

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, February 20, 1995
Volume 31—Number 7
Pages 231–262

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

- Burundi, radio address—233
- California
 - American Council on Education in San Francisco—241
 - San Bernardino Valley College in San Bernardino—249
- Economic Report of the President—234
- J. William Fulbright, memorial service—258
- Middle Eastern leaders—232
- Radio address—231

Appointments and Nominations

- White House Office, Assistant to the President and Director of Political Affairs—258

Communications to Congress

- Chemical and biological weapons, message on proliferation—256
- “Middle-Class Bill of Rights Tax Relief Act of 1995,” message transmitting—237
- United Nations peacekeeping, letter—240
- Weapons of mass destruction, message on proliferation—257
- “Working Wage Increase Act of 1995,” message transmitting—238

Interviews With the News Media

- Exchange with reporters in the Oval Office—234, 239
- Interview with Dick Enberg of NBC Sports—253

Joint Statements

- Bulgaria-U.S. relations—239

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

- Bulgaria, President Zhelev—239
- Middle Eastern leaders—232

Proclamations

- National Poison Prevention Week—254

Statements by the President

- See also* Appointments and Nominations
- Argentina’s accession to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty—231
- Disaster assistance for Georgia, Florida, and Alabama—260
- Petroleum imports and energy security—255

Supplementary Materials

- Acts approved by the President—262
- Checklist of White House press releases—261
- Digest of other White House announcements—260
- Nominations submitted to the Senate—261

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

Week Ending Friday, February 17, 1995

**Statement on Argentina's Accession
to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation
Treaty**

February 10, 1995

I warmly welcome Argentina's accession to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) this morning. In joining the NPT, Argentina has taken an historic step to reinforce its own security and to unite with 170 other NPT parties in the global effort to stem the spread of nuclear weapons. I salute President Menem and his government for their foresight and courage in making Argentina a champion for nonproliferation in Latin America and around the world. In the State of the Union Address, I pledged that the United States would lead the charge for indefinite extension of the NPT when the treaty's future is considered this April. Argentina's NPT adherence will help us reach that goal.

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

The President's Radio Address

February 11, 1995

Good morning. Today I've asked Attorney General Reno and Drug Control Director Lee Brown to join me here at the White House. I want to discuss the crime and drugs that plague almost every community in our country.

I ran for President because I believe it's the responsibility of our generation to work together to preserve the American dream for all Americans and to ensure that we move into the next century still the strongest country on Earth. The best way for us to do that is by building a new partnership in our country between Americans and their government, and especially between Americans and each other. I call that partnership the New Covenant.

Essentially that means the Government's responsibility is to expand opportunity while shrinking bureaucracy, to empower people to make the most of their own lives, and to enhance our security not just abroad but here at home, too. At the same time, it means we must demand more responsibility from every citizen in return, responsibility for our country, for our communities, for our families and ourselves.

Part of our job here in Washington is to help arm the American people to fight crime and violence. During the Presidential campaign I promised the American people that I would cut 100,000 Federal bureaucrats in Washington and use those savings to put 100,000 new police officers on America's streets. Last year, Democrats and Republicans joined together to pass the crime bill to keep that promise. We've been working ever since to put that crime bill into effect.

It's been only 4 months since the crime bill became law, but already we've awarded over 16,000 new officers to half the police departments in America. We're under budget; we're ahead of schedule.

Police departments all around the country are putting this effort to work, hiring, training, and deploying officers as fast as we can give a go-ahead. The last thing your local police department needs is Congressmen in Washington playing politics with their safety and yours. But the astonishing thing is, despite the urgent need for more police on our streets, despite our success in getting them there, some Republicans in Congress actually want to repeal this effort. They want to replace an initiative guaranteed to put 100,000 police on the street with a block grant program that has no guarantees at all.

The block grant is basically a blank check that can far too easily be used for things besides police officers. That's why the law enforcement steering committee, representing over 450,000 police officers, is absolutely opposed to this block grant approach or to any

other change that weakens our commitment to put 100,000 police on the streets.

Undermining this commitment to law enforcement is not acceptable. I didn't fight to cut 100,000 Federal bureaucrats so we could trade them in for an old-fashioned pork barrel program. I fought to trade 100,000 bureaucrats for 100,000 police officers. Last year, Republicans and Democrats passed the 100,000 cops bill, and I signed it. I made a commitment, a promise to put 100,000 more police on our streets, because there is simply no better crime fighting tool to be found. And I intend to keep that promise. Anyone on Capitol Hill who wants to play partisan politics with police officers for America should listen carefully: I will veto any effort to repeal or undermine the 100,000 police commitment, period.

Of course, as crucial as these 100,000 police officers are, they can't do the job alone. Every citizen in America has to help in this fight, because no amount of police officers can replace people taking responsibility for their own lives and for their communities.

This week, I announced our administration's 1995 drug control strategy. It involves cutting off drugs at the source, stiffer punishment for drug dealers, more education and prevention, and more treatment. But perhaps the most important part of this strategy will be to boost efforts to educate our young people about the dangers and penalties of drug use. Our children need a constant drumbeat reminding them that drugs are not safe, drugs are illegal, drugs can put you in jail, and drugs may cost you your life.

Community-based education programs work. I saw them work in school when my daughter was younger. This morning I've been joined by some police officers who participate in community education programs and especially in the national drug abuse education and resistance program that you probably know as DARE. Every American should follow their example and accept the responsibility to join the fight against drugs and crime and violence.

Parents must teach their children right from wrong. They must teach that drugs are bad and dangerous. And make no mistake about it, parents must set a good example for their children. Young people must have

the courage to do what's right and stand up for what's right. That means not using drugs, staying out of gangs, studying hard, avoiding violence. It also means telling friends that drugs and gangs and guns aren't cool, and children that are involved in those things aren't going to be your real friends.

That's what the New Covenant is all about—more opportunity, more responsibility. We've got to do our part here. But each and every one of you must take responsibility to join us. We can only win this fight together.

Thanks for listening.

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

Remarks at a Meeting With Middle Eastern Leaders

February 12, 1995

Thank you, Mr. Secretary. And thank you, all of you, for coming to this very important meeting. It is no secret to anyone in the world that we are at a critical moment in the peace process. We cannot allow the rise of terror again to threaten this peace, or as Chairman Arafat said the other day, we cannot allow it to kill the Palestinian dream.

We are prepared in this country to redouble our efforts to get the peace process back in full gear. We are doing what we can on our own and with others to deal with the problem of terror.

I want to begin by saying a special word of appreciation to President Mubarak for the Cairo summit. He has been involved in this process all along, and I think that the Cairo summit produced a clear statement by the leaders of all of you here represented that we are not going to let terror hold sway, that we are not going to let the peace process collapse. Today it is for us to begin to take the specific steps necessary to have the message of peace and renewed commitment carried out.

I think it's clear that we have to complete phase two of the Israel-Palestinian Agreement. I think it's clear that we have to fully implement the peace treaty between Jordan and Israel. I think it is clear that we have

to bring some economic benefits of peace as quickly as we possibly can.

And the United States is prepared to do its part on that. For example, if you agree to establish industrial zones in the West Bank and Gaza and elsewhere, I am prepared to go to Congress and seek approval for extending duty-free treatment to products coming out of those zones. Of course, in the end, the economic and political cooperation among all of you will be the most important thing in reaping economic progress. But I want to do our part.

I know our Russian partner feels the same. I think that many others around the world will also help. But I am absolutely convinced that we need to move as quickly as we can to prove that there are some economic benefits to peace.

Let me say also that, even though we must have enhanced security to create enhanced economic benefits, it is obvious that our attempt to do that is impaired when the movement of goods is limited by boycott, by closure, by any other action. So we're all going to have to work hard to make progress on the peace front, on the security front, and on the economic front at the same time. And we all have to recognize that there are difficult decisions to be made in this area.

The negotiations that you have already concluded have built a framework for peace. What we have to do now is to have specific achievements, lasting achievements. We will do our part. We are as committed today as we have ever been to a comprehensive peace. I wish the representatives of Syria and Lebanon were around this table; they are not here only because there has been no peace agreement signed with them. But I know you all join me in saying that our work will never be completed until we are all around a table as partners working for peace.

Now, there are many other things I could discuss today, but I mostly want to say to you, the United States is still committed to this, more strongly than ever. We are ready to do our part. We are ready to do our part economically. We are certainly ready to do our part in fighting terror. But we all have to do this together. And I hope that this meeting will produce further specific steps

that we can all take to keep doing it together. We cannot let people believe that they can disrupt the rational, humane, decent course of history by terror.

Mr. Secretary.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:30 p.m. at Blair House. Foreign Ministers Atef Sedky of Egypt, Shimon Peres of Israel, Abd Al-Karim Kabariti of Jordan, and Minister of Planning and International Cooperation for the Palestine Authority, Nabell Sha'ath, and their respective peace delegations attended the meeting.

Radio Address to the People of Burundi

February 13, 1995

The recent violence in Burundi demonstrates that extremists want to reverse your remarkable progress toward democracy. The United States rejects those who reject peace. We stand with those who are against violence and for tolerance and peace. Burundi has suffered enough.

Your historic elections in 1993 promised to open a new, peaceful chapter in your nation's history. The American people and supporters of democracy around the world watched with high hopes as Burundi embarked on a new course. Despite tragedy and suffering, the vast majority of your people have worked for lasting peace, security, and freedom.

I say to the people and the leaders of Burundi: Do not go back. You deserve to live in peace and without fear. Democracy will help you build a better future for yourselves and your children. Say no to violence and extremism. Say yes to peace and reconciliation.

NOTE: The address was recorded on February 11 at approximately 10:15 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House, and it was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on February 13. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this address.

Remarks on Receiving the Economic Report of the President and an Exchange With Reporters

February 13, 1995

The President. As you know, we are here to receive the annual Economic Report of the President. So I want to begin by thanking the Council of Economic Advisers: Dr. Laura Tyson, our Chair; Dr. Joseph Stiglitz; and Dr. Martin Baily.

This economic report is an important milestone for me. It measures our success in fulfilling the mission that I brought to the Presidency. I ran for this office to help to restore the American dream and to guarantee its availability for all Americans into the 21st century, to make sure that the middle class would still be growing and that work would still be rewarded. The best way to do that is by building a new partnership between Americans and their Government and Americans and each other, the partnership that I have called the New Covenant.

Essentially, it means that our responsibility here in Washington is to expand opportunity while shrinking bureaucracy, to empower people to make the most of their own lives, and to enhance our security, not only abroad but here at home as well. At the same time, it means that we must demand more responsibility from every citizen, especially those who seek the benefits of Government action, responsibility for our country, for our communities, for our families, and for ourselves.

These responsibilities have defined our economic strategy. We have pursued deficit reduction to make more of our Nation's resources available for private investment, growth, and jobs. We have reduced the size of the Government's bureaucracy, cutting the Federal work force to its lowest level in 30 years. We have expanded trade to provide more opportunity for jobs and higher incomes. And we have invested in the American people, from Head Start to the Goals 2000 program, to the program to help young people who don't go to college but do need further training, and of course what we've done in national service and student loans.

We've done all of that to help our people get the skills they need so that they can grow and prosper in a global economy. And now,

2 years into our administration, we can see the positive results of this strategy: almost 6 million new jobs, the lowest core rate of inflation in 30 years, the deficit reduced by over \$600 billion.

It's not enough. Too many of our people are still working harder for less, with less security. So today I'm sending Congress two new bills that are the next installment in our comprehensive effort to raise the wages and the incomes of working Americans and to give them more opportunity in return for their responsibility of learning and working. These bills reward work. They raise living standards. They allow people to invest in themselves and to make the most of their own lives.

The "Working Wage Increase Act" would increase the minimum wage by 90 cents over 2 years. This would benefit over 11 million workers and their families. It would be the equivalent of an \$1,800 raise or about 7 months of groceries for a family.

The middle class bill of rights has four provisions that will also benefit those who are working to help themselves: a \$500 tax cut for families with children under 13; a way to allow more families to invest in an IRA and withdraw those investments tax free to pay for education, health care, purchase of a first home, or the care of an elderly parent; a voucher to improve worker skills worth \$2,600 a year for 2 years for people who are unemployed or who are working for wages low enough to qualify for Federal training; and of course, I think, over the long run most importantly, a tax deduction for the cost of education beyond high school.

The success of the United States is clearly dependent upon our ability to educate and develop the capacities of every one of our citizens. That's what the middle class bill of rights is all about. It goes with our previous efforts to expand Head Start, to work to help public schools achieve excellence, to move people into the work force who don't go to college, and of course, to expand the student loan program.

This Economic Report of the President shows that this strategy is working. We should not abandon it. Instead, we should build on it. We should deepen it. When you're doing something that's working, you

shouldn't turn around and do something else. You should do what you're doing better, do more of it, keep going in the same direction. That's what we're trying to do. We're reducing Government spending. We're cutting Government bureaucracy. But we are increasing our investment in the American people. The middle class bill of rights, raising the minimum wage, these are things we ought to do. The evidence that we ought to do them is in the success of the last 2 years' strategy in the Economic Report to the President.

I thank Dr. Tyson and the others and, of course, all of those on our economic team and all of those in the Congress and throughout the country who've done so much to make this report a reality.

Thank you.

Minimum Wage

Q. What do you think the chances are of getting the minimum wage, Mr. President?

The President. Well, I think they should be pretty good. The more we see the evidence—you know, there was a very moving piece in one of the papers yesterday on that community in North Carolina that has such a high percentage of minimum wage workers.

I saw a television interview the other night with a lady working, I believe, in southwest Virginia, who gave an answer to the question that has become the battle cry for the minimum wage around here when she said, "Well, some people say if we raise your minimum wage that you could lose your job because more of the work will be done by machines," and she looked at the interviewer and said, "Honey, I'll take my chances." [Laughter] That's sort of become our battle cry around here for the minimum wage.

I will say this, in 1989, or the last time the minimum wage was raised, whatever year it was, '91, the bipartisan support was truly impressive. It ought to be there again. Half of this minimum wage increase is necessary just to bring the minimum wage back up to the point where it was when it was raised the last time. The other half would be a modest increase in the living standards of people who are working hard to support themselves and often their children. So I'm going to keep fighting for it. I'm going to keep working for

it. And my instinct is, we've got a pretty good chance to pass it.

Deficit Reduction

Q. Mr. President, you've taken a lot of criticism for your budget, and a lot of people are saying that you haven't done enough to reduce the deficit in the coming 5 years, that you actually have stopped doing what we were doing before. I think Speaker Gingrich today said that maybe your budget was even—that it could even be a factor that would tip the country into recession. What do you say to these critics?

The President. Well, let me just say, first of all, all those people, including the Speaker, were here for 12 years when we had a bipartisan conspiracy to quadruple the debt of this country. With Republican Presidents and Democratic Congressmen, they quadrupled the debt of the country. If it weren't for the interest we have to pay on the debt that was accumulated between 1981 and 1993, we would have a balanced budget next year and a surplus thereafter. And we have cut the deficit more than it has ever been cut before in history, I might say, with no help—no help—not a single vote from the Republicans.

Now, they're in the majority, and it's their turn. If they don't like my budget, let's see what theirs is. They promised—they made promises that would make the deficit bigger with all the tax cuts and spending increases they talked about. Now the real world is crowding in on them. I have done my duty. I have sent a budget to the Congress that contains another \$140 billion in spending cuts, that pays for the middle class bill of rights, including the education tax deduction, that reduces the deficit by \$80 billion more, and that does it without cutting Social Security, Medicare, veterans, or education. It is time for them to take a little responsibility.

They were here during the years of the eighties when we created this deficit problem. America was never buried in a deficit problem until 1981. They voted and voted and voted and voted. I got here 2 years ago. I have been fighting this as hard as possible. I have welcomed them to give me their ideas. I have said, I will work with you to reduce the deficit more. And I will do that, but let's

see what they want to do to do it. They have some responsibility, too. Where is their budget? What are they for? Let's see what they're for. I want to work with them. You know I find it amazing that people who are here every year, digging the country in the hole I've been digging us out of, are now saying I'm not getting this out quick enough. I mean, where were they, and where are they? It's time for them to suit up and show up.

Surgeon-General-Designate

Q. Are you going to the mat on Dr. Foster?

The President. Yes.

Q. Mr. President, there are some who would argue now that you're going to be spending so much time trying to get Dr. Foster confirmed, it's going to detract from your other priorities, because this looks like it's going to be one hell of a fight. Are you prepared for that right now?

The President. Yes, but I want to say, just because you've spent a lot of time talking about it, doesn't mean it's going to take us a lot of time to do it. [Laughter] We've got a lot of folks that work here and a lot of things to do. And every day we may only be talking about one or two things, but we're working on a lot of things. It will not in any way undermine the impact of the Presidency on the other work we have to do.

And let me also say—let me go back to that other question. I don't see how anybody could seriously say that our budget would cause a recession. They caused the recession before I ever showed up here. Since I have been here, we have reduced the deficit, we have grown the economy. After we presented our budget, the markets had a very positive response to it: Long term interest rates dropped; the stock market went up. It was seen as a very prudent budget. Now if they can do better, then we ought to get beyond the politics and let them put their proposal on the table and let us work through. At some point, they have to vote. They've got to get beyond the talking. I've gotten beyond the talking. I've given the budget. Let's see theirs.

Entitlements

Q. Why haven't you taken on entitlements, Mr. President?

The President. I did take on entitlements. The Republicans ran out against me last time. Don't you remember that, in '94? And don't you remember all the surveys that said, "Democrats losing their edge among elders" because the Republicans, the people now in the majority of Congress, launched those vicious ads claiming we had tried to tax Social Security recipients, when in fact the upper 13 percent of Social Security recipients were only asked to pay taxes on their Social Security on the same basis that private pensioners were.

We took on entitlements. We had savings in Medicare. We had savings in Medicaid. We did that. And the Republicans said they hated that. Now let's see what they do. It's their turn. They're in the majority in Congress. It is time—I don't have a vote; let them do it. Do you remember when Ronald Reagan—they protected him for years. They said President Reagan and President Bush, in 12 years between them, vetoed one appropriations bill because it didn't spend enough money and got away with blaming the Congress for raising the deficit. It beat anything I ever saw.

Now, I have tried to work with the Congress. I have tried not to be political. I have tried to say, "Here's my budget. If you've got a better idea, you put your ideas up. Then we'll work together." So far their reaction is, "It hurts us too much to put our ideas forward. We think we'll criticize yours." The American people are sick of this. They want us to work together.

White House Conference on the Economy

Q. Why are you going to have an economic conference in March?

The President. What?

Q. Why are you having an economic conference in March?

The President. Because I think it would be a good thing to get those people back together that gathered 2 years ago, not only to review the progress that has been made but, more importantly, to look at the thorny problems that remain. The middle class still feels squeezed in the midst of a recovery.

And I want us to focus on the challenges that we face for the 21st century in terms of ordinary middle class people. What can we do to raise living standards and increase security for people who are working harder and harder? How are we going to spread the benefits of economic recovery to the middle class? How are we going to grow the middle class and shrink the underclass and still keep this marvelous environment for entrepreneurs in which so many people are doing better than they ever had before? That is a separate set of questions.

Two years ago when that group gathered, we had to focus on just getting the economy out of the recession, getting the deficit down, getting the overall growth up. That has happened. Now we need to focus on what still needs to be done to make sure we're solidifying and strengthening and growing the middle class instead of dividing and shrinking it.

The Republican Party

Q. Mr. President, is the Republican Party being taken over by extreme right-wing, anti-abortion elements? *[Laughter]*

The President. Well, I hope not, but that's up to them, isn't it?

Surgeon-General-Designate

Q. Do you have the votes for Dr. Foster now, Mr. President?

The President. He hasn't even had a hearing yet. I haven't even canvassed them.

Q. Do you think you'll have the votes?

The President. I think if he's judged on his life's work, on the merits, I think he'll be confirmed. I think that if he gets the kind of hearing I would expect him to get from a fair-minded Senate, I think he'll be confirmed.

Border Crossing Fees

Q. Mr. President, are you going to change your border crossing fees? Some Texans saw advisers of yours today and thought—*[inaudible]*—Mr. Panetta was going to take a closer look at it.

The President. I certainly think we have to look at it.

Presidential Candidates

Q. Are you happy that Speaker Gingrich is not going to run against you for the Presidency?

Q. They're dropping like flies, Mr. President.

The President. Did he say that today? They're dropping like flies? Is that what you said? I notice there's still a few. *[Laughter]* I wish the absence of Republican opposition was my main worry, but I don't think it is. Somebody will show up, sure as the world. *[Laughter]* Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:23 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the "Middle-Class Bill of Rights Tax Relief Act of 1995"

February 13, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit today for your immediate consideration and enactment the "Middle-Class Bill of Rights Tax Relief Act of 1995." I am also sending you an explanation of the revenue proposals of this legislation.

This bill is the next step in my Administration's continuing effort to raise living standards for working families and help restore the American Dream for all our people.

For 2 years, we have worked hard to strengthen our economy. We worked with the last Congress to enact legislation that will reduce the annual deficits of 1994-98 by more than \$600 billion; we created nearly 6 million new jobs; we cut taxes for 15 million low-income families and gave tax relief to small businesses; we opened export markets through global and regional trade agreements; we invested in human and physical capital to increase productivity; and we reduced the Federal Government by more than 100,000 positions.

With that strong foundation in place, I am now proposing a Middle Class Bill of Rights. Despite our progress, too many Americans are still working harder for less. The Middle Class Bill of Rights will enable working Americans to raise their families and get the education and training they need to meet the

demands of a new global economy. It will let middle-income families share in our economic prosperity today and help them build our economic prosperity tomorrow.

The “Middle-Class Bill of Rights Tax Relief Act of 1995” includes three of the four elements of my Middle Class Bill of Rights. First, it offers middle-income families a \$500 tax credit for each child under 13. Second, it includes a tax deduction of up to \$10,000 a year to help middle-income Americans pay for postsecondary education expenses and training expenses. Third, it lets more middle-income Americans make tax-deductible contributions to Individual Retirement Accounts and withdraw from them, penalty-free, for the costs of education and training, health care, first-time home-buying, long periods of unemployment, or the care of an ill parent.

The fourth element of my Middle Class Bill of Rights—not included in this legislation—is the GI Bill for America’s Workers, which consolidates 70 Federal training programs and creates a more effective system for learning new skills and finding better jobs for adults and youth. Legislation for this proposal is being developed in cooperation with the Congress.

If enacted, the Middle Class Bill of Rights will help keep the American Dream alive for everyone willing to take responsibility for themselves, their families, and their futures. And it will not burden our children with more debt. In my fiscal 1996 budget, we have found enough savings not only to pay for this tax bill, but also to provide another \$81 billion in deficit reduction between 1996 and 2000.

This legislation will restore fairness to our tax system, let middle-income families share in our economic prosperity, encourage Americans to prepare for the future, and help ensure that the United States moves into the 21st Century still the strongest nation in the world. I urge the Congress to take prompt and favorable action on this legislation.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 13, 1995.

NOTE: A fact sheet on the “Middle-Class Bill of Rights Tax Relief Act of 1995” was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the “Working Wage Increase Act of 1995”

February 13, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit for your immediate consideration and enactment the “Working Wage Increase Act of 1995.”

This draft bill would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to increase the minimum wage in two 45 cents steps—from the current rate of \$4.25 an hour to \$4.70 an hour on July 4, 1995, and to \$5.15 an hour after July 3, 1996. The pattern of the proposed increase is identical to that of the last increase, which passed the Congress with a broad bipartisan majority and was signed by President Bush in 1989. The first increment of the proposal simply restores the minimum wage to its real value following the change enacted in 1989.

If the Congress does not act now, the minimum wage will fall to its lowest real level in 40 years. That would dishonor one of the great promises of American life—that everyone who works hard can earn a living wage. More than 11 million workers would benefit under this proposal, and a full-time, year-round worker at the minimum wage would get a \$1,800 raise—the equivalent of 7 months of groceries for the average family.

To reform the Nation’s welfare system, we should make work pay, and this legislation would help achieve that result. It would offer a raise to families that are working hard, but struggling to make ends meet. Most individuals earning the minimum wage are adults, and the average worker affected by this proposal brings home half of the family’s earnings. Numerous empirical studies indicate that an increase in the minimum wage of the magnitude proposed would not have a significant impact on employment. The legislation would ensure that those who work hard and play by the rules can live with the dignity they have earned.

I urge the Congress to take prompt and favorable action on this legislation.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 13, 1995.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With President Zhelyu Zhelev of Bulgaria and an Exchange With Reporters

February 13, 1995

The President. I'd like to tell you how delighted I am to welcome President Zhelev and the representatives of his government here. The United States supports the democratic and economic transformation of his country, and we're looking forward to having this visit and then signing a declaration of principles and a common agenda together. We look forward to working together. And we're very, very pleased to have him and the Ambassador and leaders of the Government here.

Bosnia

Q. Is Bosnia at the top of your agenda, and the lifting of the embargo? Any move toward that?

The President. Well, I imagine we'll discuss that and a number of other things. But we just started.

Declaration of Principles

Q. What is this declaration of principles? Is it just a friendship kind of thing?

The President. It sort of—it outlines the basic principles that will govern our relationship and also sets forward an agenda for how we can work together so that we can support their successes, which is something we want to do.

Q. Thank you.

Q. Life in the old corral.

The President. What did she say?

The Vice President. She said, "Life in the old corral." [Laughter]

The President. I don't know—you haven't stayed rounded up too well, Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International]. This corral analogy has got its limits. [Laughter]

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

The President. We are honored to have President Zhelev and the leaders of the Bulgarian Government here today, and I look forward to our conversations and to continuing the support of the United States for the democratic and economic transformations in

the country. We are also going to sign a joint declaration in a few moments, setting forth the principles and the specific agenda that we will follow in working together. And I am very, very pleased that the President and the leaders of the Government are here.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:54 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Joint Statement on Relations Between the United States of America and the Republic of Bulgaria

February 13, 1995

At the invitation of President Bill Clinton, President Zhelyu Zhelev visited Washington, meeting with President Clinton at the White House on February 13.

President Clinton and President Zhelev stressed the value of the close cooperation established over the past five years in maintaining regional stability and supporting Bulgaria's democratic and market economic transformation. They agreed that relations between the two countries rest on the values of democracy and human rights. President Clinton noted that the security of Bulgaria and the other Central European democracies is inseparably linked to that of the United States and praised Bulgaria's balanced and constructive policy in the Balkans.

Both Presidents noted the importance of continued implementation of Bulgaria's market economic reforms. In this context, they noted the need for Bulgaria to solidify its efforts at stabilization, to accelerate implementation of privatization and to complete the legal and regulatory conditions necessary to a market economy. President Clinton offered continued U.S. assistance to support Bulgaria's efforts in this direction. As part of the planned 1995 \$30 million U.S. foreign assistance program in Bulgaria, President Clinton told President Zhelev of a new \$7 million loan program designed to support small and medium-sized private businesses, especially in rural areas.

Recognizing the significant cost to Bulgaria of enforcing United Nations sanctions

against Serbia/Montenegro, President Clinton and President Zhelev agreed about the continuing importance of sanctions as a key tool to resolving peacefully the conflict in the former Yugoslavia.

President Clinton reaffirmed that the United States will remain engaged in efforts to improve regional transportation infrastructure in the southern Balkans, including Bulgaria. The two Presidents agreed that such projects can help mitigate the interruption of trade routes and promote regional stability and democracy. President Clinton noted that he has asked Congress for \$30 million for this regional project.

The United States and Republic of Bulgaria affirmed their determination to enhance regional and European stability through support of the OSCE, United Nations and Partnership for Peace.

Both countries will work to advance Bulgaria's integration into international and Euro-Atlantic economic and security institutions. President Clinton and President Zhelev affirmed support for the Partnership for Peace as the path for all countries of Central Europe and other Partners who wish to work toward NATO membership. President Clinton stated that under his Warsaw Initiative the United States will seek \$5 million in security-related assistance for Bulgaria to support the purposes of the Partnership for Peace plus additional resources to support security cooperation.

Recognizing the international dimension of many crimes, the two Presidents agreed to deepen cooperation between their respective law enforcement agencies in the struggle against terrorism and organized criminal activities including narco-trafficking, money laundering and smuggling of cultural and historical objects.

The two leaders agreed to encourage and promote trade and investment between their countries, based on market principles. The two nations intend to work together to create the conditions necessary for such market cooperation, taking into account such issues as protection of investments and new technologies, adequate and effective protection of intellectual property and other elements necessary to a friendly investment environment. Agreements concerning trade and in-

vestment have already been signed, including a Trade Agreement and Bilateral Investment Treaty, and the two Presidents placed high priority on the conclusion of a Treaty on the Avoidance of Double Taxation. Following the announcement of a new Central Europe Initiative by the U.S. Export-Import Bank, the Presidents agreed to work to establish a cooperative financing arrangement to support Bulgarian exports that also involve U.S. goods and services to third country markets. The two Presidents agreed that this initiative could help create jobs in both Bulgaria and the United States.

President Clinton recognized the importance of the removal of Bulgaria from application of the provisions of Title IV of the U.S. Trade Act of 1974 (the Jackson-Vanik Amendment). The U.S. Administration has made determinations that Bulgaria is in full compliance with Title IV criteria and will consult with the U.S. Congress concerning legislation to remove Bulgaria from application of Title IV at an early date.

Both Presidents agreed to support ongoing educational and cultural projects such as the American University in Blagoevgrad and to seek to conclude and implement a Science and Technical Agreement.

Through cooperation to advance common political, economic, security and humanitarian interests, the United States and the Republic of Bulgaria continue to build a strong and enduring relationship.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Reform of United Nations Peacekeeping

February 13, 1995

Dear Mr. Chairman: (Dear Member:)

There have been few times in history when mankind has had such an opportunity to enhance peace. The founding of the United Nations fifty years ago was one such opportunity. The victorious Allies put in place an institutional mechanism that could be used to enhance peace. Unfortunately, it was not used properly, and Cold War replaced peace.

Now, with the Cold War behind us, we have another important opportunity. Around the world, old enemies are coming together in the Middle East, South Africa, Haiti, Ireland, Central America, and across the great rift that divided Europe for almost five decades. This is a unique period. It can be, as was written in Ecclesiastes, a time for peace.

Peace, however, does not come easily or quickly. Numerous threats remain to our own and our allies' security.

For our generation to seize this opportunity for wider global peace, America must stay engaged. We must also be prepared to pay our fair share of the price of peace, for it is far less than the cost of war.

One of the tools we have to build this new peace is that institution created fifty years ago, the United Nations. As the Cold War ended, the previous Administration turned to the UN and its peacekeeping mechanism to deal with many of the conflicts left over from the superpowers' competition. As a result, the number of UN peacekeepers and their cost sky-rocketed, overburdening the capabilities of the UN system.

I have made UN peacekeeping reform a key goal, working to reduce costs and improve efficiency, using UN peacekeeping when it will work and restraining it when the situation is not ripe. More needs to be done to make UN peacekeeping realize its potential and more effectively serve U.S. interests. It is in the U.S. interest to ensure that UN peacekeeping works and to improve it, because peacekeeping is one of the most effective forms of burdensharing available. Today, other nations pay more than two-thirds of the costs of peacekeeping and contribute almost 99 percent of the troops. Troops from seventy-seven nations are deployed throughout the world in the service of peace.

The UN, once a forum for anti-American debate and propaganda, now is a vehicle for promoting the values we share. Throughout the world, the UN is promoting democracy and providing security for free elections. Its agencies are the chief instruments in the battle against proliferation of nuclear arms and other weapons of mass destruction. UN forces have assumed roles that once had been performed by American troops—in Kuwait, Somalia, Rwanda and soon Haiti. They stand

on battlements in places of great importance to us: on Israel's border, and Iraq's, in the Mediterranean between two NATO allies, in Europe on the border of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to deter a wider Balkan conflict, and in the Caribbean. The UN recently completed and closed successful operations in numerous places, including in our own backyard in Central America, Cambodia, Namibia and Mozambique.

Were the UN not engaged in promoting peace and security, we would have to invent it. If we did so, it might not look precisely as it has now evolved. The U.S. assessment share would be less. It would be able to respond more rapidly to disasters and do so more economically and effectively. These and other improvements we seek can be achieved only if the U.S. stays engaged in the world and we remain a member of the United Nations in good standing.

I look forward to working with the Congress, as we continue the task of reforming UN peacekeeping and the mission of building and consolidating world peace.

The enclosed report is submitted pursuant to Section 407(d) of the FY 1994/1995 Foreign Relations Authorization Act (PL 103-236).

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Jesse Helms, chairman, and Claiborne Pell, ranking member, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; Mark O. Hatfield, chairman, and Robert C. Byrd, ranking member, Senate Committee on Appropriations; Benjamin A. Gilman, chairman, and Lee H. Hamilton, ranking member, House Committee on International Relations; and Robert L. Livingston, chairman, and David R. Obey, ranking member, House Committee on Appropriations.

Remarks to the American Council on Education in San Francisco, California

February 14, 1995

Thank you very much. Thank you, Juliet, and thank you ladies and gentlemen. Your welcome was worth the 5-hour plane ride. [Laughter] I want to congratulate you all on this meeting, and I want to thank Juliet for

her leadership and also say to Frank Jenifer, whom I know will carry on the Council's outstanding work and strong leadership in higher education, I wish you well, and I'm delighted to see you again.

I want to thank the entire American Council on Education Board of Directors for endorsing our middle class bill of rights. It will build education and training across America, and I want to say a little more about it in a few moments. You will have to play an important role in making it a reality, and I know that you'll be interested in what I think you have to do along with what I have to do.

Let me say at the outset what an honor it is for me to be here with my longtime friend, our Secretary of Education, Dick Riley. He has really done a wonderful job, and I am very, very proud of him. And he is responsible for the fact that we had the most successful year last year in promoting advances in education in the Congress in at least 30 years in the United States, and I thank him for that.

I'm also glad to be here for the second straight year and to have Juliet's suggestion that maybe I should think about becoming a college president when I am once again unemployed. [Laughter] Now, before we came out here, she gave a slightly earthier description of why I should think about that. She reminded me that President Kennedy, when asked why he wanted to be President said that the pay was pretty good, a nice house came along with the job, and you work close to home, and that was like a lot of college president's jobs. [Laughter]

Over New Year's I met a college president who told me that we had a lot in common with people who run cemeteries. He said, "You know, if you run a cemetery, you've got a whole lot of people under you, but nobody's listening." [Laughter] On the hard days, when you're about to cry, you can think of that and laugh a little bit about it.

We have more in common than that. You are the keepers of a great trust of this Nation, the most diverse network of learning in the entire world. It's a spur for our economy and a magnet for our people and for people and ideas from all around the globe. I come today as someone who spent some of the happiest years of his life teaching in colleges and uni-

versities, as someone who worked as a Governor tirelessly to advance the cause of education and now, in this job, as your partner in a very important mission at a very important time in our country's history.

Our job, yours and mine together, is to redefine the partnership to empower our people through education and through training to face the demands of this age. That's really why I ran for President. I believe it is the responsibility of our generation to work together to preserve the American dream for all Americans, and to ensure that we move into the next century still the strongest country in the world.

And I think the best way for us to do that is by building a new partnership in our country between Americans and their Government and between one another. I've called that partnership the New Covenant, more opportunity in return for more responsibility, and a renewed sense of citizenship and community. In that New Covenant, Government's responsibility is to expand opportunity while shrinking bureaucracy, to empower people to make the most of their own lives, and to enhance our security abroad but here at home as well. At the same time, we have to demand more responsibility from every citizen in return—more responsibility for our country, for our communities, for our families, and for ourselves.

As we end this century, we are facing dramatic changes in our economy, our Government, and our daily lives. As we move away from the cold war into the information age, we face a world that is both exciting and very challenging, a world where knowledge is the basis of wealth, creation, and power, and where technology accelerates the pace of change. In a world like that, those who have the skills to prosper will do far better than any generation of Americans has ever done. But those who lack the ability to learn and to adapt may be left behind no matter how hard they work.

That is part of the frustration of America today, that there are so many of our fellow Americans who are working harder and harder and harder, and never feeling that they're rewarded, feeling that they're falling further behind, having less time for their children, having less time for their spouses, having less

time for the things that we know as the quality of life, and just plowing ahead. It leads to people having too much anxiety and too little hope, and it leads to special responsibilities for all of us.

At the heart of all three of the responsibilities that I said the Federal Government has, expanding opportunity, empowering people, enhancing security, is your work: education. It is, indeed, the essence of the New Covenant. Now more than ever, education and training are the keys to opportunity for every American, and the future will only make that more true. They will only work, of course, if individuals also assume the responsibility for themselves to get themselves educated and to impart the value of education to their children, to their families, and throughout their communities. But it is clear that the key to opening the American dream for all Americans as we move into the next century is our ability to broadly spread the benefits of education.

For more than two decades, I have not budged from this conviction. I had, as it turns out, for this job the good fortune of growing up in a State which itself was burdened in America's greatest explosion after World War II for lack of education. And I have worked now for about 20 years, relentlessly, to constantly change the role of Government so that it wastes less money and does fewer things it shouldn't but so that at the same time, it serves people better. It insists on accountability. It promotes excellence, but it especially emphasizes educating people.

America now must do that if we have any hope of preserving the American dream in terms of all of our people, in terms of an expanding middle class instead of one that is shrinking and constantly being divided between the haves and have-nots, not in terms of money but in terms of education. As a Governor, I invested more in education and in higher standards for our students, for our teachers, and for our schools and in trying to make it easier for our young people in my State to go to college.

The "Nation At Risk" report, back in 1983, confirmed the crying need for changes in our public schools, and I was glad to work on trying to change the conditions in ours. At the end of the decade, I was proud to be

one of the Governors who reached out across party lines to work with the Governors' Association and with President Bush and his White House to craft anew national education goals, goals which we then wrote into law in the Goals 2000 program, and which we are doing our best to help schools all across America to achieve on their own.

From the first day I became President, we have been committed in this administration to reinventing Government in all areas but especially in education. Our approach is not—and I repeat, is not—to micromanage anything. We have deregulated the Federal Government's role in education, in the public schools and elsewhere. We have worked to inspire reform at the grassroots level. We have recognized that our job is to define a road map, clear standards of excellence and then to work to empower everyone in this society to reach those standards through education, to support the educational institutions all across this country, to support the students and the families to help them to reach those standards of excellence.

Instead of defending the status quo, we have worked to change it. We've abolished 13 of the education programs we inherited. We have cut another 38 programs that we thought were less than essential. We have consolidated 70 more programs in the budget I have just sent to Congress. And all of this is designed to empower students and working people not educational bureaucrats, to help teachers to do their job not to help the Federal Government to regulate more.

Others have talked about such things, but our administration has actually cut over a quarter of a trillion dollars in Federal spending. We have reduced more than 300 domestic programs. We have eliminated more than 100,000 people from the Federal payroll, and we have used the savings from the payroll reduction to put 100,000 more police officers on our streets in community policing settings, not run by the Federal Government but people who work at the grassroots level on the problems they confront every day.

We are on our way, if no other law passes, to cutting more than a quarter of a million people from the Federal payroll and putting all those resources back into making our communities more secure. And the budget

I have just sent to Congress proposes another \$144 billion in spending cuts. But my strategy is eliminating yesterday's Government to meet the demands of today and tomorrow, to give us a leaner but not a meaner Government, to cut Government to reduce the deficit and to increase our investments in the future, in education, in technology, in research, things like Head Start and Goals 2000, and the defense conversion programs we supported, and the medical research programs we supported.

These things make us stronger as a people. They build opportunity, and they demand responsibility, and they are good for America. We should be discriminating in this work we are doing. We should move beyond rhetoric to reality. Let others talk about cutting spending. We have done it, and we'd like some more help. But we have to realize why we're doing it. We're doing it to lift the country up and bring the country together and move the country forward, not to find some way to divide us in a new and different way so we have more rhetoric, more hot air, and less progress. Let that be our commitment: to do better.

You know, now I admit that some in the new Republican Congress see education in another way. They think education at the national level is just another area to cut and gut. Their proposals will cut investments in our future and increase the cost of student loans to our neediest students to fund tax cuts for the wealthy. They will limit the availability to lower cost direct loans to middle class students to increase profits for the middleman in the student loans, even though that means a higher deficit. Indeed, the only thing they have proposed spending more money in education on are funds going to middlemen by limiting the amount of the direct loan program, by cutting it off, just as it's becoming more and more successful. And some of them don't want to reinvent the Department of Education as I have done to make it stronger and leaner and more effective. They want to abolish it altogether. Well, I think Dick Riley's worth the money. And so, I want you to know that to all of this, I will say, no. I will fight these proposals every step of the way. And I want you to join me in fighting them, too.

The fight for education is the fight for the American dream. It is the fight for America's middle class. It is the fight for the 21st century. It should therefore—and I emphasize—it should therefore be a bipartisan fight. When we passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act last year, drastically reducing regulation, emphasizing more help to poor children in need, giving teachers and school principals more flexibility, it had bipartisan support.

Look, I want to work with this new Republican Congress to help America. We support many of the same initiatives. I supported them when they passed the bill to apply to Congress all the laws they put on private employers. I have supported our common efforts to reduce the burden of unfunded mandates on State and local governments. I have supported giving more flexibility to the States in pursuing welfare reform and health care reform. I've supported the line-item veto. But we clearly have our differences.

Look at the student loan reforms. We eliminated the middlemen and got the funds directly to the schools and the borrowers which meant, unbelievably, lower fees, lower interest rates, easier repayment choices for students. It meant less paperwork, less red-tape, less bureaucracy to administer the programs for colleges and universities, and it meant much, much lower costs to the taxpayers.

Our proposal, when fully implemented, will save the taxpayers \$12 billion over a 6-year period, while lowering the cost of college loans to the student, and reducing the hassles to you. That is reinventing Government at its best. That is the new Democrat approach. It ought to be the new Republican approach, but instead, they want to cap these loans. I want to expand them. I want to include all the schools and all the students who want to be a part of this program by 1997. Your choice, but I'll be darned if I want to cut it off from you when I know that it will help you.

They want to pay for the tax cuts in their contract for America by eliminating the student loan subsidy so that we start charging interest on the loans to our poorest students while they're in college. That costs \$2 billion a year. That adds 20 percent on the average

to the cost of going to college for some of our neediest students to pay for tax cuts. It is not right. That would be the biggest cut in student financial aid in the history of the United States.

Our approach is to help students and their hard-working parents to cut bureaucracy, to reduce the deficit by not subsidizing non-competitive middlemen. I might add that those who wish to compete for student loans are now doing it in many places for lower costs than they were providing when the Government was giving them a lock-down guarantee because of the competition from the direct loan program.

Now, that is our approach. The other approach would increase the cost of education, would keep the bureaucracy and the redtape, and would increase the deficit by guaranteeing billions and billions more in no-risk funds to middlemen in the student loan system. It is wrong. It is wrong. And we should not stand for it. And I hope you won't stand for it. I hope you'll stand up and fight for it.

Now, as you well know—and I want to emphasize—we are not talking about a giveaway. This Department of Education has gotten tougher on enforcing laws against default. And the default rate has dropped by one-third. The net annual cost to the taxpayers has fallen by almost two-thirds since we have been in office, from \$2.8 billion to \$1 billion, because we're enforcing the laws against default. I think it is wrong to default on your student loan. This Department of Education has gotten tough with scam operators masquerading as higher education. And every one of you wanted us to do that. Now, with this progress, I hope we can continue to remove the regulatory burdens from many of the strong institutions with proven records of responsibility. That's what you want us to do. That's his valentine present to you.

But that's the way we ought to be doing this. Secretary Riley will work with you to find a better way of balancing the flexibility you want with our obligations to the taxpayers. But the point is, other people talk about this stuff, but when I showed up in town 2 years ago, I found a student loan program that was too costly, helping too few people, gave too few options to the borrowers with a redtape headache to you, and the tax-

payers were being ripped off. And we've tried to change it.

Now, when we proposed these direct student loans, our opponents and those who wanted to protect the status quo said that the Federal Government was completely incapable of administering a loan program. Well, they weren't right. They were wrong.

I got a letter that was sent to Terry Hartle by Jerome Supple, the president of Southwest Texas State in San Marcos. It's a big school now. It has 21,000 students. It distributes grants and loans in excess of \$23 million. President Supple wrote about what direct lending has meant to his school. He also wrote to me, but Dick Riley gave me this copy of his letter to Terry Hartle, and I like it better than what the speechwriters put in, so I'm going to write what he actually said. *[Laughter]*

This is what he said: "We are aware of the concern of some members of the financial community about the shift to direct lending and can understand the concern for a loss of revenue. However, the savings to the Government and the improved service to other students offered by direct lending are of greater importance. The other argument that the Federal Government cannot effectively administer such a program and must rely on the expertise of the private sector is counter to our experience."

Listen to this: "The results have more than met our expectations. We have gone from an institution that was scrambling to meet our students' need, often after classes have started, to an institution that was one of the first in the State to get awards out last fall, so early, in fact, that it had a positive effect on our admissions program.

"While the direct lending program must share some of the credit for the improvement of our financial aid services with our hard-working and talented staff"—there's a good politician—*[laughter]*—also true—"there is no doubt that direct lending allows us to serve our students better. And finally," he says, "it is legitimate to express concern about the ability of the Department of Education to manage the direct lending program at full capacity, but the experience to date suggests that it can do this very well. It is rare that the Federal Government creates a

program that both saves money and improves service to its constituents.”

Listen to what the students say. I got a letter from Marie Lyons, a 40-year-old student—rather more typical these days. She wrote to me to say that she had given up hope on going to college. But with our loan reforms, she’s been able to go to Murray State University in Kentucky, studying criminal justice. She’ll be the first person in her family to graduate from college.

You know, we can’t take hope away from people like Marie Lyons, and all the other people now that are flooding back into your institutions, into the community colleges, into the 4-year institutions, because they know—they’re way ahead of the politicians—they know what they need to do to make good lives for themselves, and they’re coming to you. They’re coming to you in record numbers. But people like that deserve the best opportunity we can give them. They are very responsible. They are working hard. They are people from all races and income groups and backgrounds with a million different life stories, but they are chasing a common dream. Because of people like that, we should not abolish the Department of Education, either. We should not do that.

You know, everybody talks about this being the information age. The White House and now the House of Representatives are in this little friendly contest to see who can do the most high-techy stuff on Internet, and call us on the computer and see what we have to offer, read the administration’s budget. But if this is true, if the new economy really is based more than ever before on knowledge and skills, we have to do more of education. And undercutting education at this time, saying that this is not a national concern, that would be like undercutting the Department of Defense during the cold war. We won the cold war because we stayed strong. And we will win the fight for our own future and a place in the 21st century if we stay strong with education. That is what we should do.

You know our future depends upon it. You know, as President, as has already been said, I’ve worked pretty hard for us to do well in this new war for the minds and hearts of our people and for the future. And I do think one of the smartest things I ever did was to

appoint Dick Riley as the Secretary of Education. One of the reasons is, I find that once you become President, sometimes people, even people you think know you very well all of a sudden don’t really tell you what’s on their minds. It drives me nuts since I don’t mind hearing what’s on people’s minds. Sometimes they don’t want to hear what’s on mine in return when they tell me, but it’s okay. [*Laughter*] But one of the things you need to know about the Secretary of Education is, we’ve been friends since I was barely old enough to shave. He always tells me what’s on his mind—[*laughter*]—and what’s on his mind is you and your students and the future of this country.

So I’ll say again, we’re cutting inessential education programs. We’ve saved more money by going to the direct student loans than they can save by cutting out the people who work at the Department of Education. Who are we trying to kid here? He is worth the investment; the other people who work there are worth the investment.

We are not running education, but we are trying to energize it and create opportunity and shine a light to the future. This is a classic battle, and we ought to fight it and win it together, not just the battle to save the Department of Education, not just a battle for the direct loan program, not just a battle against increasing the cost of student loans, but the larger issue, and I will say again, this ought to be a bipartisan battle that we fight so that we can meet our responsibility to prepare our children for the 21st century and so that we can make the most of our own lives.

For 2 years, we have done everything we could do to prepare our people for the new economy. Last year when I came before you, I presented a comprehensive agenda for life-long learning. I’m proud to report that with the last Congress, we did produce a tremendously successful record in achieving that agenda. We reformed Head Start and expanded it by 30,000 more children. And next year, I want to expand it again by at least that many. That’s why we’re cutting inessential programs, not only to reduce the deficit but to put the money where the people need it. I think the taxpayers want the Head Start program expanded.

We passed the Goals 2000 program, and for the first time we spell out a national understanding of what our young people must learn to compete in the world. This goes right to the heart of the whole approach of the national role in education, not trying to tell people how to teach or regulate how they spend every day and every hour or control them through a blizzard of paperwork but to set national standards and then give State and local governments the control, the power, the opportunity, and, where we can, the resources to get the job done, to give them the flexibility through waivers of complex Federal rules and reforms like charter schools and public school choice. And to do it with no new Federal regulations to diminish State and local control. I'm proud of that.

The way we're running that program is the way the Federal Government ought to relate to the States in the area of public education. We are raising the bar for everyone. All of our young people are going to have to do better. I think we all know that. All of our parents and grandparents are going to have to help our young people to do better. All of you in this room now accept as a truism that we have the best higher education system in the world, but that we have to do better in our school systems K-12, and we are all going to have to teach to higher standards, to work to higher standards, to learn to higher standards.

Our communities, our businesses, they're going to have to pitch in and do more. And our young people, we know—and let me say this with all sincerity and convictions—we know that too many of them are still trying to learn in atmospheres that are too dominated by violence and drugs. If they can't walk down the halls or learn in the classrooms because they're afraid for their safety, then all the reforms will not be successful. That's why making our school environment safe and disciplined and drug-free are important to all the other standards being achieved, and why we have worked so hard in this administration and in this Department of Education to make sure that all of our legislative efforts included the safe schools initiatives.

You know, some young people—I ought to emphasize, too, because I know who all is out here—don't plan to go on to 4-year

colleges. And that's fine. If they don't plan to do that, we also have to make sure that they have the academic strength and skills they need to compete.

That's what our school-to-work opportunities act was all about, to reinvent the relationship of high school to the world of work and the work of post-high school education with high standards that enable our students to learn in class and to begin to reach out into the real world. Along with their classroom learnings, they are learning real jobs, dealing with real people, and we expect them to go on for some post-high school education as well.

We're not doing this with a big national bureaucracy. We're doing it with grants and advice and help and support to let every State set up a flexible network, working with employers and schools and the post-secondary educational institutions to make sure that we fill this enormous gap in the American system. There are too many of our young people still who, neither get a 4-year college degree or at least have a good school-to-work transition the way many of our competitors do.

These reforms, every one of them, will make sure that more capable students are coming into your institutions, which means you'll have to spend less time bringing them up to speed. I know that would be a relief to all of you. A lot of us have been working on it for years and years, but I believe it will make a difference.

Something else we did last year that I'm very proud of that two or three of you have already mentioned to me today is our national service program, AmeriCorps. It already has 20,000 Americans taking responsibility for improving their country at the grassroots level and earning some money to go to school. It is a very, very important thing for this country, and I am very proud of it.

Americans like the 16 members at the University of California at Berkeley, who have 750 of their classmates tutoring middle school students and helping four local police departments set up neighborhood watch programs. Now, that's just one example of hundreds I could give you of what a modest Federal investment can do to get a big result. Eighty-nine members of AmeriCorps in

Texas immunized—listen to this—104,000 infants in Texas two summers ago.

In Simpson County, Kentucky, AmeriCorps members are teaching second-graders to read, and they've already raised the reading levels there from 2 years behind the official standard to 1 year ahead of it. Now again, some people in the new Republican Congress say that AmeriCorps is a waste of money, bribing people to do service, an expensive way to send people to college. I say it's about the best thing that's happened to this country in a long time. I'm going to fight to keep it, and I hope you'll fight for that, too. And for all of you that have had AmeriCorps projects on your campuses and with your students, I thank you, and I hope more of you will ask to do it.

We've got a lot more work to do. We have to protect the Pell grants, and as Juliet said, my budget raises the maximum grant by 12 percent. We all know the Pell grant program got in trouble, and we had to make it solvent again, and it hasn't kept up with the economy. But this is a good step in the right direction.

We've got to preserve the work-study program, the other campus-based programs that we all know are important to the students on your campuses. And we've got to keep moving forward on university-based research with expanded investments and less redtape. I do not believe that it is the right thing to do to take universities out of the partnerships we now see forming. In defense conversion, for example, where we are doing remarkable things with the decline of the defense budget, taking some of that decline and putting it into partnerships between universities and private companies with some Federal investment and a whole lot of private investment. Again, there are some in the new Congress who say, let's get rid of all that. That's our competitive edge, research, development, mind work, making connections, moving forward.

All of this is an agenda that works. In his state of American education address earlier this month, to which Secretary Riley alluded, he said that America is turning the corner from being a nation at risk in education to being a nation on the move. Well, you've got my word: I will fight for the education and

training reforms that will keep us on the move. And I want you to fight for them, too, and we will win because the American people are for us.

Now, that's why I have proposed this middle class bill of rights, because I want to emphasize what we still have to do. We can't just preserve what we've got. We've got to keep going forward. All over this country there are people who are saying, "Well, I read about this recovery, and I know we've got 6 million new jobs, but it's not affecting me. I still feel insecure and uncertain, and I haven't gotten a raise. The middle class bill of rights, I think should be called the bill of rights and responsibilities because, like all the other things we've been talking about today, you can't take advantage of it unless you act responsibly. It does offer a tax cut for people, but only if they're behaving responsibly, raising their children, educating themselves or their children.

From your point of view, the most important parts of it are a tax deduction for the cost of education after high school; an IRA that you can withdraw from tax-free for education and for other purposes like buying a health insurance policy; and the collapse of 70 of the Government's training programs into a program which a person who's eligible for Federal training help because he or she is unemployed or working for a very low wage can draw on and just take the money, up to \$2,600 a year, to an institution of his or her choice, getting around the Federal bureaucracy, getting around all the programs and going direct to a lot of you.

Now, this is a good thing, and I thank you for endorsing it. But I need your help to make it happen. Why is it a good thing? It's a good thing, first of all, because it will lower the cost of living for hard-working people who have gotten no benefit out of this recovery yet. But instead of just giving them a quick fix, it lowers their cost of living because it increases their standard of living over the long run by putting the money into education. It is the right way to give tax relief to the middle class. It is consistent with long-term control of the deficit. It is consistent with a commitment to long-term economic growth. And I ask each of you to do what you do best now—to help teach people about

this, to talk about it; because this resolution is really nice, but what we really need is for every Member of Congress to hear from every college president, every dean of students, every member of every board of trustees, every student body president, every student organization in the country, "Hey, don't take the interest subsidy away." "Hey, don't stop us from getting the direct loans." "Hey, pass the middle class bill of rights."

Education is the key to our future. It ought not to be a partisan issue. If there is one thing in the wide world that ought to unite us on the way to the next century, it should be our common commitment to explode the potential of our people. I need your help. I want your help. You can do it. But the resolution has to be a first step, not the last step. Be heard in every office of every Member of Congress in the United States, and we will have a great victory. I need you. I want you to do it. I'm confident you will.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:45 a.m. in the Hyatt Regency Embarcadero Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Juliet Garcia, chair, Franklyn Jenifer, incoming chair, and Terry Hartle, vice president for government relations, American Council on Education.

Remarks at San Bernardino Valley College in San Bernardino, California

February 14, 1995

Thank you for that wonderful, wonderful welcome. Thank you, Dr. Singer, for your introduction. I know the Secretary of Education, Secretary Riley, has already spoken. I'm glad to be here with him. And I thank the mayor for being here and Dr. Bundy. And let's give the Etiwanda High School Band a hand. Didn't they do a great job? Great job. Thank you. When I heard them playing "Hail to the Chief" outside I thought they'd transported the Marine Band from the White House here, they were so great. They were great.

I'd also like to recognize a couple of other groups that are here. First of all, I want to thank the members of our national service program, AmeriCorps, who are here. They're

over there. And I want to thank a representative group of incredible people who just spent about an hour with me, talking to me about this institution, how it has affected their lives and your community and the remarkable partnerships that are being made and the dreams that are being made to come true. I'd like for all the people who were just in the little roundtable discussion with me to be recognized. They're over here somewhere. Where are they? There they are. [Applause] Thank you. They were great. I feel that I know a lot more about you now because I listened to all of them, and believe me, they put you all in a very good light.

I want to talk to you today about the importance of this community college and education in general, not only to your future but to the future of our country, what it means and what we should be doing about it. I met a lot of folks already here today that represent what I think America is all about, people who are coming together around the idea of education without regard to their race, their income, their background, what country they were born in, what situation they're in now just because they want to make the most of their own lives and make a contribution, live up to the fullest of their God-given abilities. And I really think that's what we ought to be supporting.

The reason I worked so hard for the national service program that you see all these young people in is because I believe that we ought to be helping young people to find ways to earn money for education and contribute to the strength of their communities at the same time.

I ran for President because I was worried, as we come to the close of this great century, that we wouldn't be able to guarantee the American dream for all people moving into the 21st century and we wouldn't be able to make sure America was the strongest country in the world, and I believe those are the two jobs the President has to do. And I believe the way we should do that is what I have called the New Covenant. We should create more opportunity; we should insist on more responsibility from all of us; and we should work to build our communities at the grassroots level, where the real strength of America is.

Now, there's been a lot of debate in our country now in two separate elections, in 1992 and 1994, about what the role of Government is and whether Government is bad or good inherently. My answer to you is that we need a different kind of Government for the 21st century and that your National Government has three major jobs. One is, we should expand opportunity while shrinking the Federal bureaucracy and the burden it imposes. Two, we should recognize that the Government can't support everybody, but it should work to empower people to make the most of their own lives. And three, we should work to enhance the security Americans feel not only in terms of what goes on beyond our borders but here at home as well. More opportunity, more empowerment, more security: that is what we should be about in the National Government.

Now, if you look at what this national service project does, they're working in the San Bernardino forest, people who are helping to clean up the forest, maintain it, strengthen it, keep it there for our children and our grandchildren, make sure it's an important resource. Last year there were 89 young people in this program in south Texas who immunized 102,000 infants to help them live. And all of them earned money on their education. Sixteen of these young people work at Berkeley, helping 750 of their classmates to tutor middle-school students. These are the kinds of things that are going on all over America, and I think it emphasizes what I'm saying. For a small amount of Federal money we have increased opportunity with no bureaucracy. This is all done at the grassroots level.

We have certainly empowered these young people to make more of their own lives, and we are clearly going to be a stronger country because we have more people getting an education and more people preserving the environment, making our kids healthier, making our country stronger at the grassroots level. That is what I am trying to do. And I want to talk to you today about what that means for education in general, and especially for community colleges like this one, which are the key to the future of the American economy and the ability to preserve the American dream for all people.

Let me give you an example of what we're trying to do in another area on security, and then I'll come back to education, because I want to make sure that you understand exactly how I'm thinking about this. I welcome the call of the new Republicans in the Congress to cut the Government, but I—now, wait a minute, you all don't get into a partisan fight already; wait until the end of the speech. *[Laughter]* For the last 2 years, we've been doing it without any help. I'd like some help. I'd like some help. But what is the purpose of this? That's what I want you to think about.

Now, there are now over 100,000 fewer people working for the Federal Government than there were the day I took office. We have shrunk the Federal Government. If they don't pass a single law this year, we will reduce the size of the Federal Government by over a quarter of a million because of the budgets adopted in the first 2 years of my term, and we'll make the Federal Government the smallest it's been since John Kennedy was President.

Now, what do we do with the money? What are we doing with the money? We cut, already, over \$600 billion from the deficit, and we're going to cut more. I've just sent a budget to the Congress that cuts more spending from the deficit. What are we doing with the money? We propose, first, to reduce the deficit and, secondly, to increase investments in the areas that I mentioned: to increase investments that would create more opportunities, jobs; that would empower people more, education; and that would enhance security, things like the crime bill.

If you just take the crime bill, for example, I said when I ran for President—I came to California and campaigned—"Vote for me, and I will reduce the size of the Federal bureaucracy by 100,000 and we'll put another 100,000 police officers on the street." And that's exactly what we've done, except we reduced the size of the Federal Government by 270,000 and used it to pay for police officers, prisons, and prevention. We passed that crime bill last year with a bipartisan majority. After 6 years of partisan haggling and scrapping around and people throwing words at each other, we actually passed a bill. And since October, we have put—but I only was

there a year and a half, you understand—*[laughter]*—but since October, we've put 16,000 police officers out, 16,000.

And we've got 17 right here in San Bernardino, new police officers. Listen to this, we did it with a one-page form, eight questions that could be faxed in; nobody had to hire consultants. And of all the communities in America with police officers, every size, including those with just one, one-half of all the communities in America have already applied for help under this program because it's a good program, it works, and there's no hassle in it. That's the kind of Government we ought to have, a leaner, not a meaner Government that makes sense and makes people more secure. We're under budget, ahead of schedule, moving forward.

It took 6 years to pass the bill. I started working on it when I got elected; we got it done. In only 6 weeks of this new Congress, the new majority in the House of Representatives is trying to wipe out the crime bill and pass two block grants, to cut back on the money that goes to police and to prevention, to put it all in one package, send it to the States and say, you all do whatever you want to with it, and to put more money into the prison system. Now, here's the interesting thing—wait a minute, don't get into a partisan fight, just listen to me make my piece. *[Laughter]* Every police organization in the country, including those that are overwhelmingly Republican, has endorsed our position to leave it alone and let it work. This is not a partisan issue.

So the people in the House said, "I don't care what the police said. I don't care what the people working in the community said. I don't care what the evidence shows. This is what we're going to do. We're determined not to spend any money on prevention. If the States want to do it and not put police on the streets, that's their business. And here's the money, build the prisons, or else." Now, what I believe is that we still have a chance to keep this a bipartisan issue. And I'm going to do my best to go into the Senate and to work with people who understand law enforcement, who will listen to people who are out here on the streets every day trying to save these kids and save our communities and save our streets and keep this bill intact

so we can put the police on the street and have the prevention programs.

But I will not—I will reiterate what I said Saturday—if I have to, I will veto any bill that attempts to undermine the commitment that we made last year after 6 years. But it need not be a partisan issue. It ought to be an American issue. And that's what I say to you about education. What are we going to do in this day and time? What is our job in Washington that affects you way out here in the Inland Empire when it comes to education? What is our job when it comes to helping to raise middle class incomes and let people in the underclass work themselves into the middle class? What is our job, and what is the problem?

You know, if anybody told me 2 years ago that we would be able, in the space of 2 years, to bring the deficit down over \$600 billion and have a hand in creating almost 6 million new jobs, I would have been very happy to hear that. In 1994, we had the best year for economic growth in a decade and the first year in a long time when all 50 States, including California that's been through so much, had economic growth. What is the problem?

The problem is, a whole lot of people have jobs but their incomes aren't going up. They don't feel secure at work. They're afraid they can't keep their health insurance, or they don't have it now. We had 8.5 million people worried about their retirement until we passed a reform of the retirement guaranty system late last year. So in this global economy the good news is, there are more people in America becoming millionaires than ever before. That's good news. The good news is, there are more people with an education doing exciting things than ever before. The bad news is, if you don't have the skills you need, you can work harder and harder and harder for less and less and less, right?

So when you have a good news-bad news story, you have two choices. You can tell a joke about it, but if you're President, that doesn't seem to be a particularly good option. *[Laughter]* The other choice you have is to try to make more good news and less bad news. And the only way to do that, I would argue to you, is to make sure we give all of our people access to the education and training they need to compete and win in this

global economy, so when they work harder, they'll be rewarded for it and not punished for it. That is what we have to do.

Now, I want you to focus with me just for a minute, therefore, on two big issues, what we ought to do in this year and what we should not do. I think we ought to give some tax relief to hardworking middle class people who haven't felt the benefit of the recovery. But the question is, what kind, and will we pay for it? I do not think we should increase the Federal deficit. That's been a big problem. We've gotten it down. We ought to keep bringing it down, not exploding it.

Secondly, I think that the best tax relief is embodied in what I call the middle class bill of rights because it rewards work and family. It gives tax relief for people raising young children, and it gives tax relief for the cost of all education after high school, which I think is important. You think about it, you can deduct the cost of interest on your home if you have a home. But in the information age, if you don't have an education, you may never get to a home. So why shouldn't we let people deduct their education costs? It's a good investment. We also propose to let more people get an IRA, an individual retirement account, and withdraw from it tax-free for the cost of education. I think that's what we ought to be doing.

And finally, I had a lot of questions earlier about unemployment; one gentleman talked about his father being unemployed. We have scores of different Federal training programs that you have to wonder, are you really qualified for or not? And what we propose to do is to create a GI bill for America's workers by taking 70 of these programs, putting them in one big pot and saying, "If you're unemployed or if you're working for a really low wage and you're eligible for Federal help, instead of having to figure out how to enroll in one of these programs, qualify. We'll send you a voucher. Show up at this community college. We'll send them a check." That's the way it ought to be done.

We're also taking the savings from cutting out all of these programs. In the Education Department alone, Secretary Riley has abolished 13 programs, reduced 38 others, and consolidated 70 more, in the Education Department. We took the savings and put it into

more funds for Head Start, more funds for apprenticeship programs for people who don't go on to 4-year colleges.

I met a young woman today and a police officer who is working with her, who's in one of these programs that we now see people desperately trying to set up all over the country, training young people in high school, giving them work experience, letting them see what it's like, giving them a chance to look forward to a job in the workplace.

You know, not everybody has to go to a 4-year college, but everybody needs to get out of high school and have access to at least 2 years of further education. And one way to do it is to abolish the artificial distinction between learning and work by bringing the workplace into the school, the education into the workplace, and doing it everywhere in America. So we've put some more money into that.

The other thing we have sought to do is to make available college loans on better repayment terms and lower costs to more people, through the so-called direct loan program.

This is an amazing thing. I want you all to—this is an amazing thing. When I became President, I discovered that we were spending about \$3 billion a year in your money because of people defaulting on their college loans. I discovered we were spending a fortune because the college loan program was a guarantee program. So you'd go to a bank, and if you qualified, the bank would give you a note. And if you didn't pay it back, we'd give them the money. So they didn't have much incentive to see that you paid it back, because we were going to give them the money.

And we discovered if we started loaning the money to people directly, these good things would happen if it could be properly managed. We discovered we could loan the money sometimes at lower interest rates and always at lower fees. We discovered that we could give people a lot of options about how they repaid it so that when you get out of school if you take a job that doesn't pay much money and you've got a lot of loans, you could pay it off as a percentage of your income instead of having to pay an amount you couldn't afford to pay. We discovered we

could cut the bureaucratic paperwork and hassle for the colleges by more than half. And we discovered, miracle of miracles, if we didn't have to pay a middleman and we started collecting on these student loans, we could actually lower the cost to the taxpayers.

It almost doesn't make sense: lower costs to students, lower costs to taxpayers. But this plan has already saved in the budget about \$5 billion, and if we can send it to all colleges and universities in the country, it can lower the deficit by \$12 billion and lower the cost of loans to every student in America with a student loan. That's one of the most important things we have done, and we need to do it.

Now, here's the political problem that you need to be a part of. We're having a big debate up there: Everybody wants to cut the size of Government, everybody wants to reduce the deficit, and everybody has got a different idea for a tax cut. But some people in the new Congress believe that one of the ways they can reduce the deficit is by increasing the cost of student loans to people who don't have to pay interest on the loan while they're in school now. You know about the loan subsidy; a lot of you are probably eligible for that. That will add 20 percent to the cost of student loans.

I'm against it. That is not the way to cut the budget. That is not the way to pay for a tax cut, to increase the cost of going to college to people. We need more people going to college at lower costs, not fewer people going to college at higher costs. And I hope you will support that.

The other idea—this is unbelievable to me—is we got this program working to lower the deficit, lower the cost of student loans, and there are some people in the Congress who want to limit the number of students in this country who can get these direct loans to 40 percent of the colleges in America. Why? Because the people that are in the middle who get the money don't like losing it. I mean, it's not a bad deal: I loan you money; you don't pay me back; I get a check from the Government. But it didn't work very well.

Secretary Riley, since he's been there as Secretary of Education, has cut the cost to the taxpayers of college loan defaults from

\$2.8 billion a year to \$1 billion a year. We're collecting the loans. We're doing it right, and we ought to keep going.

So what I want to ask you to do is, without regard to your party, and maybe—especially if you have never voted before—I want to tell you something: You've got a big stake in this debate that's going on in Washington. And it is a good and healthy debate in some ways. We do need a less bureaucratic, more creative, more entrepreneurial, more flexible Government in Washington as we move into the 21st century. We do need more responsibility put down to the State and local levels. What's the best institution you know? The community college. Nobody from Washington is telling you what programs to have, what to do, who to sign up for—nobody. You're doing this. It's a community-created institution. We do need to change the nature of the Federal Government. We do have to keep cutting Federal spending.

But the key to our future is whether we educate everybody so we don't need to cut investment in education, and we do need to do things, I will say again, that enhance security, empower people to make the most of their own lives, and expand opportunity. That is education, education, education. We should not turn back on it.

Thank you very much. God bless you. We need your help. Please support it. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:45 p.m. in the Snyder Gymnasium. In his remarks, he referred to Dr. Don Singer, president, San Bernardino Valley College; Mayor Tom Minor of San Bernardino; and Stuart Bundy, chancellor, San Bernardino Community College District.

Interview With Dick Enberg of NBC Sports in Palm Springs, California *February 15, 1995*

Mr. Enberg. Well, a historic foursome. How do you put this group together to play a game of golf?

Bob Hope. Well, it's damned lucky, I think, you know. Because I called President Clinton and asked him, and he finally said, "Yes, I'd like to do that." Then I got President Ford, President Bush, and we got—and

me. Three Presidents and a hacker. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Enberg. Mr. Clinton, your ambitions as a golfer—have you set any goals?

President Clinton. I'm just trying to get my handicap in single digits. That's my goal. It seems unlikely in my present position. But I love to play, and I was gratified when Bob called me the other day. He said that he liked my State of the Union Address, but I could speak a lot better if I come out here and played in his tournament. It would put me in a better frame of mind.

Mr. Enberg. You're without your 35-year-old putter. I hope the rumors aren't true that Mr. Ford confiscated that. [*Laughter*]

President Gerald R. Ford. Well, Dick, I've played here 17 years with Bob, and it's always a great, great thrill. He's kind of a scoundrel, but he's fun to play with, and it's a great cause.

Mr. Enberg. And your thoughts, Mr. Bush?

President George Bush. Just to try to get it in the air. [*Laughter*]

President Clinton. We're going to try to stay out of—we're going to avoid out of bounds, he and I are. We're not going to go too far right or too far left. We're going to play political golf today. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Enberg. Have you been in this close an association in recent terms, or have you played before?

President Clinton. We've never played golf together before, but President Bush has been good enough to support a lot of things we've done together on trade and issues, for example, things he started that I tried to finish. So we've been together on several occasions.

Mr. Enberg. Any interesting wagers as you go around today?

President Bush. I don't know. We haven't gotten to that.

President Clinton. We're on the same side. We want somebody to bet with us and these other foursomes.

Mr. Enberg. Well, how about that on this side?

President Ford. Well, Bob and I will take the young fellows on. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Hope. Yes, sir.

Mr. Enberg. Well, Mr. Hope, this event becomes bigger and better every year. It's a great testimony to your love for—

Mr. Hope. Well, I'll tell you, we've drawn a crowd here today. I don't remember seeing anything like this. It's a beautiful thing to have happen for golf, you know, because you can't do any better.

President Clinton. Absolutely.

Mr. Enberg. Isn't it interesting that in these complicated times, this sport brings this unusual group together?

President Clinton. One of the nicest things about golf is that it's really becoming a sport for every man and woman in America. All kinds of people, all these new courses coming up, public courses, people able to play who never could have played 10, 20 years ago. And that's very rewarding, because it's a sport that you can play throughout your life and at all different skill levels. It's really a perfect sport for our people.

Mr. Enberg. Well, you gentlemen are used to high pressure. I can't think of anything in sports that has more anxiety and pressure than that first hit. [*Laughter*]

President Clinton. We are nervous as cats. We were just talking about it. We're just as nervous as we can be. [*Laughter*]

President Ford. Dick, I would advise people they should stay behind us. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Enberg. Gentlemen, thank you very much, President Bush, President Clinton.

President Clinton. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The interview was taped at 9:56 a.m. for later broadcast at the Indian Wells Country Club where the President participated in the Bob Hope Chrysler Classic golf tournament. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Proclamation 6770—National Poison Prevention Week, 1995

February 15, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Children are the future of our country, and protecting them is America's most sacred responsibility. All of us—government leaders,

citizens, parents—are bound to do whatever we can to keep them safe and healthy. Simple safety measures—such as using child-resistant packaging correctly, locking cupboards, keeping prescriptions and cleaning supplies out of the reach of a child's hands—all can protect our most precious resource from the dangers of poison and other hazardous substances.

The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) has made great progress in safeguarding our young people by mandating child-resistant packaging for medicine and dangerous chemicals. And the invaluable work of the Nation's poison control centers has saved countless lives, both young and old. These public health efforts have reduced childhood poisoning deaths from 450 in 1961 to 62 in 1991.

However, according to the American Association of Poison Control Centers, nearly 1 million children each year are exposed to potentially poisonous medicines and household chemicals. Every year we lose children to poisoning—and almost all of these poisonings are preventable. This week—and every week—we must rededicate ourselves to informing everyone of the importance of prevention and to educating all caregivers about ways to prevent childhood poisonings.

To encourage the American people to learn more about the dangers of accidental poisonings and to take more preventive measures, the Congress, by Public Law 87-319 (75 Stat. 681), has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation designating the third week of March of each year as "National Poison Prevention Week."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week beginning March 19, 1995, as National Poison Prevention Week. I call upon all Americans to observe this week by participating in appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:17 a.m., February 16, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on February 17.

Statement on Petroleum Imports and Energy Security

February 16, 1995

I am today concurring with the Department of Commerce's finding that the Nation's growing reliance on imports of crude oil and refined petroleum products threaten the Nation's security because they increase U.S. vulnerability to oil supply interruptions. I also concur with the Department's recommendation that the administration continue its present efforts to improve U.S. energy security, rather than to adopt a specific import adjustment mechanism.

This action responds to a petition under Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which was filed by the Independent Petroleum Association of America and others on March 11, 1994. The act gives the President the authority to adjust imports if they are determined to pose a threat to national security. The petitioners sought such action, claiming that U.S. dependence on oil imports had grown since the Commerce Department last studied the issue in response to a similar, 1988 petition.

In conducting its study, the Department led an interagency working group that included the Departments of Energy, Interior, Defense, Labor, State, and Treasury, the Office of Management and Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the U.S. Trade Representative. The Commerce Department also held public hearings and invited public comment. Following White House receipt of the Commerce Department's report, the National Economic Council coordinated additional interagency review.

As in the case of its earlier study, the Commerce Department found that the potential costs to the national security of an oil import adjustment, such as an import tariff, outweigh the potential benefits. Instead, the Department recommended that the administration continue its current policies, which are aimed at increasing the Nation's energy secu-

rity through a series of energy supply enhancement and conservation and efficiency measures designed to limit the Nation's dependence on imports. Those measures include:

- Increased investment in energy efficiency.
- Increased investment in alternative fuels.
- Increased Government investment in technology, to lower costs and improve production of gas and oil and other energy sources.
- Expanded utilization of natural gas.
- Increased Government investment in renewable energy sources.
- Increased Government regulatory efficiency.
- Increased emphasis on free trade and U.S. exports.
- Maintenance of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.
- Coordination of emergency cooperation measures.

Finally, led by the Department of Energy and the National Economic Council, the administration will continue its efforts to develop additional cost-effective policies to enhance domestic energy production and to revitalize the U.S. petroleum industry.

Message to the Congress on the Proliferation of Chemical and Biological Weapons

February 16, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

On November 16, 1990, in light of the dangers of the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons, President Bush issued Executive Order No. 12735, and declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*). Under section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), the national emergency terminates on the anniversary date of its declaration unless the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice of its continuation.

On November 14, 1994, I issued Executive Order No. 12938, which revoked and super-

seded Executive Order No. 12735. As I described in the report transmitting Executive Order No. 12938, the new Executive order consolidates the functions of Executive Order No. 12735, which declared a national emergency with respect to the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons, and Executive Order No. 12930, which declared a national emergency with respect to nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and their means of delivery. The new Executive order continued in effect any rules, regulations, orders, licenses, or other forms of administrative action taken under the authority of Executive order No. 12735. This is the final report with respect to Executive Order No. 12735.

This report is made pursuant to section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act regarding activities taken and money spent pursuant to the emergency declaration. Additional information on chemical and biological weapons proliferation is contained in the annual report to the Congress provided pursuant to the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991.

The three export control regulations issued under the Enhanced Proliferation Control Initiative are fully in force and continue to be used to control the export of items with potential use in chemical or biological weapons (CBW) or unmanned delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction.

During the final 6 months of Executive Order No. 12735, the United States continued to address actively in its international diplomatic efforts the problem of the proliferation and use of CBW.

At the termination of Executive Order No. 12735, 158 nations had signed the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and 16 had ratified it. On November 23, 1993, I submitted the CWC to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification. The United States continues to press for prompt ratification of the Convention to enable its entry into force as soon as possible. We also continue to urge those countries that have not signed the Convention to do so. The United States has remained actively engaged in the work of the CWC Preparatory Commission headquartered in The Hague, to elaborate the tech-

nical and administrative procedures for implementing the Convention.

The United States was an active participant in the Special Conference of States Parties, held September 19–30, 1994, to review the consensus final report of the Ad Hoc Group of experts mandated by the Third Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) Review conference. The Special Conference produced a mandate to establish an Ad Hoc Group whose objective is to develop a legally binding instrument to strengthen the effectiveness and improve the implementation of the BWC. The United States strongly supports the development of a legally binding protocol to strengthen the Convention.

The United States maintained its active participation in the Australia Group (AG), which welcomed the Czech Republic, Poland, and Slovakia as the 26th, 27th, and 28th AG members, respectively. The Group reaffirmed members' collective belief that full adherence to the CWC and the BWC provides the only means to achieve a permanent global ban on CBW, and that all states adhering to these conventions have an obligation to ensure that their national activities support these goals.

The AG also reiterated its conviction that harmonized AG export licensing measures are consistent with and indeed actively support, the requirement under Article I of the CWC that States Parties never assist, in any way, the manufacture of chemical weapons. These measures also are consistent with the undertaking in Article XI of the CWC to facilitate the fullest possible exchange of chemical materials and related information for purposes not prohibited by the Convention, as they focus solely on preventing assistance to activities banned under the CWC. Similarly, such efforts also support existing non-proliferation obligations under the BWC.

The United States Government determined that one foreign individual and two foreign commercial entities—respectively, Nahum Manbar, and Mana International Investments and Europol Holding Ltd.—had engaged in chemical weapons proliferation activities that required the imposition of trade sanctions against them, effective on July 16, 1994. A separate determination was made and sanctions imposed against Alberto

di Salle, an Italian national, effective on August 19, 1994. Additional information on these determinations will be contained in a classified report to the Congress, provided pursuant to the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991.

Pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, I report that there were no expenses directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency in Executive Order No. 12735 during the period from November 16, 1990, through November 14, 1994.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 16, 1995.

Message to the Congress on the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction

February 16, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

On September 29, 1994, in Executive Order No. 12930, I declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States posed by the continued proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and their means of delivery. Specifically, this order provided necessary authority under the Enhanced Proliferation Control Initiative (EPCI), as provided in the Export Administration Regulations, set forth in Title 15, Chapter VII, Subchapter C, of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 768 to 799 inclusive, to continue to regulate the activities of United States persons in order to prevent their participation in activities that could contribute to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means.

I issued Executive Order No. 12930 pursuant to the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America, including the IEEPA, the National Emergencies Act (NEA) (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3 of

the United States Code. At that time, I also submitted a report to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of the IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)).

Executive Order No. 12930 was revoked by Executive Order No. 12938 of November 14, 1994. Executive Order No. 12938 consolidates a number of authorities and eliminated certain redundant authorities. All authorities contained in Executive Order No. 12930 were transferred to Executive Order No. 12938.

Section 204 of the IEEPA requires follow-up reports, with respect to actions or changes, to be submitted every 6 months. Additionally, section 401(c) of the NEA requires that the President: (1) within 90 days after the end of each 6-month period following a declaration of a national emergency, report to the Congress on the total expenditures directly attributable to that declaration; or (2) within 90 days after the termination of an emergency, transmit a final report to the Congress on all expenditures. This report, covering the period from September 29, 1994, to November 14, 1994, is submitted in compliance with these requirements.

Since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12930, the Department of Commerce has continued to administer and enforce the provisions contained in the Export Administration Regulations concerning activities by United States persons that may contribute to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and missiles. In addition, the Department of Commerce has conducted ongoing outreach to educate concerned communities regarding these restrictions. Regulated activities may include financing, servicing, contracting, or other facilitation of missile or weapons projects, and need not be linked to exports or reexports of U.S.-origin items. No applications for licenses to engage in such activities were received during the period covered by this report.

No expenses directly attributable to the exercise of powers or authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency in Executive Order No. 12930 were incurred by the Federal Government in the period

from September 29, 1994, to November 14, 1994.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
February 16, 1995.

**Announcement of Appointment for
Assistant to the President and
Director of Political Affairs**
February 16, 1995

White House Chief of Staff Leon E. Panetta announced today that the President has named Douglas B. Sosnik as Assistant to the President and Director of Political Affairs.

"Doug has spent his career in politics and Government at the national level," the President said. "His combination of White House, congressional—both House and Senate—and political experience will serve the administration well."

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

**Remarks at a Memorial Service for
J. William Fulbright**
February 17, 1995

Mrs. Fulbright, the children and grandchildren of Senator Fulbright, all of his family and friends here assembled, we come to celebrate and give thanks for the remarkable life of J. William Fulbright, a life that changed our country and our world forever and for the better. In the work he did, the words he spoke and the life he lived, Bill Fulbright stood against the 20th century's most destructive forces and fought to advance its brightest hopes.

He was the heir of Jefferson in our time. He believed in the American idea, but he respected others who saw the world differently. He lived with passion tempered by reason. He loved politics, but cautioned against the arrogance of power. He cherished education as the answer to our common problems and our personal dreams. But he knew there would always be more to learn.

Time and again for 32 years as a Congressman, a Senator, Chairman of the Foreign Re-

lations Committee, he worked for progress and peace, often against great odds and sometimes at great personal cost, expanding opportunities for the people of his beloved Arkansas and other Americans who needed help to make the most of their lives, leading the way to found the United Nations, taking a long, lonely stand against Joseph McCarthy, expanding the reach of our culture as the driving force behind the Kennedy Center, fighting to change our course in Vietnam, reminding us that the forces of freedom would win the cold war if we could avoid nuclear war, what he called his generation's power of veto over the next, and of course, in a cold dawn only 2 weeks after Hiroshima, calling for the creation of the international exchange program that will live as his most profound legacy.

The Fulbright Scholarship Program is a perfect example of Bill Fulbright's faith, different kinds of people learning side by side, building what he called "a capacity for empathy, a distaste for killing other men, and an inclination for peace." Next year will be the 50th anniversary of that program. Now it includes as its alumni Nobel Prize winners, Members of Congress, leaders for peace and freedom the world over, and many not so famous people who went home to live out the faith of Senator Fulbright, more than 120,000 from other countries have come here and more than 90,000 Americans have gone overseas to study, to learn, and to grow. No matter what their native tongue, all of them are now known by the same name, Fulbrights.

In a way, a lot of us here, especially those of us from Arkansas and those who worked for him in other ways over the years, are also in our own way Fulbrights. Those of us who knew and loved him, who worked for him, who learned from him, each of us have our indelible memories, some of them serious, some of them quite funny.

I must say that I was a little reluctant to accept the request that I speak today because I once attended a funeral with Bill Fulbright, and I know how much distaste he had for highly formalized rituals. If he were giving me instructions, he'd say, "Bill, say something nice, be brief, and try to get everybody out so they can enjoy this beautiful day."

But let me tell you that those of us who understood and shared his roots in the Ozarks, those of us who knew what his life was like as a young person growing up and playing football and becoming the president of a university, those of us who understood later in life what he learned when he had the chance first to travel overseas and study in England and see the insanity that resulted from the squandering of the victory in World War I, those of us who saw firsthand the enormous anguish he felt, as I would see him early in the morning and late in the evening in the Senate office building, in the great struggles over the Vietnam war, those of us who saw him in his campaign in 1968, when this country was being literally torn apart, still trying to learn, trying to understand, and trying to be understood, we will never forget the debt that we owe him and the debt the country owes him.

When Mrs. Fulbright spoke last year in Germany, in recognition of the Senator's receipt of a distinguished award from the American Chamber of Commerce there, she quoted from a letter Senator Fulbright received 30 years ago. I'd like to leave it with you, so that you can remember something of what he did, and the times in which he did it.

She said, all this talk of leadership, freedom and education may seem simple, self-evident and commonplace to you now, but there was a time when it was considered radical, even dangerous. Thirty years ago, Senator Fulbright was called names I wouldn't dream of putting on paper, much less pronouncing to a respectable audience. He got emotional letters full of praise and hate. There was one which affected him far more deeply than all the rest. And after reading it, he closed his office doors, ordered all the calls held, and wrote in longhand an answer which he did not copy. I will read you the letter:

"Dear Senator Fulbright: I have never voted for you. I have never missed a chance to belittle you. But deep inside me, there was a nagging suspicion that I have been wrong. As this world plunges headlong toward what well may be its destruction, it gets increasingly harder to hear lonely voices, such as yours, calling for common sense,

human reason, and the respect for the brotherhood of man. But be of good cheer, my friend, keep nipping at their heels. This old world has always nailed its prophets to trees, so don't be surprised at those who come at you with hammers and spikes. Know that those multitudes yet unborn will stand on our shoulders. And one among them will stand a little higher because he is standing on yours."

We owe a lot to Bill Fulbright, some of us more than others. Let us all remember the life he lived and the example he set.

A few years ago, Senator Fulbright came home to Fayetteville, and we celebrated a Fulbright Day. I was then the Governor, and after the official event, we went back to his hotel room and watched the football game. And when the young player for one of the teams kicked a field goal, he looked at me and he said, "You know, I used to do that over 60 years ago. I don't know what happened to all those years. They sure passed in a hurry." I think we can all say that they also passed very well.

Senator Fulbright's lesson is captured on the statue in the Fayetteville town square in these quotes: "In the beauty of these gardens, we honor the beauty of his dream, peace among nations and free exchange of knowledge and ideas across the Earth." Bill Fulbright also left us the power of his example, always the teacher and always the student.

Thank you, friend, and Godspeed.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:25 a.m. at the Washington National Cathedral. In his remarks, he referred to the Senator's wife, Harriet Fulbright.

Statement on Disaster Assistance for Georgia, Florida, and Alabama

February 17, 1995

We will continue to stand by the people of Georgia, Florida, and Alabama as they do the hard work of recovering from last summer's storms, rebuilding their homes, repairing their roads, and restarting their businesses.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing an additional \$145 million in emergency funding for the States to assist in their continuing recovery from the effects of Tropical Storm Alberto.

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.

February 11

In the afternoon, the President hosted a working lunch for Prime Minister Jean-Luc Dehaene of Belgium.

February 13

In the afternoon, the President had a telephone conversation with President Boris Yeltsin of Russia to express strong U.S. support for the continuation of reform in Russia.

The President announced his intention to nominate Gloria Rose Ott and Harvey Sigelbaum to the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC). He also announced his intention to renominate to full 3-year terms on the OPIC board, George Kourpias and John Chrystal, who were previously confirmed for the first term in November 1993.

The President announced his intention to nominate John Goglia to the National Transportation Safety Board.

February 14

In the morning, the President traveled to San Francisco, CA. In the afternoon, he traveled to San Bernardino, CA, and in the evening, he traveled to Palm Springs, CA.

The President announced his intention to appoint the following individuals to the Federal Salary Council:

- Anthony F. Ingrassia, Vice Chair;
- John F. Leyden;
- Leslie E. Nulty;
- John N. Sturdivant;
- Peter A. Tchirkow;
- Robert M. Tobias.

The President announced his intention to name the following members to the Advisory Committee for the 1995 White House Conference on Aging:

- Liz Carpenter;
- Elsie Frank;
- Anita Freedman;
- Elinor Guggenheimer;
- Daniel P. Perry;
- Ruth Shepherd;
- James T. Sykes.

February 15

In the evening, the President returned to Washington, DC.

February 16

In the afternoon, the President met with presidents of Historically Black Colleges and Universities in the Cabinet Room at the White House.

February 17

In the evening, the President attended a musical salute to African-American World War II veterans at Constitution Hall.

**Nominations
Submitted to the Senate**

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted February 13

Curtis L. Collier, of Tennessee, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee (new position).

**Checklist
of White House Press Releases**

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as

items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released February 11

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on National Security Adviser Anthony Lake's meeting with representatives of the transitional Government of Ethiopia

Transcript of a press briefing by Attorney General Janet Reno, Drug Control Director Lee Brown, Associate Attorney General John Schmidt, and Director of COPS Program, Chief Joseph Brann on the 1994 crime bill

Letter from the Law Enforcement Steering Committee to the President and Members of Congress

Released February 12

Transcript of a press briefing by Secretary of State Warren Christopher on the President's meeting with Middle Eastern leaders

Released February 13

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's telephone conversation with President Yeltsin of Russia

Fact sheet on the "Middle-Class Bill of Rights Tax Relief Act of 1995"

Announcement of the nomination of Curtis L. Collier to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee

Released February 14

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on National Security Adviser Anthony Lake's announcement of Andrew D. Sens as Executive Director of the National Security Council

Transcript of a press briefing by Deputy Assistant to the President for Economic Policy Gene Sperling on the President's remarks to the American Council on Education

Fact sheet on the President's remarks to the American Council on Education

Excerpts of the President's remarks to the American Council on Education

Released February 15

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the administration's determination that USIA, AID, and ACDA should continue as independent agencies

Released February 16

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the appointment of Douglas B. Sosnik as Assistant to the President and Director of Political Affairs

Released February 17

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by U.S. Ambassador to Canada James Johnston Blanchard on the President's upcoming visit to Canada

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the Ecuador-Peru peace declaration

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on conventional arms transfer policy

Fact sheet on conventional arms transfer policy

Fact sheet on the criteria for decisionmaking on U.S. arms exports

**Acts Approved
by the President**

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