strong, stable, and prosperous China. The President emphasized that he wants to strengthen our bilateral relationship, but to accomplish that goal there needs to be progress on human rights as called for in last year's Executive order.

Vice Premier Zou was accompanied, among others, by Vice Foreign Minister Liu Hiaqui, Vice Minister Zeng Peiyan from the State Planning Commission, and Ambassador Li Daoyu.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Departure for Atlanta, Georgia

May 3, 1994

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, are you going to send military advisers to Haiti? What is our Haiti policy, and are you thinking about military action or advisers or trainers, sir?

The President. Right now, what we're doing is to put in place a stiffer sanctions policy, consistent with what President Aristide has been asking for some months now. And we want to have a better enforcement of the sanctions we have as well as the stiffer sanctions. And I don't think it's useful to rule out any option, and I'm not ruling out any option.

But to use a phrase the Vice President made famous in 1992, "It's time for them to go." I mean, the military leaders of Haiti have abused their authority. They have begun to clearly kill more innocent civilians, people not even directly involved in the political life of the country.

I think the United States and the world is outraged by it. And we've tried other initiatives, and they have not worked. We have done our best to work through this, and the things we have done have not worked. So we're now doing this sanctions regime, as recommended by President Aristide and others, but we're not ruling out anything.

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:15 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Remarks to the Community in Atlanta

May 3, 1994

Thank you so much. Thank you for being here and in such large numbers and with such enthusiasm. Thank you, Mayor, for that wonderful introduction. Thank you, Governor and Mrs. Miller and secretary of state Cleland, Commissioner, Congressman Lewis, Congresswoman McKinney, and ladies and gentlemen. Thank the Wings of Faith Choir and the Morehouse College Glee Club, and all those who sang for us, thank you.

It is good to be back in Georgia and Atlanta again. I went running the other day with a number of members of the United States Olympic Team for the Winter Olympics. My wife and daughter represented us there in Lillehammer, and I could at least keep up with the winter Olympians. I don't think I can keep up with the summer Olympians, but I'll be here in 1996 to cheer them on along with you.

I want to thank all of you who came here with these "America Back On Track" signs. You know, I ran for President because I thought our country was not on the right track; because I was worried about my daughter growing up to be part of the first generation of Americans that did not do better than their parents; because I thought our country was being too divided by party, by race, by region, with arguments about what was right or left or liberal or conservative, obscuring the truth, the facts, and a way to the future.

Frankly, there is still a lot of that in our politics and too much of that in Washington, where people scream at each other across

the divide and try to confuse you folks out here in the country with negative images and useless rhetoric. But there are some things that do not change. In the end, we will all be judged on whether we have done what is right to bring this country together and to move this country forward, to make it possible for every man and woman, every boy and girl to live to the fullest of their God-given capacities. That is our common obligation and our great opportunity. And I am doing my best to seize it for you as President of the United States.

I asked the United States Congress last year to pass an economic plan that would bring the deficit down and drive investment up, that would drive interest rates down, keep inflation down, create jobs, and move this country forward. And the Congress did it in the face of withering, withering hot air and rhetoric. And all the people who were against it said, "Well, if you do this, all the middle class people in America will have their income taxes go up, and the economy will collapse." Well, what happened?

The economic plan passed. Interest rates went down; investment went up. Last year, in the first 14 months of our administration, 2½ million new jobs were created, more than the previous 4 years. And we are moving this country forward.

It is true that 1.2 percent of the American people paid more in income taxes, but it all went to pay down the deficit. And we cut even more in spending. And this year, one in six working families will get an income tax cut so that they will not fall into poverty and be tempted to choose welfare over work. We are going to choose work over welfare by not taxing people into welfare, but lifting them out for work.

And I have now presented a budget to the Congress which eliminates 100 Government programs, cuts over 200 more, has no tax increases, and if adopted, will give us 3 years of declining deficits for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States of America.

That is not partisan rhetoric, my fellow Americans. And that's not all that liberal and conservative talk in the air. That's just the facts. We are doing it. And what we need in America is more people to leave aside the

hot air, roll up their sleeves, and go to work on the promise and the problems of this country in that way.

They said when I took office all the Democrats were for big Government. Well, let me tell you something. The budget I gave to the Congress does provide more money for Head Start, more money for new technologies and job training, more money for education and training our people in the future. But you know what? It still reduces domestic spending in everything but health care for the first time since 1969. No other President has been able to do that. If the Congress adopts it, we'll do it for the first time since '69.

This is not a partisan issue. It's a question of whether we're going to do what it takes to get this country going again so those little children will have a future. That is what is at stake.

And now we have many challenges before us. We must keep this economy strong. The economy of Georgia last year—in the last year—has produced 150,000 new jobs, the fastest growing economy east of the Mississippi River. You have benefited from this, and we have to keep it going.

If you look ahead to this year—I came here today to be part of a remarkable thing that CNN is sponsoring, making you the telecommunications capital of the world. Tonight I will be talking with people not only all across America but with 75 million people, at least, in over 100 other countries, people asking questions about what this world is going to be like and what America's role is in it. And I want to say something that you know here: We cannot withdraw from the world. Last year, we made more progress in opening America's borders to new trade, new investment, and reaching out to the rest of the world, than had been made in a generation. This year, the Congress has got to adopt the new world trade agreement. This year we have got to adopt new systems for educating and training our people so they can compete in that global economy. We're going to be challenged to do that.

Tomorrow I'm going back to the White House to sign a bill that will, for the first time, put in place a national system for all the young people in our country who don't go on to 4-year colleges but do need more

education and training, so they can move from school to work with high skills and better opportunity in the future.

And then we are going to take up a bill to totally change the unemployment system. You know, a lot of you here can identify with this. It used to be when people lost their jobs, they were just laid off for a while, and then they were called back to their old jobs. So the unemployment system gave them enough to live on while that happened. Now, most people who are laid off do not get called back to their old jobs; should not be allowed to wait month after month after month but instead should be able, from the day they are laid off, to immediately start a training program and a new set of job searches. And that's what we're trying to do with this reemployment system, instead of an unemployment program.

We are working on a crime bill in Washington which mirrors a lot of what Governor Miller and the legislature have done here: to put more police officers on the street; to help cities like Atlanta have community police officers who walk the streets, know the kids, know the neighbors, and can reduce crime as well as catch criminals; one that has tougher penalties but also alternative punishments, like boot camps for first-time offenders; one that will give us a chance to have drug treatment as well as tougher punishment. These are the kinds of things that we need to do to make this country safe again. And we're going to do it this year in Washington, just as you've been trying to do it in Georgia.

Soon I will present to the Congress a welfare reform program designed to begin the process of ending the whole welfare system as we know it. And a lot of that welfare reform program is like what you are doing here in Georgia. People want to be independent, not dependent. People want to succeed as parents and workers. And we have to give them the tools, the incentives, and, if necessary, the requirements to do just that. And I believe we can. And I think the American people want us to do it.

Finally, let me say that when you look at all this, it all brings you back to the beginning. We are moving into a new and different and very exciting time in which the young

people here will be able to grow up, if we complete our work at dismantling the nuclear arsenals of other countries, unafraid of nuclear war. I was so proud to be able to go to Russia and sign an agreement where we agreed that for the first time in decades we would no longer even point our missiles at each other. That is a good thing.

But if you look all over the world, with the end of the cold war and the opening up of new technologies and the increasing entrepreneurialism and the more rapid pace of change, there are dangers there, too. Because now countries instead of invading each other are fighting from within, from Bosnia to Rwanda. And even countries that are trying to promote democracy are made more vulnerable by high technology and organized criminal activity, from organized crime in Russia to the drug kingpins in Mexico and South America, to the gangs that terrorize the streets of the United States of America.

We have great tests and challenges before us, each of us within our borders and across our borders. But the next century can be the best time America has ever known. And the young people in this audience can have the best life any group of Americans has ever known if we have the courage and the vision and the wisdom to cool down the traditional politics-as-usual, to reduce the gridlock, to reduce the hot air, to reduce the name-calling, and instead think about the people that live in this country and do something to bring them together and move them forward. That is my promise to you.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:12 p.m. in the CNN Center Atrium. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Bill Campbell of Atlanta; Governor Zell Miller of Georgia; secretary of state Max Cleland of Georgia; and state agriculture commissioner, Thomas T. Irvin.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters on Departure From the CNN International Studio in Atlanta
May 3, 1994

Congressional Elections

The President. [*Inaudible*—the elections will help, because the elections will give an

opportunity for the facts to come out. The Georgia economy's doing well. It's done much better since I've been elected President. The economic program, which we passed—a lot of the Republicans, including some of the prominent Republicans in Georgia, accused us of raising income taxes on everybody. Now they know, the American people know, only 1.2 percent of the American people paid higher income taxes. And this year, one in six working families will get a tax cut. We're reducing the deficit. And under our administration, we'll have 3 years of declining deficits for the first time since Truman.

So the economy's doing better. We passed sweeping education and training reforms. We're passing the toughest crime bill in American history. We're going to pass welfare reform. We're dealing with the problems of America. And I think by election time that should be very helpful. That'll be a good environment in which Democrats can run. We Democrats don't have the kind of machine, in a way—media machine—that the Republicans do, sort of spewing out all this venom and all this labeling and name-calling all the time. So we get down sometimes, but we'll get back up.

Georgia—Atlanta has benefited greatly from the trade initiatives of this administration, from the North American Free Trade Agreement, from the worldwide trade agreement, from our outreach to Asia. So I think the record—the economic benefits and the fact that we reflect middle class values and welfare reform, the crime initiative, and other things, all those things will help the Democrats by November.

Q. Do you take a fairly relaxed attitude about the fact that some Members of the Georgia delegation, congressional delegation, would just as soon stay in Washington and not right now come down and be with you?

The President. Sure, I take a fairly relaxed attitude about whatever they want to do. But I think the—you've got to understand, in the rural South where you've got Rush Limbaugh and all this right-wing extremist media just pouring venom at us every day and nothing to counter that, we need an election to get the facts out. So I really—I welcome the election—American people find out the

truth, they're going to support people who didn't say no every time.

Essentially these Democrats, most of them have said yes to America. They've said yes on crime, yes on getting the deficit down, yes on getting the economy going, yes on moving the country forward. We have ended gridlock. It took us years and years and years to pass some of this anticrime initiatives and other things that we're doing now. And when the American people see the facts, even in the places which were tough for us, I think that the Democrats will do very, very well, because they'll have their own record to run on. So I'm kind of looking forward to it.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 3 p.m. at the studio. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Exchange With Reporters Following a Meeting With President Jimmy Carter in Atlanta

May 3, 1994

Haiti

Q. President Clinton, is military intervention on the table?

President Clinton. I agree with what President Carter said. That's basically what I said this morning, and I believe that. After all, we had an agreement, a Governors Island Agreement, which was broken. And I think the military leaders are going to have to understand that we have been very patient. After they reneged on the Governors Island Agreement, we went back and spent a few more months trying to come up with some alternative formula. President Aristide did not dispute the fact that he had to broaden his political base in order to effectively govern. He was willing to do that. And we have worked on this for months now.

For the last several weeks we keep getting reports not only of Aristide backers but of civilians being not only murdered, but mutilated. And I think it's time for a new initiative. We're now, as you know, doing two things: We're going for stronger sanctions in the U.N. and stiffening the enforcement of the sanctions we have, consistent with what President Aristide has wanted all along. We're going to consult with all of our friends

and allies in the region, and we're going to do our best to bring a conclusion to this before more people die innocently and continue to suffer. But we cannot remove the military option. We have to keep that as an option.

Q. It sounds like your patience is running out.

President Clinton. I think it has run out; maybe we've let it run on a bit too long. But we're—the United States is very sensitive to the fact that without our direct intervention, today, all governments in Latin America, Central America, and the Caribbean have elected leaders except two—Haiti has ousted theirs, and Cuba. And we have done that in a spirit of partnership at its best in Latin America. When we have intervened in the past it hasn't worked out very well.

The work that President Carter has done in Central America on elections—he's about to go back to Panama—is an example of America at its best being a genuine good neighbor to those countries. And that's the best approach. But this is an unusual and in some ways unprecedented circumstance. We're going to keep trying to find other ways to do it, but we cannot remove the military option.

South Africa

Q. Mr. President, how much aid do you have in mind for the new government in South Africa?

President Clinton. Well, I'm going to talk about that a little tonight. We're going to roughly double what we had previously scheduled.

Q. Which was?

President Clinton. And I think it will be about \$600 million over 3 years, something like that. I will have the figure tonight. I'm trying to—because I asked today, ironically that you asked this, for a little more information about some of the programs, and I'm going now to prepare for the program tonight. So I'll have it nailed down exactly about what we're going to do. But we're going to have a big increase in our aid, and I hope we'll be able to sustain it for some time, because if the South African miracle can be translated from an election into the lives of the people there, then the promise

that that would have for lifting all of southern Africa and setting an example that others might follow is quite extraordinary.

I think the whole world has been moved by the size of the turnout, by the profound passion of the people, and by the rather miraculous partnership between Mr. Mandela and Mr. de Klerk, and the fact that Chief Buthelezi and the Inkatha Party came back in the 11th hour, participated, and apparently have done as about projected and will be a part of the government. So I'm hoping that this is all going to work out fine.

Supreme Court Appointment

Q. Mr. President, would you appoint someone on the Supreme Court without interviewing them yourself?

President Jimmy Carter. I would.

President Clinton. Did you hear what he said? He said, "I would." [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The exchange began at 5:23 p.m. at the Carter Center. President Jimmy Carter made welcoming remarks and answered reporters' questions prior to the President's remarks. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Interview on CNN's "Global Forum With President Clinton"

May 3, 1994

The President. Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Johnson, Mr. Turner, and ladies and gentlemen, good evening. I want to welcome those of you who are here at the CNN conference and the millions more who are watching all across the world tonight. I also want to thank the Carter Center for hosting us for this pathbreaking discussion of world events.

Throughout the history of the United States and particularly after major conflicts, America has had to reexamine how we define our security and what kind of world we hope to live in and leave our children and what our responsibilities for that world are. With the cold war over we have clearly come to another such moment, a time of great change and possibility. The specter of nuclear annihilation is clearly receding. A score of new democracies has replaced the former Soviet

empire. A global economy has collapsed distances and expanded opportunity, because of a communications revolution symbolized most clearly by CNN and what all of us are doing this evening all around the world.

We are front-row history witnesses. We see things as they occur. I remember when I was a young man watching the news on television at night. There was only a small amount of coverage allotted to the world scene, and very often the footage I would see as a boy would be a whole day old. Now we're impatient if we learn about things an hour after they occur instead of seeing them in the moment.

The Berlin Wall has been toppled. A handshake of hope has started the series of peace news that will be necessary at long last to bring peace to the troubled Middle East. And this week we saw these glorious and unforgettable scenes of millions of South Africans of all races lining up with joy and courage to give birth to their new multiracial democracy.

But all of us know that this era poses dangers as well. Russia and the other former Communist states are going through wrenching transitions. The end of the superpower standoff between the United States and the Soviet Union lifted the lid off a cauldron of smoldering ethnic hatreds. And there is now so much aggression within the national borders of countries all around the world. Indeed, all of us feel our humanity threatened as much by fights going on within the borders of nations as by the dangers of fighting across national borders.

There are regimes, such as Iraq, Iran, and North Korea, who persist in working to develop weapons of mass destruction. We see brutal human rights abuses from Haiti to Rwanda and dire humanitarian and environmental problems from the sweeping AIDS epidemic and desertification in Africa to deforestation in Latin America and Asia.

In the face of so much promise and trouble, we have a chance, a chance to create conditions of greater peace and prosperity and hopefully more lasting peace and prosperity, but only if the world's leading nations stay actively engaged in the effort.

With the cold war over, there are pressures here in America and in other nations around

the world to turn inward, to focus on needs at home. Here at home for us that means things like job creation and reducing crime and providing health care to all our citizens. It is right, and indeed imperative, for us to address these needs. But the United States cannot turn our back on the world, nor can other nations. I know our engagement costs money, and sometimes it costs lives. I know well that we cannot solve every problem, nor should we try. But in an era of change and opportunity and peril, America must be willing to assume the obligations and the risks of leadership. And I am determined to see that we do that.

It is important that we have a clear road map in a new era based on our national interests and our clearly stated values, a road map that charts where we're trying to go. Tonight let me briefly sketch it out before taking questions.

Our highest priority and my highest priority as President must continue to be simply and clearly to protect our land, our people, and our way of life. That is the core of our national interest. We also must seize opportunities that will enhance our safety and our prosperity, acting alone when necessary, acting with others whenever possible.

We have an interest in continuing to serve as a beacon of strength and freedom and hope. For we are, after all, a unique nation. We are the world's most powerful arsenal, its oldest democracy, its most daring experiment in forging different races, religions, and cultures into a single people.

Since taking office, my strategy to advance those interests has been based on three priorities: first, developing policies to meet the security challenges of this new era and then shaping our defense forces necessary to carry out those policies; second, making our Nation's global economic interests an integral and essential part of our foreign policies; and third, promoting the spread of democracy abroad.

Let me discuss each of these briefly. First, ensuring that we have strong policies and ready defenses for a new security environment. Thankfully, we no longer face the prospect of Soviet troops marching into Western Europe. But the world is still a dangerous place, and the skill and the power and the

readiness of our men and women in uniform remains a bulwark of our freedom and freedom in many places abroad.

Last year, we completed a sweeping assessment of what military forces we now need in order to meet this era's threats. We concluded that we must have forces that can fight and win two major regional conflicts nearly simultaneously. These forces will cost less than what was needed during the cold war, but we must not cut too far. And I have fought against deeper cuts in our defenses that would weaken our ability to be ready to defend our interests.

We're taking other steps to meet the threats of this new era. At the NATO summit convened in January, we and our NATO allies adopted the concept of the Partnership For Peace to help draw former Communist states and other states in Europe not presently aligned with NATO into closer security cooperation with Western Europe. We're working to increase regional security in areas like the Middle East, where we hope tomorrow Israel and the PLO will sign an important accord that builds on the promise of their breakthrough last September.

We're continuing to reduce the world's nuclear dangers, working to end North Korea's dangerous nuclear program. We started negotiations on a comprehensive test ban. When I took office, four former Soviet republics had nuclear weapons. We succeeded with three of them in nailing down commitments to eliminate their entire nuclear arsenals. And we are proceeding in that important work. And now, for the very first time, our nuclear missiles are no longer targeted at Russia, nor theirs at us.

The second part of our strategy is to place economic progress at the center of our policies abroad. For too many years there was a dangerous dislocation here in America between our international policies and our economic policies. We were strong militarily when we became economically weak because of our dangerously high deficits and low productivity, things which contributed to the weakening of nations all around the world and dried up much of the capital needed in less developed countries for development and growth. We advocated free trade, but often we practiced just the reverse when

under the pressure of poor economic performance. And even when we pushed free trade, we often here in our own country lacked the policies we needed to make sure that it benefited ordinary American citizens.

My goal has been to reduce our deficit, increase our investment, increase our competitiveness, improve the education and training of our people, and keep pushing for agreements to open world markets for no special treatment for the United States but more open markets so that all of us may grow and compete together.

This past year, there was important progress. We enacted the North American Free Trade Agreement with Canada and Mexico and secured the biggest market opening agreement in history with the GATT world trade talks, agreements that will create American jobs for us here in the United States while spurring significant global economic growth. We hosted a summit of leaders from the Asian-Pacific region, the fastest growing region on Earth. This year we will seek enactment of the GATT round in the Congress and convene the first summit in a generation of our hemispheric neighbors.

We work to promote environmentally sound forms of economic development both here and abroad. We have to remember that many of the civil wars we have seen and are seeing today, tearing apart societies across Africa and elsewhere, are caused not only by historic conflicts but also by the abject and utterly terrifying deterioration of not only the economy but the environment in which those people live.

The third key to our policy is fostering democracy. The new progress of democracy all around the world resonates with our values and our interests. It makes us safer here in the United States. We know democracies are less likely to wage war, to violate human rights, to break treaties. That's why we fought two world wars, to protect Europe's democracies, and why we stood firm for a half a century to contain communism.

Now the greatest opportunity for our security is to help enlarge the world's communities of market democracies and to move toward a world in which all the great powers govern by a democratic plan. If we do, we'll have more valuable partners in trade and bet-

ter partners in diplomacy and security. That's why I have given a lot of attention to promoting democratic and market reformers in Russia, in Ukraine, the Baltics, and other former Communist states. We saw that strategy pay off again just last week as Russia and Latvia reached an historic accord to withdraw Russia's military from Latvian territory by the end of August.

Our goal is to foster the success of new democracies like those in Latin America and now in South Africa and to apply pressure to restore democracy where it has been overthrown, as in Haiti.

Security, prosperity, democracy: These are the pillars of our strategy in the new world. These building blocks do not answer every question we confront. In particular, this era has seen an epidemic of humanitarian catastrophes, many caused by ethnic conflicts or the collapse of governments. Some, such as Bosnia, clearly affect our interests. Others, such as Rwanda, less directly affect our own security interests but still warrant our concern and our assistance.

America cannot solve every problem and must not become the world's policeman. But we do have an obligation to join with others to do what we can to relieve suffering and to restore peace.

The means we use will and must vary from circumstance to circumstance. When our most important interests are at stake, we will not hesitate to act alone if necessary. Where we share an interest in action with the international community, we work perhaps through the United Nations. This week we will unveil a set of policies to reform U.N. peacekeeping to help make those operations both less expensive and more effective.

In other cases we will work in partnership with other nations. In Bosnia, for example, we have stepped up our diplomatic involvement, along with Russia and others. We supported NATO enforcement measures and committed to provide United States forces as a part of a NATO enforcement mission if and when the parties can reach a workable peace agreement.

Although that conflict continues, we should never forget that there are tonight people in Sarajevo, Tuzla, and Mostar who are alive because of the actions taken with

NATO working with the United Nations. The safe areas, the no-fly zone, the longest humanitarian airlift in history, all these efforts and others are contributing to a resolution of a very difficult problem.

This is a pivotal moment in the affairs of our world, a moment when we can expand the frontiers of freedom, create a more prosperous global economy, give millions in war-torn lands a chance to enjoy a normal life, when we can make the people in each of our lands safer from the world's deadliest weapons.

On each of these, I believe the leadership of the United States is indispensable. My commitment is to exercise that leadership so that we can pass onto our children a world that is safer, freer, and more livable for their future.

Thank you very much.

The President. Thank you.

Haiti

[At this point, Judy Woodruff described the format for the forum and introduced a participant from Trinidad, who asked about U.S. policy toward the Caribbean and Latin America.]

The President. Well, our policy has not changed. I believe in the Good Neighbor Policy, and we've tried to be a good neighbor. We have worked with our friends in Mexico on trade and democracy. We have worked with many other countries. The Vice President has been to South America a couple of times to work on developing the information superhighway and many other things. We're trying to bring democracies into closer trade relationships with us in the Caribbean, as well as in Central and South America. And I have made it very clear that the United States wishes to be a partner, not a dictator, about the internal events of other countries.

On the other hand, every country in the region is governed by a democratically elected government but two. One is Cuba; the other is Haiti, which voted two-thirds for President Aristide, and he was then thrown out. We had an agreement, the Governors Island Agreement, made by the military, the Aristide faction, in cooperation with the United States and the United Nations. It was abrogated by the military rulers of Haiti. We

went back to the drawing board. We have worked for months since Governors Island was abrogated to try to find other solutions. Meanwhile, innocent civilians are being killed and mutilated.

We are doing our best to avoid dealing with the military option. We are now pursuing—we put on the table at the United Nations today—stiffer sanctions. We're working for tougher enforcement of the existing sanctions. But given how many people are being killed and the abject misery of the Haitian people and the fact that democracy was implanted by the people and then uprooted by the military rulers there, I think that we cannot afford to discount the prospect of a military option.

I want to work with our friends and neighbors in the Caribbean and in all of Latin America. And I hope that whatever we do from here on out will have their support. The United States never will interfere in the affairs of another country to try to seek to thwart the popular will there. This is a different case.

Ms. Woodruff. If I may follow up, Mr. President, when you say you wouldn't rule out a use of military force, you're saying U.S. troops on the ground. What would be their mission if they were to go there?

The President. Well, let me say what our policy is. Our policy—and we have not decided to use force; all I've said is we can't rule it out any longer. Our policy is to restore democracy to Haiti and then to work to develop Haiti with a functioning government and a growing economy. The people who are now in control in Haiti have thwarted democracy; they have brought down the economy; they have visited abject misery on their people. And they are now once again killing and mutilating not just sympathizers of Aristide but other innocent civilians. And it is wrong, and we've got to do what we can to try to stop it. That is our policy, and we are going to pursue that policy as vigorously as we can.

I want to make it clear: This is the responsibility not of the United States but of the people who are running things in Haiti tonight. They abrogated the Governors Island Agreement. They have started killing, first the allies of President Aristide and now innocent civilians. They have brought this reign

of terror and poverty on their people. They can change it tomorrow if they will. And I hope they will.

Ms. Woodruff. But you wouldn't say at this point what the mission would be if we were to go in?

The President. The mission of the United States, whatever means we choose to pursue that mission, is to restore democracy, to start a multinational effort to help Haiti function and to grow again and to crawl out of this enormous hole that the present rulers of Haiti have illegally driven the people into.

North Korea

[A participant from Seoul, South Korea asked about the nuclear crisis on the Korean Peninsula.]

The President. Well, I think it is a very serious situation. And let me say, first of all, it is a very serious situation because North Korea has agreed to be a nonnuclear state, to follow nonproliferation policies. Because it has nuclear resources, it has agreed in the past to submit to the international inspections of the IAEA. There has been a lot of trouble about that, as you know, as well as about how to resume a dialog between North Korea and South Korea. I would say to you, sir, that the options we have are largely again in the hands of the North Koreans themselves. North Korea can choose, and I hope they will.

And I would say this to the North Koreans—I believe we have North Koreans watching us tonight—I would say to you: The United States wishes to have friendly and open relationships with you. We wish to have a constructive relationship. We want you to have a constructive relationship with South Korea. You in North Korea have pledged yourselves to a nonnuclear Korean Peninsula. That's what we want. If there is a policy of isolation pursued by us, it will only be because you decide not to follow through on the commitments you have already made to honor international inspections and to be a nonnuclear state.

The options are, I think, clear. But they are not easy. No one wishes this confrontation. But neither does one wish to have a state not only with nuclear power but with a capacity to proliferate nuclear weapons to

other nations. It is a very serious potential situation. We intend to stand firm and to keep working with our allies, the South Koreans, the Japanese, working with the Chinese and others, to reach a good solution to this.

Our hand is still out to the people of North Korea and to the leaders of North Korea. But we expect the commitment that North Korea made to be a nonnuclear state to be honored.

Ms. Woodruff. Mr. President, if I may just quickly follow up here. With all due respect to what you said, if North Korea wants to go ahead and develop a nuclear weapon, what is to stop them from doing so? You're not saying that the United States is prepared to go to war if they continue with this program that they've begun.

The President. At a minimum, North Korea will be much more isolated, in a much more tenuous position. And the relationships between the North Koreans and South Korea will be strained, I think, irrevocably in many ways. And the problems that North Korea will then have with their neighbors in Japan as well as with their friends in China will be very significant. The least that would happen is that they would be much, much more severely isolated and they would run a risk of having more difficult things happen. And their rhetoric has recognized that.

I think this is another one of those issues—it's in the hands of the North Koreans. But we have reached out the hand of friendship and cooperation, and we know the South Koreans wish to do the same. It does not really make sense for the North Koreans to pursue this path of isolation. They can have more prosperity, more security, and more prestige by abandoning this nuclear program that they have already promised to abandon than by going forward with it, and I hope they will.

Bosnia

[Following a commercial break, a journalist in Belgrade asked if it would be more productive to treat all factions in the Bosnia conflict equally, without sanctions against the Serbs.]

The President. I guess the short answer is no, but not entirely no. Let me explain what I mean by that.

The United States does not believe that we can or should, alone or through NATO,

enter into your war on the side of the Government of Bosnia and its new partnership with the Croats. When we supported creating the safe zone around Sarajevo, we made it absolutely clear that anyone caught violating the safe zone would be subject to the NATO air strikes, including weaponry of the government. We also have made it clear to the government that they should not look to us to change the military balance on the ground, and that there has to be a negotiated settlement. We have said that to the government, just as the Russians have said that to the Bosnian Serbs. And we intend to undertake a very intense effort to restore diplomatic negotiations.

Now, having said that, I do not favor lifting the sanctions while that is going on for the very simple reason that the United States supported and recognized Serbia when it became an independent country, Croatia, and Bosnia. The United Nations decided to keep the arms embargo on all of the former Yugoslavia. But the arms embargo was a mockery in Bosnia because Serbia was next to the area occupied by the Bosnian Serbs. And as you know, Yugoslavia was a great manufacturer, even an exporter, of arms before it broke up. So the necessary effect of the arms embargo was to give an enormous strategic advantage to the Serbs in heavy weaponry, to facilitate ethnic cleansing when we were trying to support a peaceful solution that would enable all the people of Bosnia, the Serbs, the Croats, and the Muslims, to live together.

So I could not support lifting the embargo. But I agree with you to the extent that there cannot be a military victory here. There must be a negotiated settlement. That is why I thought it was a mistake for the Serbs to press their advantage around Gorazde. We only seek to use NATO air power to protect safe areas, to keep the Brcko area stable, to stop this fighting on the ground. Let's go back to the negotiations. Let's make a peace so that we can all return to normal peaceful relations. I want that, and I want that with Serbia as well. But we have to do it in the right and moral way.

[A participant from Sarajevo asked if delay in articulating a policy on Bosnia had aided the Bosnian Serbs and if the policy flip-flops

would encourage North Korea, for example, to take the United States less seriously.]

The President. No, but speeches like that may make them take me less seriously than I'd like to be taken. There have been no constant flip-flops, madam. I ran for President saying that I would do my best to limit ethnic cleansing and to see the United States play a more active role in resolving the problem in Bosnia. And we have been much more active than my predecessor was in every way from the beginning. I also said very clearly that I did not believe we should inject American ground forces on the ground in Bosnia to try to affect the strategic outcome, to take part in the civil war.

When I became President, I argued to our European allies that we ought to lift the arms embargo, or at least be caught trying, in the United Nations because of the unfairness of the situation on the ground. They argued back to me that they were on the ground as part of the U.N. peacekeeping force and that if we lifted the arms embargo, we would lengthen the war, make it more bloody, and subject their people to being shot or taken as hostages. So, we could not prevail.

I then worked to get NATO, for the first time in its history, to agree to an out-of-area operation, which we did in August. We have enforced a no-fly zone. We have had the longest humanitarian air lift in history. We have succeeded, because of the NATO air power, I believe, in getting a lot of the lines of communications for humanitarian aid open again there, and of course, the safe zone around Sarajevo and elsewhere. I wish it could have been done overnight, but fundamentally, Bosnia is in the—its in the American interest to limit the conflict to Bosnia, to try to restore humanitarian conditions, to see that a bad example is not set, and to limit the refugee outflow. Those are the things we are trying to do.

We have troops in Macedonia. We have used our air power. We have pushed NATO. And we have pushed the United Nations. But I don't think you can say that the world community could have intervened and changed the course of this war or should have intervened on one side or the other. What we need to do is to stop the conflict from spreading, which I think has been done, try to stop

the military escalation within Bosnia, which I think has been done, and then get the parties back to negotiate a decent peace.

I believe that was, as a practical matter, the only option open to me after I became President, and I have worked very hard on it for a year. I do not believe I should have injected American ground forces there into the conflict. We, after all, had at the time I became President several thousand forces in Somalia. We have obligations in Korea and in other places in Asia. We have obligations potentially in the Middle East because of the work we are doing there. And the United States has done the best it could.

I think we have done a very great deal. Do I wish we could have done more earlier? Do I wish the Europeans and our other allies had totally agreed with me? Of course I do. But I also respect their differences and their long experience in this area. I did the best I could. I moved as quickly as I could. I think we have shown a good deal of resolve. And I think what this Bosnian situation shows is that if you can get NATO agreement to act with resolve, NATO can have an impact.

I will still say in the end we have to resolve this through negotiations. Air power cannot change the course of the civil war either. They're going to have to negotiate a peace. What we're going to try to do is to make it less bloody and less productive to pursue aggression, so that the parties will want to go back to the peace table.

Ms. Woodruff. Mr. President, just a quick followup. Would you not acknowledge that given what you said during the campaign about it being time to end Serb aggression, that it is much easier to make these statements in a campaign than actually to carry them out as President?

The President. Well, what I will acknowledge is that I underestimated the difficulty of putting a coalition together, all agreeing on one policy. And that—her question to me was right if she were to ask me, do I think it took too long for all of us to get together? Yes, I do. But we worked at it very hard from the beginning. I don't think it's fair to say we've gone back and forth. We tried one area; it didn't work; we try another.

There were people who said to me, "Don't get involved in Bosnia. Leave it alone. Let

it go. It's a sinkhole. You can have no influence. Walk away from it. If you try to do something, you can't dominate it; you'll just be attacked for that." I thought that was bad advice. The United States sometimes has to try to make a difference where it cannot control events but can influence them. That is the situation with Bosnia. We are not in control; we have some influence, we're doing our best to exercise it, and I think we're better off.

I think during the campaign, when I made it clear that I didn't think we could or should send ground forces in unless there was an agreement, I underestimated the difficulty of getting broad agreement through NATO and then getting the U.N. to use the NATO force. I did underestimate that. It took longer than I wish it had. But if you think about what an unprecedented action NATO has taken, the first time we have ever acted together out of the NATO area, I think still it's something that's remarkable and very much worth doing.

Poland and NATO

[A participant from Poland asked about the denial of NATO membership to Poland.]

The President. First of all, I fully expect NATO to be expanded eastward. At the time we formed the Partnership For Peace and asked Poland to participate, which it agreed to do, along with Hungary, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, all the former Warsaw Pact countries, Ukraine, all the former republics of the Soviet Union, there was at that time no consensus within NATO about which countries to take in, in what order, and what the obligations of NATO membership would be for a new country coming in. So it wasn't, with all respect, in response to Russian pressure that no membership was offered to Poland or any other country last summer.

What I argued for in the Partnership For Peace was the beginning of joint planning, joint maneuvers, joint operations with military cooperation with any country that wanted to join the Partnership For Peace, including, I acknowledged Russia if they wished to join. Because I thought at the end of the cold war, we had a chance which we ought to take, a chance to see Europe united for the first time since nation states began to dot

the European continent—a chance. And it seemed to me that the Partnership For Peace offered us the best of both worlds. That is, if everyone would agree to observe and respect their neighbors territorially and to see their neighbors' territory as integral to their own security, then we might succeed.

If, in fact, imperialist tensions in Russia reasserted themselves, then we could always, by planning for NATO, take in other countries into NATO membership at an appropriate time without any risk to their security whatever. That is my hope and goal.

If you're asking me, the big question is, does the United States have an interest in the security of the people of Poland and Hungary and Central Europe and Eastern Europe? The answer to that is yes. But don't assume that NATO has walked away from Poland. NATO is walking toward Poland, not away.

Middle East

[An Israeli journalist asked what evidence the President had of a strategic change on the part of President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria regarding peace with Israel and regarding terrorism.]

The President. The evidence I find is that he has welcomed a very frank and candid and explicit exchange of views and ideas about how to make a lasting peace and achieve normal and peaceful relationships with Israel.

Secretary Christopher has been asked by President Asad, and approved by Prime Minister Rabin, to serve as an intermediary at this point in having what I believe are the most serious conversations ever held since the creation of this terrible divide between Israel and Syria, between a leader of Syria and a leader of Israel.

I have had several conversations with President Asad and of course with Prime Minister Rabin, with whom I talked just this afternoon about the ongoing progress of Middle East peace negotiations. And all I can tell you is that all of us believe that we have a greater chance to achieve a breakthrough agreement than ever before. And obviously, that breakthrough agreement ultimately would have to include an agreement with Lebanon recognizing the territorial integrity

of Lebanon and excising terrorism from Lebanon. And I believe we are on that road, and we have a real chance to make progress this year.

Obviously, since their conversations are private, I can't say more. But all I can tell you is I honestly believe that, and I think the other major actors in this drama believe it as well.

Ms. Woodruff. Mr. President, I've just been told that just in the first few minutes that a Palestinian delegate, PLO delegate, has announced in the Middle East that the Israelis and the PLO have wound up their talks, and they have reached an agreement on Palestinian autonomy, which was something you referred to just a few moments ago.

We want to go—continue in our Jerusalem location now with a question from a Palestinian journalist.

Go ahead.

[A Palestinian journalist in Jerusalem asked about loans and loan guarantees for Palestinians.]

The President. Well, first, let me say, I agree it will take more than \$2 billion to totally construct a successful economy on the West Bank and around Jericho and in other places—in Gaza and Jericho, excuse me. But I think the \$2 billion is a very good start. That's what we might call real money. I mean, it's a pretty good beginning.

And let me say, in anticipation of—I've not checked this today, but I asked if we could have in Cairo, when the agreement is signed between the PLO and Israel, a delegation of American business people, American Jews and Arab-American business people who have pledged themselves to work together to bring private capital and private investment in to support the other commitments that the governments have made at the donors conference.

So, I believe you can look forward to a significant increase in private investment from the United States from both Arab-Americans and Jewish-American business people in these areas because of their common determination to work together to see that you are able to work and live together.

Japan

[A television correspondent from Japan asked about U.S. requirements for continuation of trade negotiations with Japan.]

The President. Well, let me answer the first question first, the “what.” If you go back to the agreement I made on my trip to Japan as part of the G-7 conference last summer with the then-Prime Minister Miyazawa and the conversations I had with Prime Minister Hosokawa and with your new Prime Minister, Mr. Hata, when he was in his previous position, what we wish to do is to simply continue to make progress within the framework of the agreement that Japan and the United States both made last summer.

The big hangup is over the question of the use of numerical targets, and does this amount to managed trade, does this amount to quotas. I want to emphasize, if I might, two things: Number one, I have never asked for any access to the Japanese market for the United States that I have not sought for every other country. It would be wrong. I have not asked for that. Number two, I have pledged my efforts to ensure that the use of numerical quotas would not be used—or numerical targets would not be used to establish trade quotas or managed trade for the Japanese people. I know that we cannot require your people to buy products they do not wish to buy, or we cannot overcome price or quality problems our products or services might have.

On the other hand, the Japanese Government, both when Prime Minister Miyazawa was in office and when Prime Minister Hosokawa was in office, always agreed that Japan needed a more open trading policy, that your consumers were paying 37 percent more for consumer goods than they would pay in a more open economy, that it was in your long-term interest not to have a permanent trade surplus, not just with us but with the world, of over \$100 billion a year.

So we have to know, are we making progress or not? The only reason we wanted to use numbers was because that will show some aggregate worldwide trend. I do not want you to promise the United States any specific part of your markets. And I think

if we can overcome that misunderstanding, we can begin again.

As to when it happens, I think that depends in part on how things go with your attempt to develop a new government and new policies. You have a new Prime Minister now. I hope he can work out arrangements so that we can resume this dialog. I must say I have a very high regard for all three of the Japanese Prime Ministers with whom I have worked. And I believe we can work this out.

I also think I should say—I don’t mean to abuse your time, sir—but for the benefit of the whole rest of the world who look to the United States and to Japan for leadership, I think sometimes people are worried about our relationship because they think we’re fighting over trade too much. We are basically not only partners but friends. We share common strategic interests, we share common political values, and we share common economic interests. We will not allow, we must not allow these differences which reflect a mature discussion and debate to spoil the relationship that I think is so important for the whole world.

China

[Following a commercial break, a journalist from China asked about U.S. relations and trade with China.]

The President. Let me answer the second question first, and then I’ll answer the first question. Yes, I believe if we were to withdraw most-favored-nation status from China it would undermine what I hope to see in terms of our relationship, and it would be detrimental to the economic progress in China and to the standard of living which has come to so many millions, indeed, hundreds of millions of Chinese people. So I do not wish that to happen.

As you know, relationships between our two countries became very strong again, after a period of difficulty, starting in 1972 with President Nixon’s trip and then in 1979 with President Carter’s actions to recognize China and all the things which have come after that. Then there was a great strain on our relationship after the difficulties in 1989 in China at Tiananmen Square.

What I have sought to do is to find a balanced way for our two countries not simply to be partners but to restore our genuine friendship, which is very much in the interest of the whole world as well as our two people, by trying to establish conditions that would permit that partnership and that friendship to go forward. Those are the criterion I set forward in order to continue the most-favored-nation status next month.

I do not seek nor would it be proper for the United States or for any other nation to tell a great nation like China how to conduct all its internal affairs or to treat all its citizens or what laws it should have. That would be wrong.

The criteria in the Executive order I issued are those things recognized in all universal declarations by all countries as essential to human rights. I will say we have made real progress in our relations with China on the immigration issue, on getting a prison labor agreement, in many other areas. As you know, Wang Jontao was released last week. There has been some progress there, too, in the area of political dissidents and human rights.

We still have a way to go. And I told Vice Premier Zou that I would work personally very hard and that our Government would work very hard in the next month to try to work out our differences so that we could go forward together. I think that is in your interest and ours and in the world's interest. But human rights is very important to the United States. And there are some issues that I believe the United States has perhaps an extra responsibility to stand up for, human rights, nonproliferation, other things that if we didn't do it, it would be even more difficult for other countries to do.

So I'm doing what I think we must do, but I am doing it in the spirit of genuine reconciliation and hope that in the next month our two great nations can work this out.

Thank you.

Ms. Woodruff. Mr. President, is most-favored-nation trading status, just to be clear about this, is it seriously in jeopardy of being withdrawn from the Chinese?

The President. Well, under the present—under the present facts, China has made significant overall progress in several of the

areas outlined in my Executive order of last year, but not in all of them. There are still areas in which we are different. And that is obviously clearly an option on the table. Yes, it is a possibility. But he asked me the question, would it be a bad thing for China and would it be consistent with the relationship I hope we have with them. And the answer is, yes, it would be a bad thing; and, no, it's not consistent with the relationship I hope we have. But we have to keep working to get over these last humps. And I hope and pray that we will in the next month.

Somalia

[A journalist from Uganda asked about lessons learned in Somalia and their applicability elsewhere.]

The President. That, sir, is a brilliant question. I mean, it is the question of the day in Africa and in some other places.

Let me say, first of all, thank you for acknowledging the work of the Americans and the others there. While we are gone, there are still several thousand United Nations forces in Somalia from all around the world working to continue to save lives.

What lessons did we learn? First of all, I think we learned that it is very difficult to have the forces of the United Nations and certainly the forces of the United States go in for any prolonged period of time and say that this is only a humanitarian crisis. In other words, the people of Somalia were starving and dying not because they couldn't grow food but because of the political and military conflicts within the country, not because no one would send them food but because it was hard to deliver before we went there.

So I think we learned—lesson number one is, don't go into one of these things and say, as the United States said when we started in Somalia, "Maybe we'll be done in a month, because it's a humanitarian crisis," because there are almost always political problems and sometimes military conflicts which bring about these crises.

Lesson number two is that when the United States handed over its mission to the United Nations, it was quite appropriate for there to be someone who would take action, mili-

tary action if necessary, to protect the lives of the United States and the United Nations troops there. But the United States in its role as a superpower cannot be caught in the position of being a policing officer in a conflict like that when there is not political process going on, because what happened was the police operation—which was a legitimate one, that is, to protect the lives of the soldiers who were there trying to save the lives of the Somalis—became viewed as a way of choosing sides in the internal conflict of the country because there was no political dialog going on.

So I think those are the two great lessons. If we're going to go in and try to save lives, we must know that in the beginning, everyone will be glad to see the U.S. or the U.N. or anybody because they're starving and dying. But after a certain amount of time, it will be obvious that it wasn't just a natural disaster. It was a political problem, a military problem.

And secondly, we must never give up the political dialog, then, so that everyone in the country know that we are there, all of us, to make peace and be peacemakers. Yes, we will fight to protect the lives of our people, but not to try to solve your problems for you. Those are the two lessons, I think.

Rwanda

Q. Can these lessons be used to save lives in a similar situation now in Rwanda?

The President. Well, perhaps. We're looking at that with the states that border Rwanda. We released another \$15 billion today for aid. And we have to provide more aid; we have to try to deal with the refugee problem; we have to try to get a political process going again; and we have to try to marshal the resources, it seems to me, of nations all around the world who care very deeply about this. I think the conscience of the world has grieved for the slaughter in Rwanda and just a few months ago in Burundi in almost the same proportions.

But we also know from not only the Somali experience but from what we read of the conflict between the Hutus and the Tutsis that there is a political and military element in this. So I think we can take the lessons we

learned and perhaps do a better job there over a longer period of time and perhaps head off the starvation and do those things which need to be done. I hope so.

Aid to Africa

[A Nigerian television correspondent in Johannesburg, South Africa, asked why aid to Africa had declined.]

The President. The search for clients rather than friends? No, it is true that there has been a reduction in our foreign aid assistance to Africa, going back before I became President but continuing. But the reason for that, sir, is that in the aftermath of the cold war, our Government's deficit was so high we have been cutting almost all kinds of spending.

And foreign assistance has not had a great level of support in our country. It's not that we're looking for clients or we'd rather give the money to someplace else. It is that one of the things that I still have to do as President is to do a better job of persuading the American people that we have an interest, long-term interest in the success of South Africa and in the success of Nigeria and all points in between, that we have a long-term interest that requires us to invest modest amounts of our great treasure in foreign assistance so that we can be in a more secure world, a more peaceful world, and that the American people actually benefit from it.

In our country, many of our people think we spend much more money than we do on foreign assistance, and they say we have problems at home we should deal with. But that's what caused the decline in assistance. There has been no discrimination against Africa in my judgment, although I think we don't emphasize Africa enough and we should do more.

[CNN correspondent Bernard Shaw in Johannesburg asked if other nations would feel slighted if aid to South Africa is increased.]

The President. I think other nations may feel slighted. But I think if you look at the potential of the government of national unity, Mr. Mandela, after all, has committed himself to a government of national unity for 5 years involving Mr. de Klerk and his supporters and presumably Mr. Buthelezi and the

Inkatha supporters. We haven't gotten the final numbers yet, but I think that will be the case.

And if we can help to restore South Africa's economy in a multiracial environment—after all, we had a billion dollars in trade this year; just 10 years ago we had \$10 billion in trade with South Africa in the U.S. alone. And South Africa can be a beacon of economic development and prosperity for all of southern Africa, can help to build interest in American and other business people in investing in all of southern Africa and can help to build a constituency for expanded assistance throughout Africa.

So I think that this is an opportunity which in the short run benefits South Africa, but has the capacity in the near term to be of immense benefit to Africa. And it's not as if we could double aid to someplace else if we didn't do this. There is no possibility. So I think this is an enormous opportunity. We should seize it and use it to build a broader and deeper relationship with the rest of Africa.

Latin America

[A journalist from Brazil asked about leftist presidential candidates in Brazil and Mexico.]

The President. Well, we are ready to do business with the democratically chosen leaders of any nations who are willing to deal with us on honorable terms consistent with international law. And we are certainly ready to do business there. Let me say that—you may know that my Secretary of Commerce has identified 10 nations which he estimates will be growing rapidly and will provide great economic opportunities for the United States in the years ahead. Both Brazil and Mexico are on that list.

And we know that if people govern with an eye toward the interest of their people, they can govern well coming from a wide range of democratic parties. If you look next door in Argentina, when President Menem was elected, coming out of the Peronist legacy, people said, "Oh, my goodness, what will this Menem do?" Well, he got the economy straightened out, he opened up the economy to trade, he maintained a strict adherence and support to democratic principles, and

he's largely been quite successful by bringing the sort of left and center together, if you will.

So whatever decision the people of Brazil make is fine with me as long as we can have that kind of working relationship when the election is over.

Q. Do you believe that if that happens, these two countries will be on that list?

The President. It depends entirely, sir, on what policies are pursued. They still have to be committed to growing the economy, to participating in a market economy, and to giving their people a chance to compete and win in the global economy. If they do that, they can be. It depends on what you do with power once you get it, not so much what the name is, what your label is when you come to power but what do you do after you assume office.

Cuba

[A Cuban television correspondent questioned U.S. policy toward Cuba, saying that it could not be only for the sake of Florida voters.]

The President. Well, but I didn't win in Florida, so you can't hold me—[laughter]

Q. I know. I know.

The President. I mean, I like them very much, but I didn't win there. [Laughter]

I do support, however, the Cuban Democracy Act, which reinforces the blockade but also calls for greater communications contact and greater humanitarian aid to Cuba.

I think, in much the way I answered some of the previous questions, that the isolation of Cuba is largely the result of the policies of Cuba and the history of 30 years. I mean, just recently, just in the last few days, someone in Cuba was sentenced to several years in prison for simply talking to a foreign journalist.

And maybe we do have higher standards for Cuba because we have a large Cuban-American population and because Cuba is close to our borders, even though there's no longer any prospect of Russian missiles there, but that is our policy. And Cuba continues to stand in isolation to the democratic wind which has swept through every country in the Caribbean and South and Central America and even through Haiti. Even though the

Haitian President was ousted, he was at least elected.

And I think that Mr. Castro has it within his own power to change the nature of the relationships between our two countries by moving toward a more open and democratic system. And that is up to him to do. And our country, meanwhile, has simply reaffirmed its policy in 1992 with the passage of the Cuban Democracy Act. And I don't expect that policy to change anytime soon.

Antidrug Policy

[A journalist from Colombia asked about antidrug policy in the United States and Colombia.]

The President. Well, let me answer the question slightly differently. It is true that we believe, more strongly than we have in the past, that the drug problem in America is a problem of demand as well as supply. That is, we have about 5 percent of the world's population—actually, a little less. We consume about half the world's illegal drugs. Now, part of that is because we have a good deal of money, but we have only 22 percent of the world's wealth, and we consume half the world's drugs. So, obviously, we want drugs more than some other places.

There are things unique to the United States, that we cannot blame on Colombia or Mexico or anyplace else, that we have to deal with. So we have invested a lot more money in this budget in drug education and drug prevention and drug treatment—in dealing with the problem—and in enforcement here on our own streets.

There are two other things that we should focus on. One is, can you stop the drugs in transit? That has been a big emphasis of the U.S. Government in the past, getting drugs coming into the air into our country or at the borders. The other is, can we help countries deal with drugs at the source, moving farmers into other products, helping deal with the drug cartels in their own countries.

It is true that we have reduced the former, that is, we have reduced emphasis on stopping drugs in transit. But we want to increase our efforts to work with you in Colombia and other countries to stop drugs at the source. We want to do more with you if you are willing to take the steps necessary to deal with

it. And of course, I have seen your country's legitimately elected judges and prosecutors and political leaders who have taken on the drug problem, have done it at terrible risks. Many of them have been murdered; all of them have put their lives at risk.

And I understand that when the United States says to Colombia, we're not satisfied with the efforts you're making, it's a little hard to take sometimes because of the terrible risks that are associated with taking it on. All I can tell you is that we will do more to help stop the drug problem in the countries where the drugs are produced or processed if the governments are willing to work with us. That is our commitment, and we will do more.

It seems to us we can be more efficient by emphasizing the source countries and reducing demand in our country, even if we have to spend a little less in trying to stop the drugs in transit.

Foreign Policy

[A participant from Finland said that although the President was elected for his domestic policy, he has received more criticism on foreign policy issues.]

The President. I'm used to it—[laughter]

Q. Do you feel you have received unfair criticism on your foreign policy?

The President. Oh, I don't know. I wouldn't say that, in the sense that in our country, at least, there's a great tradition of freedom of the press. And part of the job of the press is to criticize whoever's in power. [Laughter] I mean, that's part of the job, to pick out the things that are going wrong.

I think what I would say is that we have had a lot of successes that perhaps have not been as noticed as they should have been, some of which I mentioned earlier tonight, and secondly, that the problems that we have had are a result of very difficult issues which do not have an easy solution. I just would mention two, very briefly, we've already talked about.

The first is Haiti. Two-thirds of the people voted for Aristide. Enormous numbers of people participated in democracy. He's kicked out. The military leaders promised to leave; they don't. But we want to be good neighbors. We don't want to be the big bully

going around using our power in a destructive way. How do you solve that?

The other is Bosnia, where I do not believe we should have intervened in the war on one side or the other, but I do believe we have an interest in trying to work with Europe. And working with Europe meant in this case working both with the U.N. and with NATO in areas sort of unfamiliar to each, and certainly working together was unfamiliar. So it took longer and it was more ragged and more frustrating than I wish it had been. But that is part of the reality of the post-cold-war world, when we're all searching for new arrangements that work.

I don't mind being criticized, but I do think it's not fair to say that we have been unprincipled or vacillating. That's just not true. We have been quite clear, and we've tried to work through these problems, but not all problems have easy solutions.

Ms. Woodruff. Do you think you underestimated, Mr. President, the complexity of some of these issues?

The President. I saw an interview the other day with President Kennedy, about a year before he was assassinated, and they asked him what he had learned as President. And he said, "The problems were more difficult than I imagined them to be." [*Laughter*] And at least on the international front, I would say, the problems are more difficult than I imagined them to be.

Ms. Woodruff. Do you think you've had the right foreign policy team to help you tackle them?

The President. Yes, I think they're quite up to the job, it's just that they're plowing new ground. We could have gotten less criticism in a way if we had just said, "This problem and this problem, this problem, don't involve our vital interests; therefore we will not commit our prestige or our efforts." But President Roosevelt once said he'd rather be part of a government that made a few mistakes in the cause of activism than be part of one that was frozen in the ice of its own indifference. I do not believe we can afford

to be indifferent. But as we venture out in these new areas, we have to risk error. And so I have been willing to risk error. And when you do that, you get more criticism.

Ms. Woodruff. And when you're accused of vacillating, it doesn't bother you, right?

The President. Oh, sometimes it really bothers me. [*Laughter*] But I think, first of all, all leaders sometimes have had to back and fill and alter their course throughout history. But there is no vacillation in the principles of the policies here. It's just that we don't know what will work within the limits of our ability to deal with some of these problems.

Not every issue is one that you can put the entire wealth, the entire military might, the entire prestige of the United States on the line for. But many issues are things that are worthy of our best efforts within the limits of our ability to proceed. And that is where all these gray areas are, the areas of frustration, particularly for the people who are on the receiving end of the problems. I didn't—I was waiting for my lecture from Sarajevo tonight, and I rather enjoyed it because that poor woman has seen the horrors of this war and she has had to report on them.

Ms. Woodruff. Christiane Amanpour [CNN].

The President. Yes, she's been fabulous. She's done a great service for the whole world on that. I do not blame her for being mad at me, but I'm doing the best I can with this problem from my perspective. I didn't know—I would have to look at her, now blush—[*laughter*]. Anyway, go ahead.

Ms. Woodruff. That's a good note to end on. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you very much all of you. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 7 p.m. in the Cecil B. Day Chapel at the Carter Center. In his remarks, the President referred to Tom Johnson, president, and Ted Turner, owner and founder, Cable News Network. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Memorandum on the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act

May 3, 1994

Presidential Determination No. 94-23

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Determination Pursuant to Section 2(c)(1) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as Amended

Pursuant to section 2(c)(1) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2601(c)(1), I hereby determine that it is important to the national interest that up to \$5,000,000 be made available from the U.S. Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund to meet the urgent and unexpected needs of Rwandan and Burundi refugees, returnees, displaced persons, and conflict victims. These funds may be contributed to international, governmental, and non-governmental organizations, as appropriate.

You are authorized and directed to inform the appropriate committees of the Congress of this determination and the obligation of funds under this authority and to publish this memorandum in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of this memorandum.

Letter to the Speaker of the House on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

May 3, 1994

Dear Mr. Speaker:

On April 15, the United States and more than one hundred other nations signed the Uruguay Round agreement in Marrakesh, Morocco. It is the broadest, most comprehensive trade agreement in history.

For half a century, the United States has led the global effort to reduce trade barriers and expand trade. The Uruguay Round, which is scheduled to enter into force on January 1, 1995, represents the most important step in that effort.

This agreement will create hundreds of thousands of American jobs and new eco-

nomie opportunities at home. Moreover, it will allow American workers and businesses to compete in a freer, fairer, and more effective global trading system that lays the foundation for prosperity into the next century.

I intend to transmit legislation to implement the Uruguay Round and am committed to seeking bipartisan support for its passage this year.

The attached booklet describes the Uruguay Round's benefit to American workers and firms. I look forward to working with you in the months ahead to implement this important agreement.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

Statement by the Press Secretary on United States Counterintelligence Effectiveness

May 3, 1994

President Clinton signed today a Presidential Decision Directive on U.S. counterintelligence effectiveness to foster increased cooperation, coordination, and accountability among all U.S. counterintelligence agencies. The President has directed the creation of a new national counterintelligence policy structure under the auspices of the National Security Council. In addition, he has directed the creation of a new National Counterintelligence Center, initially to be led by a senior executive of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Finally, the President's Decision Directive requires that exchange of senior managers between the CIA and the FBI to ensure timely and close coordination between the intelligence and law enforcement communities.

The President's decision to take these significant steps of restructuring U.S. counterintelligence policy and interagency coordination, followed a Presidential review of U.S. counterintelligence in the wake of the Aldrich Ames espionage investigation. The President, in issuing this Directive, has taken immediate steps to improve our ability to counter both traditional and new threats to our Nation's security in the post-cold-war era.

**Nomination for Chair and
Commissioner of Commodity
Futures Trading Commission**
May 3, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Mary L. Schapiro as Chair and Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC). CFTC is the Federal agency charged with regulation of the Nation's futures markets. The President also announced his intention to nominate Sheila C. Bair to continue in her role as a CFTC Commissioner.

"In her years as a Commissioner with the SEC, Mary Schapiro has contributed an intelligent and experienced voice to the matters that have come before this important board. I look forward to her taking on this new challenge as CFTC Chairman," the President said.

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

**Proclamation 6682—Public Service
Recognition Week, 1994**
May 3, 1994

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

At a time when Government is confronting the challenge of serving the public more efficiently and effectively than ever while facing substantial resource constraints, it is especially fitting to recognize the dedication of our Nation's public employees. The Federal Government, in its efforts to work better and cost less, has often found inspiration in the creative innovations initiated by State and local government employees. Moreover, the new spirit of partnership between labor and management in the public sector has reduced the time and money wasted in unproductive adversarial proceedings so that more attention can be devoted to improving the services provided to the public.

Americans at all levels of government have made a significant difference in the lives of their fellow citizens, and it is most appropriate that we set aside this week to honor

them. Public employees educate our children, administer programs to aid needy citizens, conduct biomedical research, help protect the environment, ensure the safety of our food supply, maintain our transportation networks, provide for the common defense, and enforce the Constitution and laws of the United States. These devoted women and men bring enormous talent, knowledge, and integrity to their work.

In recognition of the achievements of government employees, the Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 150, has designated the week of May 2, 1994, through May 8, 1994, as "Public Service Recognition Week" and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation calling for observance of this week.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week of May 2, 1994, through May 8, 1994, as Public Service Recognition Week. I urge the people of the United States to participate in appropriate ceremonies and activities to recognize the vital contributions of employees of Federal, State, and local government. I also encourage young Americans to learn more about the work done by public employees and to consider careers in public service.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:01 p.m., May 4, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 4, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on May 6.

**Remarks Honoring the Small
Business Person of the Year**
May 4, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, and welcome to the White House. Ladies and gentlemen, you have just seen an example of Clinton's first law of politics: whenever

possible, be introduced by someone you've appointed to high office. [Laughter] I say that in good humor. You know, when I met Erskine Bowles in 1992 when I was out running for President, and our wives had gone to college together and had known each other many, many years ago, and his wonderful wife was and still is one of the most successful textile executives in the United States. And I talked to him about what he had done over the last 20 years: starting small businesses, helping them to expand, helping them to get involved in trade, I thought to myself, you know, this is the sort of person that ought to be head of the SBA, somebody that actually made a living helping other people with their small businesses, someone that actually knew something about it and had some idea of what the practical realities of daily life were like, somebody that would be recognized by people without regard to their political party. This ought not to be a political agency. It ought to be an agency committed to the economic interest and the advancements of the Small Business Administration. And at the time, of course, I had no way of knowing whether I'd even be nominated, much less elected, or whether he would ever be willing to leave his good life in North Carolina and come up here and do this. But I want to tell you that I think he's been one of the best appointments I've made as President. And I think he's made a difference in the small business community. And I think we have set a standard that I hope future administrations will follow of not politicizing the SBA but instead appointing someone who actually knows what it's like to start up, finance, expand, and deal with the problems and the challenges of small business in America today. And I want to thank him for that.

Today is a happy day, not just for Erskine but for me because we get to honor the national Small Business Person of the Year and the second and first runners-up. We all know that those of you who will be recognized today as winners and those who have won in each of their States really represent people just like you, thousands, indeed, millions of people all across America. Nonetheless, it's a very happy thing to do.

Let me begin by saying what I guess political leaders always say, but something that's

increasingly true in this country, and that is that the small business economy is critically important to the future of America. You have only to look at just what's gone on in the last 15 months, where we have seen a dramatic expansion of new jobs in America. In the first 14 months of this administration there were 2.5 million new jobs created, which were together more than in the previous 4 years. And 2.3 million of those jobs were in the private sector, which is more than twice as many private sector jobs as in the previous 4 years. But big companies in America, in large numbers, continued to downsize, which means that in the small business sector, in the new and growing and entrepreneurial sector of our economy, even more jobs were created.

And if you look at the way the world is going, where jobs are being created more and more and more in cutting edge technologies, and opportunities are more and more and more in the refinement of certain products and services, if you try to imagine what the world will be like 10 years from now or 15 years from now, it is impossible to draw any conclusion other than that if we're going to continue to be the engine of job growth in this country and for the world, it will have to come through small business people.

It's an exciting prospect, but it means that we have to reorient a lot of our thinking toward what would be necessary to try to support small business as the primary engine of new job creation. A lot of the big things that we do in Government, which make a difference for all business, obviously help small business.

Last year, we had the biggest deficit reduction package in history, \$500 billion. It helped to drive interest rates down; it helped to trigger home-building and automobile buying and a lot of other things that got this economy going again.

This year, the Congress is dealing with a budget that I gave them which does some very interesting things I want to talk to you about. It eliminates outright 100 Government programs; it cuts over 200 others. If adopted as it is, it not only continues to reduce defense—and I want to say a little more about that in a minute and just ask you for

a little help—but it not only continues to reduce defense, but for the first time since 1969 it would have our Government reducing aggregate domestic discretionary spending for the first time in 25 years.

And we do it while we actually increase funding for Head Start, for nutritional programs for poor children, for new technologies for the 21st century, for defense conversion efforts, and for worker training, because we cut out so much other stuff. And if it's adopted, it will give us a budget, which for the first time since Harry Truman was President, in the aftermath of the Second World War, when it had to happen just naturally—when the Government has reduced its deficit 3 years in a row. And the United States will have a deficit that as a percentage of our annual income is smaller than that of any major industrial country in the world, which is a huge sea change from the last several years. And it will begin to give us some control over our financial destiny and the future of the little children that are in this audience today.

I say that because I want to emphasize that it's important that this budget pass. It's also important that we not posture with it at the end. Last night—I don't know—no reason that any of you necessarily would have seen it, but I did an hour-and-a-half press conference on CNN with people from all over the world. There were people from 200 countries and territories watching that press conference, looking to us for leadership. And what I tried to do was to explain what I thought we had to do in leading the world and what we obviously could not do, because we can't do everything; we can't afford to do everything. There are a lot of problems out there in the world that do not affect our vital interests. And even though our values are aghast at some things that happen, we can't do all this. On the other hand, there is a limit to how much we cut our national defense and still protect the security of America and the vital interests of America.

And I tell you that I think we have reached that limit. We have cut defense all we can. I imagine most people in this room and most people back home in your civic clubs and your churches and synagogues and other places think we ought to do more to bring

this Government spending down and like the fact that we're reducing the deficit. But I also would ask for your support for a reasonable defense budget. We, after all, still have—there are no nuclear missiles pointed at us from the Soviet Union, but there are other countries trying to develop nuclear programs. And we have to maintain our commitments in Asia and in Europe.

So I would ask you to support what we're doing to bring the deficit down; but say, look, there is a limit; we do have a national defense; we do have obligations here. And we do have to retrain workers, and we do have to help move these technologies from defense to commercial technologies. So we need to spend some money on that.

Secondly, let me say, there's some things that are specific to the SBA I want to emphasize. Since Erskine Bowles has been the Director of the SBA, we've increased our lending program by \$3 billion, and they've introduced a one-page application that takes 2 days to process. That alone was worth me appointing him, wasn't it? *[Laughter]*

I also want to say a word about this health care debate which is going on in Washington which is doubtless not only important to you but occasionally must be somewhat confusing because it's an extremely complex subject. First, let me say that people say, "Well, Clinton's bill's 13 hundred pages long; nothing that complicated should ever be passed by Congress by definition. They'd mess up a one-car parade." I've heard it many times.

You should know that if that bill passed in its entirety, it would replace even more pages of Federal law now in existence, that is, that a lot of this so-called complexity deals with issues not of direct concern to you but of indirect concern to you like, well, how are we going to deal with the major medical schools; and how are they going to get their funding; and what about the public health clinics of the country; what about the people that live way out there in rural areas who have no access to health care unless there's not a clinic?

But fundamentally, when I asked Erskine Bowles to come into this debate early, and I said, "Look, the biggest bone of contention to providing health coverage for all Americans will be what are the obligations directly

or indirectly of small business, because that's where the problems in affording coverage are. So make sure we design something that provides enough protection for small business so that we continue to grow jobs, not shrink jobs." It's also true that the biggest problems in health care come to small business, paying on average 35 percent more for health care premiums than larger businesses do, and being subject to a lot of problems of—my wife and I have a friend that she grew up with, and she and her husband and their children have become great friends of ours over the last 20 years. He only has four employees in his small business. And he provides coverage for all of them. And one of these young men, has been with him a long time, has a child with Down's syndrome. And this fellow—it's time really for him to move on and to broaden his horizons and to do something else in his life, and he simply can't do it because no other business can afford to hire him because he's had a sick child under the present system.

The reason the system is so complicated in America is that we're the only country that has a financing system organized around 1,500 separate insurance companies, writing thousands of different policies with different coverages, all in fairly—many of them in fairly small pools. And at the same time we have two Government programs, Medicare and Medicaid, one for the poor, one for the elderly and disabled, that have different coverages, so that the whole mechanism of financing requires massive numbers of people to figure out when you're not covered or what is not covered. And furthermore, to be fair to the people in the insurance business—we're not talking about bad people here, we're talking a system that's broken, to be fair to the people in the insurance business—requires them to charge people more or have higher deductibles if there's somebody in their family that's been sick in the past, with a so-called preexisting condition or there's a big age differential in workers, because if they insure people in small pools, if there's a couple of hundred people in the pool, one person with AIDS, one kid with a bad diabetes condition, one woman with breast cancer, one man who has a premature heart condition can throw the whole think out of whack

and make it impossible for them to make a profit.

So what we're trying to do up here in the simplest terms is this: Figure out a way to let the forces of competition work, to hold health care costs down, figure out a way to let those things work for small business and self-employed people as well as big business; because what's happening now is, people in big business and Government in the context of this debate have done a good job of slowing down medical inflation, but it still leaves big problems for the small business sector and the self-employed people.

How do we propose to do it? By giving you the chance to be in cooperative buying pools so you can buy on the same terms as big business and government; by providing discounts to small businesses with low margins and low average payrolls on the insurance premiums and by eliminating some of the practices, the discriminatory practices.

Why is that causing a problem? Partly because it will require a substantial reorganization of the health insurance industry and require them to bid on business in much bigger pools, which means a lot of the smaller policies and customs will go away. And that is a problem. And there's no way to resolve that problem if we're going to try to deal with this.

But I just wanted to say to you, without trying to resolve all the specifics, that what we need here is a very reasoned debate in this year in the Congress about how to deal with this problem in a way that enhances the long-term economic security of small businesses instead of undermining it. But if we walk away from it and we don't deal with it, what we'll continue to see is a bigger differential in premiums as more big business and Government have access to managed care and more and more people permanently without insurance, which means they'll show up at the hospital, the emergency room, when the care is too late, too expensive, and they'll shove their cost onto everybody else, and we will all pay it. So the price of doing nothing is also quite high for you. That's the point I want to make. And Erskine has done his best to be a very good advocate.

We also propose in our plan to go to 100-percent deductible for self-employed people,

which would mean a lot of people with very small businesses will actually be able to pay something for their employees and insure their families at lower costs than they're now paying for themselves by the time they buy into a big pool and get the 100-percent deductible. So, we're working on it. And I urge you to work with him because we understand there's no way to solve all these problems, and we're continuing to learn about it every day. But we need a very reasoned debate to face this issue.

Now, let me say, it is my happy responsibility to recognize this year's winners. And I want to talk a little bit about each of them and to congratulate all of you who are here. The second runner-up is Earl Kashiwagi. Stand up. There he is. You'd never guess where's he's from, would you? Earl and his wife, Chris, cut short their honeymoon in 1973 to work on his uncle's produce farm in Kauai. When one uncle became ill, he became manager and began to build a wholesale side of the business. He helped teach farmers how to diversify local crops. He fashioned innovative shipping techniques and created a broad new distribution network. He's beaten the effects of many hurricanes. In 1990 he bought his business, which employs more than 30 people and is the largest produce wholesaler in Kauai with sales exceeding \$4.5 million. He is our second runner-up. Let's give him another hand. [Applause]

I like this, but, you know, I probably should take it off because we can't have all three winners from Hawaii. [Laughter]

Our first runners-up are Francis Voigt and John Dranow. Are they here? Where are they? Stand up. Come on up. They left their chosen fields to begin the New England Culinary Institute in Vermont. Their wives, both poets, were their first support system. However, they later received less poetic, but equally public-spirited support from the SBA. They prepared people for success in the food business through hands-on training and with the lowest teacher-student ratio in the entire Nation. They offer lifelong support and financial aid to their students. They now have a 100-percent placement record. Starting from nothing, they now have 188 employees, 400 students, and revenues of nearly

\$100 million. They are our first runners-up. Give them a hand. [Applause]

After I leave you today, I'm going over to sign the school-to-work bill, something that has immense significance to the small business community. It begins to establish a Federal partnership for a network of training young people who graduate from high school, don't want to go on to 4-year colleges, but do need further training. All of our competitors have much more well-organized systems, particularly the Germans, than we do in providing further training.

One of our first school-to-work trainees, I guess the first one we've been involved in and someone they trained who now works at Blair House, so you want to—come on up, Francis—explain this.

Francis Voigt. She's right out here, Karen Webber. Karen, come on up.

You know, entrepreneurs can't help themselves; we're always looking for opportunities to promote our organization. We just visited the Blair House yesterday to see how our student was doing. The executive chef arranged for her to come by this morning and present a hat to the President.

The President. You all probably know this, but Blair House is the official guest residence for the President. That's where—when foreign leaders come to stay, for example, they all stay in Blair House.

So, are you doing a good job over there? [Laughter]

Karen Webber. Absolutely.

The President. Thank you. You all go over there and stand, and we'll do this.

[Karen Webber presented the hat to the President.]

The President. I'll use this, this weekend. [Laughter]

Our winner is Lorraine Miller from Salt Lake City, the president of Cactus and Tropicals. Come on up here. You stand here while I talk about you.

Lorraine is president of Cactus and Tropicals in Salt Lake City, Utah. She began with just a love of growing plants, half of her \$2,000 life savings, and a dream. She found a boarded-up building, lived above it, and worked 7 days a week. She's overcome reluctant bankers, salesmen who refused to be-

lieve a woman made the decisions, and the loss of her store to eminent domain. One winter, she thawed the frozen ground with briquettes to dig the footings for her greenhouse.

Today, she has 4 greenhouses, 15 employees, over \$1 million in sales, and a business growing at a rate of 20 percent a year. For her job and her persistence and her symbolism of the entrepreneurial spirit of America, Lorraine Miller has been chosen the Small Business Person of the Year.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:44 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building.

Remarks at a Housing and Urban Development Department Crime Briefing

May 4, 1994

Thank you very much, Secretary Cisneros, ladies and gentlemen. I am delighted to see you here, and I know what you've been here talking about.

I just want to make sure that you know when you heard from the Vice President and then Secretary Cisneros, that you were looking at two of People magazine's 50 most beautiful people of the year. [*Laughter*] Some of us resent that. All I can tell you is that I hope to live to see both of them become President of the United States—[*laughter*]—because they would not only be outstanding Presidents, they would quickly lose any eligibility for that title.

I want to thank you for many things; first, for working with Secretary Cisneros and the people of HUD to deal with the problem of safety in public housing. And especially, I want to thank my good friend Vince Lane and the other folks in Chicago who tried to help us work through this court decision so that the people who live in these units would still have the right to be protected from a level of crime and violence that many Americans would find it impossible even to imagine.

I also want to ask you—everyone who is here today and everybody who's associated with public housing and every law enforcement officer who is here and all those whom you represent—to call every Member of

Congress in the next 24 hours and ask them to vote on this assault weapons ban for law enforcement. This is an amazing conflict. It is a conflict that pits, on opposite sides, people that ought not to be on opposite sides.

People who are concerned with law enforcement and public safety and people who know about it and live it are overwhelmingly in favor of this assault weapons ban. They are being told by people who represent the folks who are against this that they really don't understand, that they're not in any more danger from these assault weapons than they would be from a hunting rifle. I find that amazing that any American, after what we have been through on our streets and in our schools in the last few years, could stand up and look into the eyes of the law enforcement community of America and tell them, "You don't know that your life's in more danger." I don't see how they could say it, looking into the statistics of what the emergency rooms of this country have faced in the last 10 or 15 years. If you want to talk about it just crassly, just go back and look at the statistics on gunshot victims outside the home in emergency rooms in major cities in the last 10 years, and look what the average number of bullets you find in the bodies of people who show up are.

And so I understand this is a tough political vote for the House of Representatives, and I know we started way behind. And I know that as late as yesterday, I was still talking through with Members actually what is in the bill. A lot of people didn't know, for example, that the bill grandfathered the possession of these weapons on the part of sportsmen who like to shoot a couple of them at the ranges in contests. Well, they can keep those weapons operating for decades if they take good care of them, literally decades. But people who use them on the street in crimes and gangs, they won't take as good care of them. A lot of them will be washed up; we'll get them out of the system much more quickly. But the people who have them will not lose them now by law.

I still find that we've got—a lot of the problems we've got with this bill are literally making sure that everybody knows everything that's in it. But the big problem is the political fight. And I just would implore you

to call everybody you can. They say we haven't got any chance to win, but they already admit we've made up 50 votes over where we were last time this thing was voted on. And I think we do have a chance if every law enforcement officer who knows every Member of Congress would call those people and say, "This is not a partisan issue. This is a question of law enforcement and safety for Americans and sensible policy. And don't you believe those people who tell you that we don't know what we're talking about. We are on the receiving end of these bullets, and we can count, thank you very much. We do understand the difference between being shot at with a revolver and something with 12 rounds, 15 rounds, 30 rounds, or 60 rounds. We can count."

And I believe if you can make it just that simple, then it is our job to answer all the factual questions that we are being asked by people from rural districts, who in good conscience have to be able to answer these questions to the sportsmen in their districts. We can answer those questions to their satisfaction if you will lay the hammer down and say, this is about standing with law enforcement and children and safety and the future. We are beginning to put some sanity back into our laws, and the American people are beginning to demand that we have greater safety in our homes, on our streets, in our schools.

This crime bill's got a lot of good things in it. It's going to ban possession of all handguns by minors, except under controlled circumstances with approved supervision. It's going to give us the money we need to provide security, metal detectors and other things, in schools. It's going to put more police officers on the street. It's got a lot of good things. But we ought not to walk away from this. We ought to put it in. It's right for law enforcement.

And if you guys will do this—if the men and women of law enforcement in America will call the Congress in the next 24 hours and say, "Do this one for us, and don't believe all those people telling you that we don't know our own best interest and we don't really know what's good for people on our streets. We do. We have been on the wrong end of those weapons, and we know we'll

be better off without having to look down those barrels anymore. Help us. Help us. Stand up for law enforcement. Stand up for safety. Stand up for the kids of this country"—we've still got a chance to win this thing, and we need your help. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:20 p.m. in the Indian Treaty Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Vince Lane, chairman, Chicago Housing Authority. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on Signing the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994

May 4, 1994

Just go on and sit in my seat. If you keep talking like that you'll occupy it someday anyway. [*Laughter*]

My goodness, he was good. You know, all of us, I think, carry around inside progressive impulses and conservative impulses that send us different messages from time to time. And one of the conservative impulses that has been honed in me over time is always be careful what you do because of the law of unintended consequences. Well, when I think of the enormous bipartisan support this legislation has had, it didn't seem to me that there could possibly be any adverse unintended consequences. But do you realize what Chris Brady has done today by telling us what he does? Do you have any idea how many criminals all over the world have always wondered who monitored those \$10,000 transfers for the IRS? What the heck, it was worth it to get the bill and to meet him. [*Laughter*]

You know, when a President signs a bill into law, normally he just needs the bill, a pen, and a desk. And ordinarily, the bill and the pen get the top billing; he signs the bill, hands out the pens. Today we're going to try to give the desk a little higher billing. It's no ordinary desk, and its presence here today, as much as any speech or ceremony, symbolizes what this bill is all about.

Last month Janet Swenson gave her students at the Manufacturing Technology Project in Flint, Michigan, an assignment:

Suppose the President wanted you to design a desk and build it to use at a White House ceremony. It couldn't look like a typical desk. It had to be inexpensive. It had to be easy to move and reassemble. Within an hour, eight of her students had formed a project team, drawn up rough blueprints, and even called a supplier to check on the availability of materials.

Then they went to work. They drew on their knowledge of geometry and applied math to tinker with the blueprints. They negotiated with the vendors and bought the proper supplies. They built the desk at their center in Flint, Michigan. Then they broke it down, packed it up, and brought it with them to Washington. Yesterday, with a few Allen wrenches, they put it back together again here on the White House lawn, and here it is. This is a custom-made piece of furniture, developed, designed, built, delivered, and assembled by eight young people, none of whom is older than 20 years of age. I'd like to ask them to stand, along with their teacher. Where are they? Stand up. Here they are, these eight. Give them a hand. [*Applause*]

This bill is not the end of a journey. It's not a problem that has been solved. Instead, it's a whole new approach to work and learning. Hillary and I were talking up here, as we looked out across this vast sea of faces of those of you who we have known and worked with for so many years on this issue. I was thinking about how many nights I have talked to Bob Reich about this subject over the last 10 years, long before he ever dreamed he'd be Secretary of Labor and certainly before even his fertile imagination could have figured out how I might be able to appoint him someday. [*Laughter*]

The whole time I served as Governor of my State, I kept in my office a little silver box that Dick Riley gave me way back in 1979, the first time I went to South Carolina to meet with him and talk with him. I see in this audience the sea of faces of people with whom there is some story, some connection about this great endeavor on which we are embarked. The last major initiative I supported as the Governor of my State before I began campaigning for President was one designed to create a school-to-work network

and a higher quality of training for young people who didn't go on to 4-year institutions of higher education and ultimately to degrees.

This is the work, my fellow Americans, that we will have to continue for a lifetime. If you want to keep the American dream alive, we must not only create more jobs, we have to make it possible for people who work hard and do the right thing to become members of our middle class society.

You heard Hillary mention the Grant commission report way back in '87 about the forgotten half, the young people who don't go on to further education and training, or the Carnegie report, "America's Choice: High Skills and Low Wages." These are things that she and I and all of our people for years talked about because we knew the people personally who were affected by it. If you were fortunate enough to represent people from a small State, like me or Senator Mitchell, who never comes to the White House without at least one person from Maine—I've now met half the population, Governor—[*laughter*—thanks to his coming here—you actually know people who work harder every year for lower wages. You know people who lose their jobs and then they can never get a job that good again. You see what's happened in stark terms to people whom Senator Riegle represents in the automobile industry. There are millions of people like that everywhere.

And so I want to begin just by thanking the Members of Congress who put aside partisanship and regionalism and everything else to pass this bill. And they have already been acknowledged, the leaders have, by Secretary Reich, but let me just acknowledge the people who played a major role in the various committees, whose names I now have: In addition to Chairman Ford, the minority leader of that committee, Congressman Bill Goodling; Congressman Dale Kildee; Congressman Steve Gunderson; on the Senate side, in addition to Chairman Kennedy and Senator Mitchell, Senator Durenberger, Senator Jeffords, Senator Metzenbaum, Senator Pell, Senator Simon, Senator Wofford, Senator Hatfield. And I know Senator Ford and Senator Riegle are here, but there are a slew of Members of Congress here whose names

I don't have. But I want you to see the depth of support this bill has, so I'd like to ask every Member of Congress here present to stand so the rest of you can see how much they cared about this.

We have probably more than 10 percent of the entire Congress here today. I thank Secretary Riley, and I'm glad that Secretary Reich could tear himself away from Jay Leno long enough to show up today. He was funny last night; did you see him? Probably wants a raise today. [Laughter] He needs further training before we do that. [Laughter]

I want to thank the people from business and labor and education and the community activists, all of you who are here. And most important, I want to honor the young men and women who are now seizing the opportunity provided by existing programs to make sure they don't become part of America's forgotten half. Each of the young people who are here today will receive a certificate, but I think we ought to give them another hand and say we're pulling for their future. [Applause]

Creating this national network of school-to-work programs is our common attempt to address perhaps the greatest challenge of our times for Americans: how to make the dramatic economic changes occurring all over the world work for our own people, how to put their interests first and reward their efforts and give life to their aspirations. We can revive our economy. We can bring the deficit down, increase investment, create jobs; we can expand trade. We can do all these things, but if we don't give our own people the change to reap the rewards of economic progress, we will have failed.

The last two decades have been especially hard on the working people of America—all of you know that—especially on the 75 percent of our people who don't actually finish getting a 4-year college degree. We are now in a global economy where, to use my buzz phrase, what you earn depends on what you can learn, not even what you know. We now see that we passed the decade in the eighties where the gap between the wages of college graduates and high school graduates literally doubled because of global economic forces.

For too long, we were the only country that did not have a system to provide this sort of education and training and opportunity for young people who don't go on to 4-year colleges. Oh, a lot of people were doing a great job of it and, interestingly enough, as so often happens to people, were way ahead of the system. And you can see that in the explosion of enrollments in high-quality 2-year programs all around the country and more and more high schools trying to come to grips with their responsibilities to train young people who weren't going to college. But we didn't have a way of providing these opportunities to all of our people.

The legislation that I will sign is both innovative in structure and ambitious in scope. It doesn't simply throw a lot of new money or create a lot of new bureaucracy. Instead, it enables us in the National Government to be a catalyst, to bring together workers and businesses, parents and students, the experts and the doers, the designers and the implementers to create programs that work for every American in every community in this country. It will provide development grants for each State to plan comprehensive training and education and apprenticeship systems. And it will do what I think we ought to do: It will set national standards for what these programs must accomplish, grassroots reforms, national standards.

The Federal Government is not very good at regulating or operating things like this, but we can know through readily available information what standards all programs ought to meet, and then we can empower people at the grassroots level to decide how they can most easily meet those standards. That's the sort of reinventing Government the Vice President is always talking about and working on. It's a small seed that will give us quickly, I predict to you, a national network of school-to-work programs.

In the years to come, our young people will be able to know with confidence that their learning will not end when they leave high school, but they won't leave high school without enough learning to go on to further training and to be productive citizens.

This new law, as important as it is, is a part of a larger piece. Just a few weeks ago, I signed the Goals 2000 legislation, and a lot

of you worked hard on that, setting national performance standards for the first time for our schools and again supporting grassroots reforms to achieve those standards. Now we're working cooperatively again in a bipartisan spirit with Congress to refine and to enact the last significant piece of this lifetime learning agenda, the reemployment act, that will change the unemployment system to a reemployment system in recognition of the fact that most people don't get called back to their old jobs when they are on unemployment.

The average worker will now change jobs seven times in a lifetime, and in a workplace where ROM's and RAM's and robotics are the rage, there will never, ever be a time again when our workers won't need to learn something new. The reemployment act will, therefore, complement this school-to-work act and the Goals 2000 bill. And as the American people, with all their energy and ingenuity and ability, implement them, it will be a lasting tribute to those of you from all corners of America and all walks of life and both political parties who have known for many years that this was the thing we have to do.

It will also be another chance to keep alive the dream that has driven so many of us to this place and this lawn today, the chance to make a good living, the chance to reach for the brass ring, the chance to achieve the American dream. That is, after all, what we were given and what we clearly owe to the young people here today and to their children.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:40 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Chris Brady, a school-to-work student from Boston, MA. H.R. 2884, approved May 4, was assigned Public Law No. 103-239. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on Signing the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994

May 4, 1994

Today it is with pride that I sign into law H.R. 2884, the "School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994." The enactment of this legis-

lation fulfills a promise I made to the American people. It is particularly appropriate that the enactment of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 so closely follows the enactment of the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act." These Acts are important milestones on our Nation's journey toward excellence and equity in our schools and workplaces. In particular, the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 will provide a better education for our young people as they progress from school to a first job in a high-skill, high-wage career and to further education or training.

We have failed for too long to give our young people the opportunity and tools to make the critical and challenging transition from school to a first job with a future. Too many students either drop out of school or complete school without the skills they need to succeed in a changing world. They lack a sense of the promise and potential that lies ahead of them. The School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 will help change that.

In today's global economy, a nation's greatest resource—indeed, the ultimate source of its wealth—is its people. To compete and win, our work force must be well-educated, well-trained, and highly skilled. Let me repeat what I said earlier this year: "We are living in a world where what you earn is a function of what you can learn . . . and where there can no longer be a division between what is practical and what is academic."

We all know that low-skilled jobs are becoming scarcer. Those jobs are being replaced by technology or drifting to countries whose workers are eager to labor for a small fraction of American wages. In short, the days of unskilled teenagers leaving high school and finding good-paying factory jobs for life are gone.

The School-to-Work Opportunities Act can help young people adapt to this changing world, making it an important part of my work force strategy. This Act will ensure that during the last 2 years of high school, and typically for at least 1 year beyond, young people will benefit in several ways. They will be able to obtain quality on-the-job experience combined with classroom instruction, leading to certification in marketable skills.

Such well-marked paths to productive roles in the working world will benefit both our young people and the Nation's many businesses anxious for skilled new employees.

This Act is not another top-down mandate for one more Federal program. Under the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, Federal funds will be available, for a limited period, as venture capital to stimulate State and local creativity in establishing statewide School-to-Work Opportunities systems. To promote systemic reform, State and local participants are given a substantial degree of flexibility to experiment and to build upon current promising approaches. All the States' systems will, however, have to share certain common features and basic program components that experience demonstrates are crucial to a quality school-to-work system. Also, by forming local partnerships of individuals who have a stake in their children's future, communities will play an active role in giving American youth access to skills and employment opportunities.

Under this Act, States and communities can build bridges from school to work through programs that provide students with a wide array of learning experiences in the classroom and at work. All School-to-Work Opportunities programs will contain three core components. First, the school-based learning component will include a coherent multi-year program of study tied to high academic and occupational skill standards, such as those to be developed as a result of the recently enacted Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Second, the work-based learning component will provide students with a planned program of job training and work experiences, including workplace mentoring, in a broad range of occupational areas. Third, the connecting activities component will ensure coordination of the work-based and school-based learning components, as well as encourage the active participation of employers. By completing a School-to-Work Opportunities program, a student will earn a high school diploma or its equivalent, a diploma or certificate from a postsecondary institution (if appropriate), and an industry-recognized skill certificate for competency in an occupational area.

This Act fosters the creation of "partnerships" in local communities that will develop and tailor the local School-to-Work Opportunities programs to the needs and resources of those communities. The partnerships will consist of representatives of many important local interests, such as employers, educators, labor organizations, students, parents, and local government agencies. These partnerships will, starting immediately, foster the design and implementation of a School-to-Work Opportunities system in every State. The partnerships can develop the local program based on promising practices already underway. Together, States and communities will take the lead in determining goals and priorities, developing new strategies, and in measuring progress.

H.R. 2884 was developed by the Administration working closely with the Congress in a spirit of bipartisan cooperation. This spirit of cooperation will continue on many different levels in the day-to-day operation of the School-to-Work programs. First, the Act will be jointly administered by the Secretaries of Labor and Education. Second, States and communities can work together in developing the various programs that will become part of this system. Third, the formation of the partnership at the local level will allow communities to examine their needs and to address them in a cooperative manner.

Today, with my approval of H.R. 2884, we start on the path to a better future for our Nation's young people.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 4, 1994.

NOTE: H.R. 2884, approved May 4, was assigned Public Law No. 103-239.

Statement on the Implementation of the Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles *May 4, 1994*

The signing today in Cairo of the agreement to implement the Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles marks another milestone in progress toward a lasting peace in the Middle East. On behalf of all Ameri-

cans, I have called Prime Minister Rabin and Chairman Arafat to congratulate them for this accomplishment. I expressed my high regard for Prime Minister Rabin's courageous leadership and stressed to Chairman Arafat the importance of moving without hesitation to make this agreement a reality. I also telephoned yesterday and again today President Mubarak to underscore our gratitude and appreciation for the key role he played in making this historic step forward possible.

Now the focus must be on implementing the Declaration of Principles in as rapid and successful a manner as possible. The process of transforming the situation on the ground for the better must begin. The promise of a new future of hope for Israelis and Palestinians alike must now be realized. I assured Prime Minister Rabin and Chairman Arafat that the United States would do everything possible to help make this happen.

Building on the progress achieved today and our ongoing discussions with parties in the region, I am hopeful that this can be the year of breakthrough to a lasting and comprehensive peace for all the peoples of the Middle East.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the District of Columbia Budget

May 4, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, I am transmitting the District of Columbia Government's 1995 budget request and 1994 revised budget request.

The District of Columbia Government has submitted a 1995 budget request for \$3,409 million in 1995 that includes a Federal payment of \$674 million, the amount authorized and requested by the Mayor and the City Council. The 1995 Federal payment level proposed in my fiscal year 1995 budget of \$670 million is also included in the District's 1995 budget as an alternative level. My transmittal of the District's budget, as required by law, does not represent an endorsement of its contents.

I look forward to working with the Congress throughout the 1995 appropriation process.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 4, 1994.

Remarks at the Andrew W. Mellon Dinner

May 4, 1994

Thank you very much, Mrs. Stevenson, Mr. Smith, members of the Mellon family, distinguished Justices of the Supreme Court, Members of Congress, Secretary Riley, Mr. and Mrs. Powell. To the many patrons of the arts and supporters of education who are here, it is an honor for Hillary and for me to be here at this special event at this wonderful, special building, truly our national monument to art.

It's a pleasure to be among so many of you who have done so much to support our country's cultural heritage. Without our Nation's magnificent tradition of philanthropy, Americans from all walks of life would never have the chance to enjoy art and culture, to find true education.

I first came here as a young student at Georgetown. Then, when I was in my twenties, after I had left school, I came to this gallery almost every time I came back to Washington. When Hillary and I met in law school and came from time to time to Washington, we would come to the National Gallery. Later when I was a Governor and came here only for stuffy old meetings, on occasion I would sneak away from wherever we were supposed to be convening and come here and look at these pictures and think I would never do anything remotely as important as paint some of the things that hang on these walls.

For all of you who have given, I thank you. The spirit of giving really creates America's sense of common bond, our sense of community. I want to especially thank the members of the Mellon family and other patrons of this gallery. Andrew Mellon somehow knew that throughout the ages, art could make a difference in the lives of people and nations. Thankfully, that was a gift he passed along

to his children, who represent the best tradition of service to others.

I do want to thank, since it's been mentioned, the National Gallery for the gifts of art to the White House—on loan. [Laughter] And I do want to say that I'm glad you've got enough left over to fill these wonderful buildings with so many extraordinary works of art.

Tonight we honor not only the contributions of Andrew Mellon and his family, but we take time to underscore the partnership between the United States and the citizens who have done so much to preserve and enhance artistic institutions in the United States.

In this time of budget-cutting and belt-tightening, the Federal, State, and local governments together only provide a small fraction of the support for our common cultural life. That's why the contributions of people like those of you who are here tonight are crucial to the continuing vitality of our institutions.

I must say that one of the most difficult things that I have to face as President is the sure knowledge that if I fail to relieve the burden on future generations of the enormous debt which has been built up, I will be saddling our children, our grandchildren, with something that will always handicap our economy. And yet, it is difficult for me and for the Members of Congress not to be able to give more funds to things that we really believe in. We will continue to do what we can to support the arts, but we need for you to continue to do what you can as well. We would all be not only less well-educated but, in a fundamental sense, less human than we ought to be were it not for the opportunity to spend time in places like the National Gallery.

I also want to say a special word of appreciation to those of you associated with the Gallery who support the educational programs and the outreach of the Gallery. You know, I grew up in a small town in my home State, and I never will forget the first time I went to the State's art gallery. I thought I had died and gone to heaven. Now there are children all across this country that, because of the outreach programs of galleries, see pictures, understand art, develop a level

of cultural awareness and sensitivity that would be absolutely unthinkable without these programs. So for the educational efforts you have all made, I say thank you.

And if you'll give me one more indulgence, I want to say a special word of thanks for the astonishing generosity of two people who are here tonight, Walter and Leonore Annenberg, who have done so much to help us to promote education in this country.

I was pleased when we stood in the line tonight, how many of you came through and said something like, "Well, I'm from a little town in Missouri." "I've been to your State," or "I understand something about your background." I think sometimes people think too quickly that these great magnificent works of art can only be appreciated by those of us who are fortunate enough to live in the great cities of our country, to assume the high positions in business and government and elsewhere. But if you look at the life stories of the artists that we honor by hanging their wonderful pictures in these galleries, you will see a much more typical picture of ordinary life at every age and time. You have helped us to bind up one another in a common culture and to understand our connections to the past so that we can better hand down our values to the future. For that, the United States is in your debt.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:10 p.m. at the National Gallery of Art. In his remarks, he referred to Ruth Carter Stevenson, chair, and Robert H. Smith, president, board of trustees of the National Gallery of Art; and director of the National Gallery of Art Earl A. Powell III, and his wife, Nancy.

Remarks on Legislation To Ban Assault Weapons and an Exchange With Reporters

May 5, 1994

The President. In a few weeks the Congress will pass, and I will be able to sign, landmark legislation to fight crime in this country. Working together we have been able to show that crime is not a partisan issue. It's an American issue, and it requires com-

prehensive solutions, more punishment, more prevention, more police officers.

This afternoon, the House of Representatives will be considering a key part of that strategy, a law that bans 19 deadly assault weapons that pose a clear and present danger to our citizens and to our police officers. Just 2 years ago, a similar law was defeated by a very wide margin in the House. Now we're a few votes away from a dramatic strike against these deadly weapons and the criminals who use them.

Congressman Steve Neal, in an act of conviction and courage, has joined the ranks of House Members who support our local police and fight for safe neighborhoods, joining forces with law enforcement and standing up to a lot of the misapprehension and fear and misinformation that has been spread by the opponents of this very sensible crime control measure. I want to thank Steve Neal, and the citizens across this country who are concerned about this terrible problem are in his debt.

The vote to keep dangerous assault weapons out of the hands of criminals occurs this afternoon. Members are having to choose and make difficult choices between supporting the local police in their efforts to disarm criminals who can use these weapons to kill lots of people and those who are spreading fears about the reach of this law.

Today, the American people hope and believe that common sense and the common good should prevail. With the help of people like Steve Neal, it will. I'm very grateful to him, and I wanted to give him the chance to say a few words this morning before we have the vote this afternoon.

Congressman.

Representative Steve Neal. Thank you, sir.

The President. Thank you so much.

Representative Neal. Thank you. Well, I would say that the President is right about this. It is the first responsibility of our Government to protect our citizens. There is a war going on on the streets of America, mostly in the big cities, and the police are outgunned. Now they say they need this legislation to help them protect us and our families against violent criminals. So we ought to

give them this tool that they say they need to protect us against violence.

Caning in Singapore

Q. Mr. President, what do you think of the caning of the American in Singapore?

The President. I think it was a mistake, as I said before, not only because of the nature of the punishment related to the crime but because of the questions that were raised about whether the young man was, in fact, guilty and had voluntarily confessed.

Q. What are you going to do about it, Mr. President?

The President. Well, we're discussing that, actually, as we speak here, what would be an appropriate statement by our Government in the aftermath of this.

Assault Weapons

Q. [*Inaudible*—if the assault ban fails in Congress today, is there any administrative action you could take, say, through the Treasury Department, to ban these weapons yourself in the Executive order or prohibition?

The President. I don't believe we can do that. There may be some things that we can do that will minimize the problem. But I don't think any options that are available to us will be as effective as the ban on these assault weapons.

I do want to say, as I have talked to Members, there are basically two classes of concerns among those who wish to vote for this bill. And I am convinced a majority, if they could vote anonymously, would vote for this bill. And there are two classes of concerns among those people. One is, some of the administrative requirements, which we'll circulate a letter today that Congressman Schumer and Mr. Synar and others have worked on, to satisfy the people who are worried about the recordkeeping requirements, that all those concerns, those practical concerns can be fixed in the conference report. The other is the so-called camel's-nose-inside-the-tent theory. A lot of our Members are being told by folks back home that they have been convinced by the opponents of this bill that today it's these assault weapons, which they don't own, and tomorrow it'll be some legitimate hunting weapon, which they do own.

Well, that's why the bill contains the list of over 600 specific weapons that are protected. So I hope that we can, in effect, just debunk that, can overcome that argument by the time of the vote this afternoon. Those are the two things I've been hearing.

I was on the phone until about midnight last night. And I've made several calls again this morning working on this issue. And I believe we have a chance. It's very difficult, as you know; we were way, way down when we started and counted out right up until the 11th hour. But we may still have a chance to pass this because people like Steve Neal have been willing to come forward.

Supreme Court Nominee

Q. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal says that Judge Richard Arnold is now your favorite to become the next Supreme Court Justice. Should he be penalized because he's from Arkansas? Is he your favorite?

The President. Well, first of all, I have no comment on whether I have a favorite or not. And secondly, he shouldn't be penalized because he's from Arkansas. I mean, he was first in his class at Harvard and Yale; he's the chief judge of the 8th Circuit; and he's been head of the Appellate Judges Association. So I don't think anyone would question—it would be difficult to find, just on terms of those raw qualifications, an appellate judge with equal or superior qualifications. I don't think any American would expect someone to be disqualified because they happen to come from my State.

Q. When will we learn about your selection?

The President. Well, there's one or two other things going on here, but we're working on it. We're spending a good deal of time on it. It won't be long.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:50 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Remarks Announcing Assistance to South Africa

May 5, 1994

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to all of you. Last week we watched with wonder as the citizens of South

Africa went to the polls, as voters lined up for miles and miles, coming on crutches and in wheelchairs, waiting patiently, crossing the countryside to exercise their franchise, to create a new nation conceived in liberty and empowered by their redemptive suffering.

I have just spoken with President-elect Mandela and with President de Klerk. I congratulated Mr. Mandela on his victory and told President de Klerk that he clearly deserves tremendous credit for his leadership. Their courage, their statesmanship, along with the leadership of Chief Buthelezi and others, has made this transition smoother than many thought possible.

South Africa is free today because of the choices its leaders and people made. Their actions have been an inspiration. We can also be proud of America's role in this great drama. Because those of you here today and many others have helped to keep freedom's flame lit during the dark night of apartheid, Congress enacted sanctions to help squeeze legitimacy from the apartheid regime. Students marched in solidarity. Stockholders held their companies to higher ethical standards. America's churches, both black and white, took up the mantle of moral leadership. And throughout the fight, American civil rights leaders here helped to lead the way. Throughout, South Africa's cause has been also an American cause. Last week's miracle came to pass in part because of America's help. And now we must not turn our backs.

Let me begin by saying that we all know South Africa faces a task of building a tolerant democracy and a successful market economy and that enabling the citizens of South Africa to reach their potential, economically, is critical to preserving the tolerant democracy. To show that reconciliation and democracy can bring tangible benefits, others will have to help. I'm convinced South Africa can become a model for the entire continent. And America must be a new and full partner with that new government, so that it can deliver on its promise as quickly as possible.

We've already begun. Over the past year, the United States sent experts to South Africa to negotiate a new constitution—or to help them negotiate the new constitution. We provided considerable assistance to help

their elections work. We lifted sanctions. We sent two trade and investment missions to lay the groundwork for greater economic cooperation. And we had a very fine American delegation of election observers there during the recent elections. And I'd like to especially thank the leader of that delegation, Reverend Jesse Jackson, for his outstanding contributions to the success of the South African elections. Thank you, sir.

Today I am announcing a substantial increase in our efforts to promote trade, aid, and investment in South Africa. Over the next 3 years we will provide and leverage about \$600 million in funds to South Africa. For this fiscal year we have increased assistance from \$83 million to \$143 million. Along with guarantees and other means, our resources, which will be mobilized for next year, will exceed \$200 million. Through the programs of 10 U.S. Government agencies, we will work with South Africans to help meet the needs which they identify, to build homes and hospitals, to provide better education, to promote good governance and economic development.

I'm writing to the leaders of the other G-7 countries and asking them to join us in expanding assistance to South Africa. And we urge the international financial institutions, such as the World Bank, to do the same.

Next week, I'm also sending an official delegation to South Africa for President Mandela's inauguration. Vice President Gore will lead the trip, along with Mrs. Gore. They'll be joined by the First Lady, Secretary Brown, Secretary Espy, and many others, including those here in the audience today.

We are taking these actions because we have important interests at stake in the success of South Africa's journey. We have an economic interest in a thriving South Africa that will seek our exports and generate greater prosperity throughout the region. We have a security interest in a stable, democratic South Africa, working with its neighbors to restore and secure peace. We have a clear moral interest. We have had our own difficult struggles over racial division, and still we grapple with the challenges of drawing strength from our own diversity. That is why the powerful images of South Africa's elec-

tions resonated so deeply in the souls of all Americans.

Whether in South Africa or America, we know there is not finish line to democracy's work. Developing habits of tolerance and respect, creating opportunity for all our citizens, these efforts are never completely done. But let us savor the fact that South Africa now has the chance to begin that noble and vital work.

Thirty-three years ago, Albert Luthuli became the first of four South Africans to win the Nobel Peace Prize. As he accepted the award, he described his people as, and I quote, "living testimony to the unconquerable spirit of mankind. Down the years they have sought the goal of fuller life and liberty, striving with incredible determination and fortitude."

Today, that fortitude and the strivings of generations, have begun to bear fruit. Together, we must help all South Africans build on their newfound freedom.

Thank you very much.

And now I'd like to ask the Vice President to come forward to make some acknowledgements and some remarks and to talk a little about the historic trip that the American delegation he will lead is about to make. Mr. Vice President.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:20 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to South African President-elect Nelson Mandela, President F.W. de Klerk, and Mangosuthu Buthelezi, leader of the South African Inkatha Freedom Party. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on Action by the House of Representatives on Assault Weapons and an Exchange With Reporters

May 5, 1994

The President. This afternoon, the House of Representatives rose to the occasion and stood up for the national interest. Two hundred and sixteen Members stood up for our police, our children, and for safety on our streets. They stood up against the madness that we have come to see when criminals and terrorists have legal access to assault weapons

and then find themselves better armed than police, putting more and more people in increasing danger of their lives.

The 19 assault weapons banned by this proposal are deadly, dangerous weapons. They were designed for one purpose only, to kill people. And as long as violent criminals have easy access to them, they will continue to be used to kill people. We as a nation are determined to turn that around.

In the last year there has been a sea change in the crime debate. To be sure, there is still a national consensus in support of the rights of hunters and sportsmen to keep and bear their arms. And as long as I am President, those rights will continue to be protected. But we have also overcome the partisanship and the rhetoric that has divided us too long and kept us from our responsibilities to provide for law and order, to protect the peace and safety of ordinary Americans.

We have come together in the belief that more police, more prisons, tougher sentences, and better prevention, together can make our neighborhoods safer, our streets, our schools, and our homes more secure.

This legislation passed today now becomes part of a larger strategy to fight crime to make the American people safer. That's what the elected mayors and Governors want without regard to party. That's what every major police organization wants, representing people who put their lives on the line to protect the rest of us. And most importantly, that is what the American people want, the right to be safe and secure without having their freedoms taken away by criminals or by an unresponsive or unreasoning National Government.

I want to especially thank Congressman Schumer for the tenacity, the determination that he demonstrated in leading this fight for so long in the House. And I want to thank every Member of the House of Representatives in both parties who voted for this bill today, and in so doing, demonstrated extraordinary courage in the face of extraordinary political pressure to walk away.

I want to thank our remarkable Cabinet led by the Attorney General and by Secretary Bentsen who worked so hard for the passage of this legislation. I want to thank the band of stalwart workers here in the White House,

in our Congressional Liaison Office and elsewhere, and especially I want to recognize Karen Hancox and Rahm Emanuel who never gave up and always believed we could win this fight.

Let me conclude by reminding all of you that Americans are not divided by party or section or philosophy on their deep yearning and determination to be safer. And so I close by extending the hand of friendship to our friends on both sides of the aisle and both sides of this issue. In particular, to Chairman Jack Brooks whose leadership is going to bring us the toughest and most significant anticrime bill ever passed by the United States Congress. Let us go back to work until our work is finished.

Thank you very much.

Assault Weapons

Q. Mr. President, how much difference did your lobbying make, sir, do you think? How much difference did your personal lobbying make, did you think? And when did you know that you had it, if it was before the vote itself?

The President. Well, it's hard for me to know how much difference my personal lobbying made. I made dozens of phone calls. I finished my phone calls last night at midnight, and I started again this morning. And I continued up to the very end.

To be candid, I never did know we were going to win. I don't think we ever knew for sure how this was going to come out. I had an instinct right at the beginning of the vote when I spoke with Congressman Carr.

The hunters and sportsmen of this country and the National Rifle Association itself never had a better friend in the Congress than him. And he decided to vote for this measure because he thought it was the right thing to do. And after I hung up the phone—that was right at the beginning of the vote, I think—I said, "You know, we might just pull this off." But I didn't know before then.

Whitewater

Q. Mr. President, there was a very broad subpoena served in the White House today which might raise a number of questions for you. How will you decide whether to assert executive or lawyer-client privilege on things

that might be very private, such as notes to you from Vince Foster or from you to Vince Foster?

The President. I don't know. I don't know anything about it. I've been working on this all day. I have no knowledge about it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:40 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a Cinco de Mayo Celebration

May 5, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Ambassador and Mrs. Montano, thank you for welcoming me here at this magnificent building, and thank all of you for coming and giving me a chance to celebrate Cinco de Mayo with you. I want to recognize here the Secretary of Transportation, Federico Peña, and thank him for all of his work; three of my able White House aides, Joe Valasquez, Suzanna Valdez, and Grace Garcia. And I want to say a word about the Members of Congress who are not here, apparently. They're still voting—[laughter]—but that is, in some ways, our fault. We staged a great fight today in the House of Representatives to pass the assault weapons ban. So they are a couple of hours behind schedule, but it's because they did the work of America tonight, and I'm very grateful to them.

It's an honor for me to be here to celebrate on this holiday Mexico's unity and national sovereignty. The Hispanic community, Mexicans and 13 million Mexican-Americans who live here in our Nation have every reason to mark this day with great pride.

With the implementation of NAFTA, the friendship between our two nations has grown even closer. Our cooperation is also critical to strengthening democracy in this hemisphere. Sometimes in the pursuit of that great goal of democracy, we encounter tragedy. We have known it in our own country, and we here shared your profound sadness over the assassination of Luis Donaldo Colosio last March.

But Mexico's response to this loss, in my judgment, showed its resilience, its courage,

its determination, its true patriotism. These are qualities which can inspire the world and can strengthen democracy even in adversity. The United States is committed to standing with you.

Immediately after hearing of the tragic assassination, the Secretary of the Treasury and I talked very late at night, and we committed to establishing a multibillion-dollar contingency fund to help to stabilize the financial markets until people were able to deal with the consequences of these tragedies.

I have profound confidence in the strength of Mexico's political institutions and its leadership, and in the bright prospects for the Mexican economy. I think Mexico can overcome any setbacks and any tragedy. And on August the 21st, I believe that Mexico will hold full, free, and fair elections.

I also want to say that all of you know our cooperation is terribly important for what we can do together economically and for what that can mean for all of Latin America. The North American Free Trade Agreement is a fine example of how we must go forward together. In a time when nations face crucial choices all around the world, we can be proud that, together, we made the right choice in going forward with NAFTA. I want to say again tonight how much I appreciate President Salinas in his unswerving support of the agreement. The implementation, I can report to you, is proceeding smoothly. And we are committed to continuing that cooperation.

Next week, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, our HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros, our EPA Administrator Carol Browner all will visit Mexico City to meet with their counterparts to discuss the issues that we can work together on. And in December, I will convene in Miami a Summit of the Americas where democratically elected leaders of 33 nations will come together to discuss our common goals. You think of it: Every nation in this hemisphere, save two, tonight is governed by a democratically elected leader, and one of those two had a democratic election in which the leader was ousted. That is an astonishing record. No hemisphere can claim to do so well in the pursuit of democracy.

Benito Juarez once said, "The respect for other's rights means peace." We in the United States believe if we can promote democracy around the world, there will be more peace. There will be more opportunity to make agreements. There will be more reliability. There will be less war, less turmoil, and less hatred. Not the end of problems, not the end of conflict, but the promise of working through them, that is the promise that we see fulfilled today in the wonderful relationships between the United States and Mexico, a genuine partnership among equals, striving for the future in the best way we know how. That is worth celebrating on this Cinco de Mayo.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:45 p.m. at the Mexican Cultural Institute. In his remarks, he referred to Ambassador Jorge Montano and his wife Luz Maria Valdez de Montano. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

**Message to the Congress
Transmitting the Report on Federal
Advisory Committees**

May 5, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

As provided by the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (Public Law 92-463; 5 U.S.C., App. 2, 6(c)), I am submitting my first Annual Report on Federal Advisory Committees for fiscal year 1993 for your consideration and action.

Consistent with my efforts to create a Government that works better and costs less, I issued Executive Order No. 12838 on February 10, 1993, requiring the executive branch to conduct a comprehensive review of all advisory committees. Based upon this assessment, each department and agency was directed to reduce by at least one-third the number of committees not required by the Congress. I am pleased to advise that this initiative has resulted in a net reduction of 284 unproductive advisory committees, exceeding our elimination target of 267, by 6 percent, or 17 committees. In addition, we have identified approximately 30 unneeded statutory groups.

While progress has been achieved in assuring that the work of advisory committees remains focused on national, rather than special interests, I am asking for your support in effecting other needed improvements. The Administration will forward to the Congress a legislative proposal to terminate 30 advisory committees required by statute, but for which compelling needs no longer exist. I urge the Congress to act quickly and favorably on this proposal, and I welcome any recommendations of the Congress regarding additional groups that may be eliminated through our joint efforts to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the Government. Toward this end, I hope the Congress will show increased restraint in the creation of new statutory committees.

I have directed the executive branch to exercise continued restraint in the creation and management of advisory committees. This will allow us to obtain further savings recommended by the Vice President and the National Performance Review. Consistent with Executive Order No. 12838, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget will continue to approve new agency-sponsored committees when necessary and appropriate. In addition the General Services Administration, as part of its overall responsibilities under the Act, will periodically prepare legislation to propose the elimination of committees no longer required by the Government.

We stand ready to work with the Congress to assure the appropriate use of advisory committees and to achieve the purposes for which this law was enacted.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 5, 1994.

**Message to the Congress
Transmitting the Report of the
National Endowment for Democracy**
May 5, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 504(h) of Public Law 98-164, as amended (22 U.S.C. 4413(i)), I transmit herewith the 10th Annual Report of the National Endow-

ment for Democracy, which covers fiscal year 1993.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 5, 1994.

Statement by the Press Secretary on Reforming Multilateral Peace Operations

May 5, 1994

On May 3, 1994, President Clinton signed a Presidential Decision Directive establishing "U.S. Policy on Reforming Multilateral Peace Operations". This directive is the product of a year-long interagency policy review and extensive consultations with dozens of Members of Congress from both parties.

The policy represents the first, comprehensive framework for U.S. decision-making on issues of peacekeeping and peace enforcement suited to the realities of the post-cold-war period.

Peace operations are not and cannot be the centerpiece of U.S. foreign policy. However, as the policy states, properly conceived and well-executed peace operations can be a useful element in serving America's interests. The directive prescribes a number of specific steps to improve U.S. and U.N. management of U.N. peace operations in order to ensure that use of such operations is selective and more effective.

The administration will release today an unclassified document outlining key elements of the Clinton administration's Policy on Reforming Multilateral Peace Operations.

Nomination for District Court Judges

May 5, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate the following four individuals as Federal judges: H. Lee Sarokin to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit; Blanche M. Manning to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois; Lewis A. Kaplan to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York;

and William F. Downes to the U.S. District Court for the District of Wyoming.

"These individuals will bring excellence to the Federal bench," the President said. "Each has an outstanding record of achievement in the legal community."

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

Remarks on Women's Health Care

May 6, 1994

Thank you, Mrs. Bailey, for the wonderful introduction and for the wonderful life you have lived.

I want to thank all the mothers who are here for doing such a good job with their sons and daughters, helping them to achieve a full measure of ambition. I want to thank the Vice President and Mrs. Gore for being wonderful examples of good parents. And I want to thank my wonderful wife for being the best mother I have ever known, as well as for taking on this often thankless but terribly important job.

You know, since Tipper was kind enough to mention my mother—I was sitting here thinking, I know some of these mothers here. Rosa DeLauro's mother campaigned with me in New Haven, and Rosa said, "You need to get my mother to go with you. She's worth a lot more votes than I am." [Laughter] So I watched all the people along the way being too intimidated to say no, they wouldn't vote for me. [Laughter] Sure enough, we carried it.

On Mother's Day we tend to think of the wonderful and warm and kind and loving and sacrificial things our mothers do. You heard Hillary say that, like most families, mothers make the health care decisions and prod everybody else to do it. But you know, very often mothers are also the most practical members of the family and the most hard-headed, and the most insistent that we face up to our responsibilities. Very often the values, the internal character structure of children is profoundly influenced by the sort of daily insistence of mothers that you just face up to your daily tasks and do your job and life will take care of itself. And that may seem terribly elemental, but one of the reasons

that I ran for President is I thought all that had been abandoned here, and there was a lot more talk than action.

Now, last month, we just learned today that our economy produced 267,000 new jobs in no small measure because the people in this Government have begun to take responsibility for bringing the deficit down and trying to do things that will grow the economy.

Yesterday, in a heroic move, the United States House of Representatives voted to ban 19 assault weapons. It was a very difficult thing for some of the Members, who were literally threatened with losing their seats and their political careers. But in the end, they got beyond the rhetoric to a very common-sense, old-fashioned American judgment that it was the right thing to do, the disciplined thing to do, the sort of thing your mother would be proud of you if you did. *[Laughter]*

I say that because I want to focus on what your mother would tell you to do in health care, not just for emotional reasons but because every day, those of us who are charged with the responsibility of working here are supposed to get up and do what my mother told me to do, which is to do your job. And my mother used to tell me all the time, "Bill, you give a good speech, but you still have to *do* something—*[laughter]*—in the end you still have to do something."

There's so much talk and genuine concern in this country about the American family. We're here paying tribute to it. Sunday we'll pay enormous tribute to it. And I think all of us would admit, whether we're Democrats or Republicans or independents and whatever our political philosophies are, that if the families of this country weren't in so much trouble, we'd have about half as many problems as we've got. I think we all know that. But what I want to ask you is what my mother would ask me, "Well, so what are you going to *do* about it?" And how can we be so concerned with the stability of the family as an institution, and still walk away from those stories that Hillary talked to you about? I mean, we've heard so many of these stories, we can't keep up with them all now. We literally cannot keep up with them all.

Millions of women in this country have no health insurance. Many more have insurance

policies full of the kinds of loopholes that you heard Hillary describe. There are policies that deny mammograms or that don't pay for well-baby visits or prescription drugs, that routinely exclude pregnancy as a preexisting condition. How can a profamily country say pregnancy is a preexisting condition? Some insurance companies have gone so far as to call domestic violence a preexisting condition. Well, so is breathing.

A couple of weeks ago, in the New York Times, there was a remarkable column by a novelist named Anne Hood who wrote how the system fails families today. She said she was a self-employed writer and her husband had a hard time finding health insurance. And when they finally found insurance that they were actually able to purchase, the quarterly payment was \$1,800. That's \$7,200 a year for a family policy.

And still, after they paid all that money their worries weren't over. She and her husband moved from New York to Rhode Island, and she had a baby. After the baby was born, she learned the insurance company had dropped their coverage when they moved 6 months into her pregnancy. And to renew her insurance would have cost \$2,000 more a quarter, an extra \$8,000 a year for maternity coverage. That was more than it would cost to have the baby.

Now, it seems to me that common sense tells you that if we can make it possible for self-employed people, like this fine woman and her husband, and small business people to afford to take care of themselves and their families and to stop passing on their costs to the rest of us, and we can organize it so they can buy insurance on the same terms that those of us who work for government or big business can, that we ought to do that. And it seems to me that their mothers would tell them they ought to pay a little for it and assume their responsibility, too.

We have got to try to reform this system to try to help people stay healthy and take care of them when they're sick. In any given year, about a third of all American women fail to get basic preventive services, like clinical breast exams, Pap smears, complete physicals. More than half of all American women over the age of 50 fail to receive a

mammogram, often because of problems with their insurance.

In medical research, women have been on the sidelines too long, too little research into the causes and cure of breast cancer and osteoporosis. Heart disease is the number one killer of women, but until recently, all of the search for a cure was centered only on men. The simple fact is that we've paid too little attention to the unique problems of women.

I met with a lot of mothers this week whose children either have or have already died of AIDS, and there are an enormous number of women who now have the HIV virus and who have passed it along to their children, or some have it and some don't. And we don't know whether or not there are different potential resolutions of this for women than for men.

We're trying to change all that in this administration. For one thing, I've put only women in charge of the health care struggle. Donna Shalala is Secretary of Health and Human Services. America became the first nation in the world to establish a senior Government position to oversee women's health issues. I put a woman and a mother in charge of health care reform, and you can see she's done a pretty good job, and we're all still pretty healthy.

We created an office of research on women's health at the National Institutes of Health, and increased funding for breast cancer research, for a national action plan on breast cancer, for research into other problems that affect women. We removed barriers that stood in the way of finding cures to Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease. We passed the family and medical leave law, a profamily bill if I ever saw it. You ought to read the letters that we get on that.

But if we really want to do right by the American family, and if we really want to honor our mothers, if we want the emotional satisfaction of seeing a lot of that pain taken away and the personal satisfaction of thinking we have done what our mothers would have told us to, which is to face up to our responsibilities and do the right thing, then we've got to find a way to provide health care to all Americans, to guarantee comprehensive benefits, including preventive care, including

those screenings and tests and check-ups to keep people well, not just spend a fortune on them when they really get in trouble.

We've got to preserve the right to choose doctors that women normally make the choice of. And our older women need to be able to rely on Medicare.

We can do these things. We can fix what's wrong with our system and not mess up what's right. But in order to do it, it's going to take the same discipline that was required to deal with the problems of the economy; the same courage that was required to take that vote yesterday on assault weapons; and same memory that that is, after all, what we were raised by our mothers to do. And on Mother's Day, I hope that we will all resolve that, by Mother's Day next year, the women who cared for us will have a health care system that cares for them.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:52 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Barbara Bailey, mother of Representative Barbara B. Kennelly, and Luisa DeLauro, mother of Representative Rosa L. DeLauro. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamad of Malaysia

May 6, 1994

Jones Lawsuit

Q. Mr. President, do you have any comment on the lawsuit filed against you today?

The President. Well, I thought Mr. Bennett did a fine job. I don't have anything to add to what he said.

Q. Are you going to argue that all the charges are false?

The President. I don't have anything to add to what Mr. Bennett said. I'm going back to work.

Q. Do you categorically deny the charges?

The President. Bob Bennett spoke for me, and I'm going back to work. I'm not going to dignify this by commenting on it.

Haiti

Q. Can you tell us whether you're thinking of changing your Haiti policy regarding the return of the refugees given the escalation of violence?

The President. We've had our Haiti policy under review, as you know, for the last 3 or 4 weeks. And we had a meeting about it today. We're going to meet again tomorrow. And I think we may have some announcements to make after that.

Q. About changing the policy on the refugees, sir?

Q. Have you tasked the Defense Department to do some military options just in case these sanctions cut today don't work?

The President. I don't want to discuss that. As I have said, I do not favor that option. I just don't think we can rule it out. I think it would be irresponsible to rule it out.

Q. You do not favor that option?

The President. Well, I've never favored—you know what I favor. What I've been trying to do is to get Governors Island followed. I'm trying—I think the people down there ought to keep their word. But we certainly can't afford to rule it out.

Q. Do you think you might have announcements regarding the refugee policy, was that what you were referring to?

The President. I don't have—I'll make an announcement when I have something to say about Haiti policy. But I don't have anything else to say.

Q. Are you referring to the refugee policy?

The President. I have nothing else to say about it.

[At this point, one group of reporters left the room and another group entered.]

Prime Minister Mahathir

Q. Mr. President, you missed Dr. Mahathir in Seattle. Now that you have met him personally, how do you feel about it?

The President. Well, we haven't had a chance to visit yet, but I have been looking forward to this for a long time. I admire his leadership very much, and I admire the incredible accomplishments of his nation under his leadership over the last several years. And I look forward to establishing a good relationship with him and continuing our partnership.

I'm also very grateful for the security partnership we have had and for the contributions that have been made by Malaysia to the operation in Bosnia, to the operation in Somalia, and to being a responsible leader in world affairs.

So we've got a lot to talk about and I'm looking forward to it.

NOTE: The exchange began at 2:55 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, the President referred to former Arkansas State employee Paula Jones and attorney Robert Bennett. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Proclamation 6683—Mother's Day, 1994

May 5, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

With the signing of the first Mother's Day Proclamation 80 years ago, President Woodrow Wilson set aside the second Sunday in May as a special time to pay tribute to America's mothers. This year I join with Americans across this great land on May 8, 1994, to honor our mothers with the appreciation and affection they so richly deserve.

Indisputably, the role of mothers has changed greatly in the last half-century. They are bread makers and breadwinners, heads of households and heads of state, caretakers of elderly parents and of newborn infants. They are also volunteers in our communities, schools, and religious organizations. Mothers find time to inspire and challenge their children to dream big dreams and to do good deeds. They provide encouragement to their children to reach for the stars and to strive for excellence. When our mothers succeed, our children succeed. When children succeed, our Nation's future is assured.

Mothers are not only our life-givers, but they are also our nurturers who sustain us with deep and unconditional love. In a world of constant change, they establish a reliable foundation of unchanging values. By instilling strong moral principles and showing concern for social improvement and well-being,

mothers have used their talents, ideals, and energies to shape our families, communities, and Nation. For their abiding devotion, love, patience, and loyalty, mothers, whether biological, foster, or adoptive, hold an enduring place in our hearts. They are anchors of their American families—our Nation's most important source of strength. My own mother's courage and determination profoundly influenced me in so many ways, and she will always remain a guiding force throughout my life.

Mother's Day gives us time to pause and reflect on the manner in which mothers contribute to their families and the Nation through their hard work, dedication, and daily sacrifices. We can best observe Mother's Day by expressing our thanks and our gratitude for the blessings and bounties that motherhood holds.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Sunday, May 8, 1994, as "Mother's Day." I urge all Americans to express their love and respect for their mothers and to consider how much they have contributed to the well-being of our country. I call upon all citizens to observe this day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifth day of May, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-four, 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, 11:21 a.m., May 6, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 6, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on May 9.

Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's Telephone Conversation With Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou of Greece
May 6, 1994

President Clinton spoke yesterday with Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou

regarding efforts to resolve issues relating to the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Cyprus. The President expressed his hope that the differences between Greece and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia could be resolved quickly. The President underscored the importance of the U.N. negotiating process led by Cyrus Vance and supported by U.S. Special Envoy Matthew Nimetz. The President and Prime Minister Papandreou agreed that the issue ought to be resolved promptly. President Clinton also expressed his support for the U.N.-sponsored confidence building measures in Cyprus which he said were the best hope of making progress on issues important to all the parties.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

May 2

In the evening, the President met with congressional leaders to discuss the assault weapons ban.

May 3

In the morning, the President traveled to Atlanta, GA. In the afternoon, he was given a tour of the CNN International Studio. He returned to Washington, DC, in the evening.

The President announced his intention to nominate Gus A. Owen as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and Robert J. Huggett as the Assistant Administrator for Research and Development at the Environmental Protection Agency.

May 4

In the evening, the President attended a fundraiser for Gov. Ann Richards of Texas at the Washington Court Hotel.

The President announced his intention to nominate Nancy Gist to be Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

May 6

The President named Clyde A. Wheeler as a member of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation.

The President announced his intent to nominate Eamon M. Kelly as a member of the National Security Education Board.

The President announced his intent to appoint Bruce Babbitt as Federal member and Vincent D'Anna as alternate Federal member of the Delaware River Basin Commission.

The President announced his intent to appoint Ralph G. Hoard as a member of the International Pacific Halibut Commission.

The President announced his intent to appoint Bruce Babbitt as Federal member and Kenneth J. Cole as alternate Federal member of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission.

The President announced his intent to appoint Janet Lippe Norwood as chair and Leon Lynch as member of the Advisory Council on Unemployment Compensation.

The President announced his intention to appoint the following members of the Advisory Committee on Trade Policy and Negotiations:

- Roger J. Baccigaluppi;
- Curtis H. Barnette;
- John Bryson;
- James Camerlo;
- Maurice R. Greenberg;
- Donald G. Fisher;
- Dr. W. David Leak;
- Walter Y. Elisha;
- Fred Krupp;
- Charles P. Lazarus;
- Jerome Siegel;
- Rudolph A. Oswald;
- Vilma Martinez;
- Lenore Miller;
- J. McDonald Williams; and
- Andrew Young.

The President announced his intent to appoint John Richardson as a member of the Committee for the Preservation of the White House.

**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 officer.

Submitted May 3

Brady Anderson,
of Arkansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Republic of Tanzania.

Dorothy Myers Sampas,
of Maryland, 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 Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

Nancy E. Gist,
of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance (new position).

Sally A. Shelton,
of Texas, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, vice Richard E. Bissell, resigned.

Lee Ann Elliott,
of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 1999 (reappointment).

Danny Lee McDonald,
of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 1999 (reappointment).

Submitted May 5

Nelba R. Chavez,
of Arizona, to be Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, vice Frederick K. Goodwin, resigned.

Eamon M. Kelly, of Louisiana, to be a member of the National Security Education Board for a term of 4 years, vice S. William Pattis.

H. Lee Sarokin, of New Jersey, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit (new position).

William F. Downes, of Wyoming, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Wyoming (new position).

Lewis A. Kaplan, of New York, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of New York, vice Gerard L. Goettel, retired.

Blanche M. Manning, of Illinois, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, vice Milton I. Shadur, retired.

Submitted May 6

Linda Marie Hooks, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Acquisition and Facilities), vice David E. Lewis, 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 May 2

Statement by Director of Communications Mark Gearan on the General Accounting Office Report on the White House Travel Office Operations

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Released May 3

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on U.S. counterintelligence effectiveness

Administration of William J. Clinton, 1994

Fact sheet on U.S. counterintelligence effectiveness

Released May 4

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on a letter from the Law Enforcement Steering Committee to the President endorsing the assault weapons ban

Transcript of a press briefing by Education Secretary Richard Riley and Labor Secretary Robert Reich on the School-to-Work Opportunities Act

Released May 5

Transcript of a press briefing by Deputy White House Counsel Joel Klein on the subpoena for documents relating to the Independent Counsel's inquiry into Vince Foster's death

Transcript of a press briefing by National Security Advisor Tony Lake and Director for Strategic Plans and Policy General Wesley Clark on reforming multilateral peacekeeping operations

Fact sheet on the trade, aid, and investment package for South Africa

Released May 6

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Labor Secretary Robert Reich and Council of Economic Advisers Chair Laura D'Andrea Tyson on the national economy

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers announcing the 44 person delegation to South Africa representing the United States at the inauguration of the new South African President on May 10

Announcement of Federal Facilities Policy Group mission statement on developing a strategy for waste clean-up

Statement by Special Counsel to the President Lloyd Cutler announcing the receipt of a subpoena for documents related to the Independent Counsel's inquiry into the death of Vincent Foster

**Acts Approved
by the President**

Approved April 30

H.R. 2333 / Public Law 103-236
Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal
Years 1994 and 1995

H.R. 4066 / Public Law 103-237
To suspend temporarily the duty on the per-
sonal effects of participants in, and certain
other individuals associated with, the 1994
World Cup Soccer Games, the 1994 World
Rowing Championships, the 1995 Special
Olympics World Games, the 1996 Summer
Olympics, and the 1996 Paralympics

S. 1636 / Public Law 103-238
Marine Mammal Protection Act Amend-
ments of 1994

Approved May 4

H.R. 2884 / Public Law 103-239
School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994

H.R. 821 / Public Law 103-240
To amend title 38, United States Code, to
extend eligibility for burial in national ceme-
teries to persons who have 20 years of service
creditable for retired pay as members of a
reserve component of the Armed Forces and
to their dependents

H.R. 3693 / Public Law 103-241
To designate the United States courthouse
under construction in Denver, Colorado, as
the "Byron White United States Courthouse"

S. 375 / Public Law 103-242
Rio Grande Designation Act of 1994

S. 1574 / Public Law 103-243
To authorize appropriations for the Coastal
Heritage Trail Route in the State of New Jer-
sey, and for other purposes

S.J. Res. 143 / Public Law 103-244
Providing for the appointment of Frank An-
derson Shrontz as a citizen regent of the
Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institu-
tion

S.J. Res. 144 / Public Law 103-245
Providing for the appointment of Manuel
Luis Ibanez as a citizen regent of the Board
of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

S.J. Res. 150 / Public Law 103-246
To designate the week of May 2 through May
8, 1994, as "Public Service Recognition
Week"

Approved May 6

S. 2005 / Public Law 103-247
To make certain technical corrections, and
for other purposes