Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, April 10, 1995
Volume 31—Number 14
Pages 521–576

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

Arkansas, dedication of the Dean B. Ellis Library at Arkansas State University in Jonesboro—527
Building and Construction Trades Department conference—541
Georgia, closing session of the Southern Regional Economic Conference in Atlanta—521
Haiti, United Nations transition ceremony in Port-au-Prince—523
Major League Baseball strike—521
Radio address—524
Texas, American Society of Newspaper Editors in Dallas—560
United States-Egypt Presidents' Council—548

Appointments and Nominations

U.S. Army, Chief of Staff, statement—573

Bill Signings

Self employed health insurance legislation, intent to sign—557

Communications to Congress

Alaska's mineral resources, message transmitting report—531
Environmental policy, message—558

Communications to Federal Agencies

Charter of the Special Adviser for Assistance to the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union, memorandum—556

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Florida, Tampa—521
Haiti, Port-au-Prince—522

Interviews With the News Media—Continued

Oval Office—548
Interviews
Chris Fowler, Digger Phelps, and Dick Vitale of ESPN—525
Pat O'Brien, Mike Krzyzewski, and Quinn Buckner of CBS Sports—531
News conferences
April 4 (No. 90) with Prime Minister Major of the United Kingdom—532
April 5 (No. 91) with President Mubarak of Egypt—549

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Egypt, President Mubarak—548, 549
Haiti, President Aristide—522, 523
United Kingdom, Prime Minister Major—532
United Nations Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali—523

Proclamations

Cancer Control Month—573
National Child Abuse Prevention Month—541
National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day—557

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations; Bill Signings
Buyout program for Federal employees—540
Major League Baseball settlement—526

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—576
Checklist of White House press releases—575
Digest of other White House announcements—574
Nominations submitted to the Senate—575

Editor's note: The President was in Sacramento, CA, on April 7, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

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

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

Remarks at the Closing Session of the Southern Regional Economic Conference in Atlanta, Georgia

March 29, 1995

Let me close by once again thanking Emory University and its leadership for letting us be here, and thank all of you for giving us a day of your lives, which I will say again, I hope you think it has been well spent. I have been deeply moved by the stories I have heard. I have actually quite a lot more specific and clear sense than I did when the day started about the similarities and the differences of the southern economy as compared with the rest of the country and the differences within the States which are still not insignificant.

I have a clearer idea of what all of you think, based on your personal experience, is the appropriate role of the Federal Government. And again, I will say it strikes me as not on the extreme that there is a Government solution for most problems or the extreme that it would be better if the Government went away and wasn't around anymore, but at somewhere not in the middle but way beyond that, much more sophisticated.

And I leave this meeting feeling more hopeful, as I always do when I get a chance to talk to the American people, but certainly to be here in a kind of a homecoming setting for me; there's a lot of you I've worked with for more than 10 years.

But I would say this, in view of what both Bill Winter and what Billy Payne said. You know, all of us have a scale inside us, I think, that's sort of a psychological scale about the way we look at the world, and some days, there seems to be a little more weight on the positive, hopeful side of the scale, and someday, somebody takes some of the weight off and it kind of gets off on the other edge. And we all battle it within ourselves, within our families, within our communities, within our work organizations, and one thing I said this morning I want you to remember: We cannot go on where we have a disconnect between our public conversation which is so often oriented towards what divides us and how to get us to resent one another, and our public behavior, that is, the things we do together, which is what works, is what Billy said, is when we play by the rules, we work hard, we try to bring out the best in everybody, and we recognize we don't have a person to waste.

The South learned that lesson, I think, better than any other part of the country because of the horrible price we paid for our past. And I think that's why the economy is growing more rapidly than any other part of the country, why Atlanta is the perfect place to host the Olympics, and why we have a chance to see this region lead our country into a very bright 21st century. But we've got a lot of work to do, and I feel today that all of us, and I know the President, at least, has more energy for the task ahead and a better idea about how to approach them, thanks to you.

I thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 5 p.m. in the Cannon Chapel Building at Emory University. In his remarks, he referred to William Porter "Billy" Payne, chief executive officer, Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games, and William F. Winter, Chair, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks on the Major League Baseball Strike and an Exchange With Reporters in Tampa, Florida

March 30, 1995

The President. Since I'm here in Florida, it might be appropriate to say something about the baseball situation. The judge is going to hand down a ruling, apparently,

pretty soon. And I would just say, if the injunction stays and the players do again state their willingness to go back to work, then I hope they won't be locked out. I think it gives us a chance at least to start the baseball season in a good way and without the replacement players.

Ultimately, of course, they're still going to have to work this out, and they're going to have to do it by some mutual agreement. But we may be given an opportunity in the next couple of days to have a baseball season. And if that opportunity arises, and the players are willing to go back, then I hope the owners won't lock them out.

Guatemala

Q. [*Inaudible*]—CIA covered up the murder in Guatemala?

The President. Well, we have no information to that effect. We are looking into all the allegations. And I have taken exceptional steps to make sure that there is a good investigation and to make sure that the records are secure. I think I should do that. As you know, this relates to events that occurred before I became President. But we need to know the facts, and we're going to do everything we can to find out the facts.

Haiti

Q. Is there any evidence that—any evidence that Aristide's people were behind the assassination?

The President. President Aristide immediately asked for help to investigate the action. Indeed, the people who were down there were working before to try to head off any political violence leading up to the handover this weekend. And as soon as the killing occurred, he asked for help, and we had dispatched immediately a substantial team from the FBI. So I think that is significant evidence that he wants to get to the bottom of this and that he's keeping his word not to support political violence.

There are many factions there. They've done a good job of keeping down political violence. They don't need to start it again. What they need to do is to keep things calm, maintain a low crime rate, continue to work with the United Nations, and rebuild that country. We only have, I think, 6,000 of the 35,000 factory workers who were working before the military coup back working. So we need to keep working on building the country. And that's what I'm going to say when I go down there.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 3 p.m. at Tampa Bay International Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Jean-Bertrand Aristide, President of Haiti. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Jean-Bertrand Aristide of Haiti in Port-au-Prince

March 31, 1995

Assassination in Haiti

Q. President Aristide, was your Interior Minister involved in the Tuesday assassination?

President Aristide. No.

Q. Have these allegations cast a damper over the President's visit?

President Aristide. No.

Q. Have you asked the FBI to look into the possibility that he might have been involved in the Bertin death?

President Aristide. We welcome help from the international community, from the United States in helping us finding proof of this violence for months—for days. And together we'll be working.

Q. Mr. President, are you satisfied the Interior Minister was not involved?

President Clinton. President Aristide asked the FBI to help investigate this. They are doing an investigation. I think we should applaud this quick and decisive action and let the investigation proceed and not presume its results.

This is a day of celebration, and nothing can cast a cloud on it. It's a day of mission accomplished for the United States, a day of celebration for Haiti and for the United Nations force, and a day for looking ahead for the work still to be done.

President's Visit

Q. How did you like your reception, Mr. President?

President Clinton. I liked it a lot. It was very nice. It was great.

Q. Must be a little bit tired—all the handshaking.

President Clinton. It was quite wonderful.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—was your idea?

President Clinton. No, but I liked it, though.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:05 p.m. at the National Palace. In his remarks, President Aristide referred to Interior Minister Brig. Gen. Mondesir Beaubrun of Haiti and political opponent to President Aristide, Mireille Durocher Bertin who was assassinated on March 28. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at the United Nations Transition Ceremony in Port-au-Prince

March 31, 1995

Mr. Secretary-General, President Aristide, members of the multinational force in Haiti, members of the United Nations mission in Haiti: We gather to celebrate the triumph of freedom over fear. And we are here to look ahead to the next steps that we will take together to help the people of Haiti strengthen their hard-won democracy.

Six months ago, a 30-nation multinational force, led by the United States, entered Haiti with a clear mission: To ensure the departure of the military regime, to restore the freely elected government of Haiti, and to establish a secure and stable environment in which the people of Haiti could begin to rebuild their country. Today, that mission has been accomplished, on schedule and with remarkable success.

On behalf of the United States, I thank all the members of the multinational force for their outstanding work, and pledge our support for the United Nations mission in Haiti.

Over the past 6 months, the multinational force has proved that a shared burden makes for a lighter load. Working together, 30 nations from around the world—from the Caribbean to Australia, from Bangladesh to Jordan—demonstrated the effectiveness and the benefits of international peacekeeping. And they helped give the people of Haiti a second chance at democracy.

The multinational force ensured the peaceful transition from the military regime to President Aristide. It removed more than 30,000 weapons and explosive devices from the streets. Through the international police monitors, led by Commissioner Ray Kelly, it trained and monitored an interim police force and worked side by side with them throughout Haiti. And it helped to prepare a permanent civilian police force that will maintain security and respect for human rights in the months and years ahead.

Let me say to the members of the new, permanent police force who are with us here today, you are the guardians of Haiti's new democracy. Its future rests on your shoulders. Uphold the constitution. Respect democracy and human rights. Defend them. That is your sacred mission and your solemn obligation.

Now it is the United Nations mission's task to secure and stabilize the environment in Haiti and to help the government prepare for free and fair elections. The mission, with participants from 33 countries, has the tools it needs to succeed: a 6,000-strong military force under the command of United States Army General Joseph Kinzer; a 900-member international police force, led by Chief Superintendent Neil Pouliot of Canada; and dozens of well-trained economic, political, and legal advisers.

The United Nations mission will end its work here in February 1996, after the election and inauguration of a new President. To all of you taking part in the U.N. mission, I know many challenges lie between here and there. Your work will be demanding and difficult. But the multinational force has set a strong foundation of success upon which to build.

Most important of all, the people of Haiti, have shown a powerful commitment to peace and to reconciliation. Working with them, you can help make real Haiti's reborn promise of democracy. I know you will do that.

Good luck, and Godspeed.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:16 p.m. in the National Palace. In his remarks, he referred to United Nations Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

April 1, 1995

The President. Good morning. I'm speaking to you this morning from the Gibbs Magnet School for International Studies in Little Rock, Arkansas. I'm happy to be joined by the Principal, Dr. Marjorie Bassa, members of her staff, and 30 wonderful elementary students, their parents, and other interested citizens here.

Good morning, class.

Students. Good morning, Mr. President.

The President. What you just heard was the sound of America's future. This school and these people are living proof that the education reforms that were started when I was Governor of Arkansas, and that are continuing now under the leadership of Governor Tucker, are paying off.

The young people who attend this public school are getting a head start on the 21st century. Beginning in kindergarten, they learn about other cultures. They receive foreign language training. They're already acquiring the skills that will allow them one day to compete and win in the new global economy. They come from many different racial and cultural backgrounds, but they all have a shot at the American dream.

I want to spend a few moments telling you why I think education and training for all of our people is the most important thing we can do to keep the American dream alive in the 21st century.

You know Washington's in the midst of a great debate today about the proper role of our National Government. On one side is the old view that big, one-size-fits-all Government can provide the answers to all of our big problems. On the other side is the view that Government is the source of all of our problems. In the real world, that's a false choice.

Let's look at what started this debate. As we move toward the 21st century and the information age, jobs and incomes will depend more and more on what we know and what we can learn. That means that today, at the end of the cold war, we're able to create jobs, new businesses, new millionaires at a rapid rate, more than ever before. But at the same time, about two-thirds of our people are working hard for the same or lower wages, and are quite insecure about their future. And we know we still have too many social problems we're not making enough headway on, crime and drugs, violence and family breakdown.

In the real world, we have to face the fact that we have to create opportunity but deal with these problems of economic stagnation and social disintegration. And we are stuck with a Government that's too organized to meet the problems of yesterday and not enough able to meet the problems of today and tomorrow.

I believe we have to chart a new course between the old way of big Government and the new rage of no Government, because I believe we need a Government that does four things: first, that creates economic opportunity, grow the middle class and shrink the under class; second, that enhances the security of the American people, here at home, on our streets, in our schools, and abroad; and third, that reforms the National Government to make it smaller, less bureaucratic, to serve the interests of ordinary Americans, not special interests, to serve the future, not the past, and to demand more personal responsibility of our citizens. Fourth, and most important, we need a Government that helps our people raise their education and skill levels so they can make the most of their own lives. That's what I call the New Covenant, a partnership between Americans and their Government that offers more opportunity in return for more responsibility.

Earlier this week, I convened a regional economic conference at Emory University in Atlanta with a group of economists, business and Government leaders. And working Americans discussed ways to strengthen our economy and to ensure a better future for our children. They were Republicans, Democrats, and independents. But the one thing we all agreed on was that the countries that will do the best job of developing the full capacities of all of their children and all of

their adults will be the most successful in the 21st century. We all agree that higher education levels are essential if we're going to raise the incomes of working Americans, if we're going to grow the middle class and shrink the under class.

That's why I and my administration have worked so hard to expand Head Start, to set world class standards for our schools, to give parents and teachers more resources to meet those standards but also to give them more authority at the school level to decide how best to achieve excellence. We've worked to establish apprenticeship programs to prepare young people who don't go on to college to get higher paying jobs. And we've worked hard to make college loans more affordable for more students, millions of them throughout the country.

By eliminating the middlemen in the college loan system, lowering the cost, and offering better repayment terms, our direct student loan program is giving more young people a chance to go to college while saving tax dollars at the same time. And we're demanding more responsibility in return. More students get loans at lower cost, but now they have to pay them back. Stricter enforcement of the student loan program has cut the cost of delinquent loans to taxpayers from $2.8 billion in 1991 to a billion dollars today. That's opportunity and responsibility.

Because we've focused on education, for the last 2 years we've been able to cut Government spending, cut the deficit, cut hundreds of programs and over 100,000 bureaucrats from the Federal budget, and still increase our investment in education.

Now, many in Congress think there's no difference in education and other spending. For example, there are proposals to reduce funding for Head Start; for public school efforts to meet the national education goals; for our national service program, AmeriCorps, which provides scholarship money for young people who will work at minimum wage jobs in local community service projects; even proposals to reduce school lunch funding. There are proposals to eliminate our efforts for safe and drug-free schools altogether and, unbelievably, to cut the college loan programs.

These are not wise proposals. Here at Gibbs, where students are preparing for the 21st century, close to 50 percent of the students depend upon the school lunch program for a nutritious meal. And all these young people, not just those who have the money to afford it, should be able to go as far as their talents will carry them. And if that means they need scholarships, student loans, and the opportunity to do community service, we ought to give it to them.

Some in Congress want to cut education to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. I want instead a middle class tax cut that helps families pay for education and training, a tax deduction for education costs after high school.

Now in the past, education and training have enjoyed broad, bipartisan support. Last year, with strong support from Republicans and Democrats, Congress enacted my proposals to help students and schools meet the challenges of today and tomorrow. Educational experts said we did more for education by expanding Head Start, expanding apprenticeships, expanding college loans than any session of Congress in 30 years.

Now in this new Congress, some want to cut education, and that's wrong. Gibbs Magnet School is a reflection of what we ought to be doing more of in America. I don't know what political party these children belong to, but I do know we need them all and they deserve our best efforts to give them a shot at the American dream. We must begin when they're young, training our people to succeed, preparing them for a lifetime of learning. The fight for education is the fight for the American dream.

Thanks again to all those people who are here with me today, especially our children. And thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:06 a.m. from the Gibbs Magnet School for International Studies in Little Rock, AR.

Interview With Chris Fowler, Digger Phelps, and Dick Vitale of ESPN

April 1, 1995

NCAA Basketball Championship

Q. Last year, President Clinton was the first Chief Executive to attend the Final Four

in person. Right now, we are honored. He is definitely the first President to ever join us on "Sports Center." From Little Rock—Mr. President, you're one for two today. The homestate Razorbacks get in the championship game. Your good friend is defeated.

The President. Well, I'm very proud of both those teams. I'm of course proud of Arkansas. They played well. And you can never count the Tarheels out. Dean Smith coached a great game there down the stretch. And I'm glad we hung on. And it's a real tribute to those young men and to Coach Richardson. And of course, I think Eddie Sutton had a great season. And I'm very proud of him. But UCLA has fabulous talent. And you've said it all night, but the point guard, Edney, was terrific at the end. He just took the game over.

Q. Well, Mr. President, you and I talked earlier today on the phone, and we were going through that first-half adjustment, and you said, "We need a big guy inside." Were you happy the second half?

The President. Real happy. You and I were talking—you know, they just had to get the ball to Williamson. They did, and he delivered just the way he's delivered all year. He's a real clutch player, and he played magnificently tonight.

Q. Mr. President, Dick Vitale. You look at the match-up now, UCLA, and you look at the match-up against Arkansas—how do they contain the little guy? You're a coach—should they zone? You told Mr. Jarvis to use the zone earlier this year against Massachusetts. Should they zone?

The President. Yes, I did. I think I'd start in the zone. I think Williamson will do well. I think that Thurman will do well. And I think that we've got enough skill, enough talent to beat them. But boy, they're deep, they're fast, and they're good. And we're going to have to play great defense to win that game. That's why they really got back in this game, I think.

Q. Mr. President, what has it been like as an Arkansas fan in this tournament? Game after game they've survived. They were dead against Syracuse before the timeout was called by Lawrence Moten. The average margin of victory, just four points. Has it been tough as a fan?

The President. It's been tough as a fan, but you know, every team this team has played has had their best game of the year against them. And it's been hard for them to get up. But the last two games they've been—they've been a different team in the second half of both the last two games. They've played like national champions, and they're going back to the final, and they deserve it. It's going to be a great, great game, I think.

Q. Well, Mr. President, now that you've gone through the weekend—and a little golf, a little basketball—do you have the urge to sneak out to Seattle Monday night?

The President. Oh, I do, but wherever I am, I'm going to be there cheering for them. And I'm really proud of them. And I'm excited. The fans will see a great game. UCLA's got a terrific team, and this will be a very, very exciting final, I predict.

Q. Mr. President, you better come out here, because word has it that John Wooden may be out here to give them a little bit of an edge. They need you.

The President. Well, I'm nowhere near in his class, but I'll be screaming my lungs out wherever.

Q. Thank you very much for joining us.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 9:21 p.m. The President spoke by satellite from Doe's Eat Place in Little Rock, AR. In his remarks, he referred to Nolan Richardson, coach, and Corliss Williamson, player, University of Arkansas Razorbacks basketball team; Eddie Sutton, coach, Oklahoma State Cowboys basketball team; and John Wooden, former coach, and Tyus Edney, player, U.C.L.A. Bruins basketball team. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Statement on the Major League Baseball Strike Settlement

April 2, 1995

Today's decision is good news for the game of baseball, its fans, and the local economics of the cities where baseball is played.

While I am heartened to know this season will start with major league players, there are a number of underlying issues which still need to get resolved. I strongly urge the own-

ers and players to meet and reach full agreement at the bargaining table so that another season won't be in jeopardy.

Remarks at the Dedication of the Dean B. Ellis Library at Arkansas State University in Jonesboro, Arkansas

April 3, 1995

Thank you very much. I think Molly Mayer did a great job, don't you? [*Applause*] I am delighted to be here today with so many old friends. I look out across this crowd and see a great portion of my life looking back at me, and I'm glad to see you all here.

I'm delighted to be back at ASU. I got myself a list from my staff—as I get older my memory begins to fade—I got my staff to pull up a list of all the times I have been here at least in official capacity to this campus as Governor, and we found—or as attorney general—we found a dozen times. I've been here a dozen more times, I know, just to see students and have meetings. But it is wonderful to be back here.

I was glad to see Gene Smith giving his speech. And I'm kind of glad you didn't let him retire. [*Laughter*] He looks young enough to keep working to me, and he's certainly done a wonderful job. I thank my friend, John Trout, for what he said. I cannot even begin to recount all the instances in which I worked with people from Craighead County and indeed from all of northeast Arkansas in trying to generate more economic opportunities here. I was very glad to be accompanied here today by two of your former presidents, Carl Whillock and, of course, Congressman Thornton.

And Rodney Slater and Mack McLarty and I all came up on a helicopter. We didn't mean to interrupt your ceremony, but anyway, it's not a bad sight to see us coming down. And we were all talking about all the changes that had occurred at ASU over the last several years and how much better things are. And for that I thank all the members of the board of trustees, Larry Ross and the others. And I'm glad to see a lot of people I appointed still serving. That's an immensely rewarding thing, as well as the members of the board of higher education.

I'd like to say a special word of thanks to Congresswoman Blanche Lambert Lincoln for what is literally a ferocious job of lobbying she does in behalf of the interest of the people of the first district. There is no Member of the House of Representatives who is on my doorstep more often for more different things. And when I complained about it one day, she said, "Well, that's just the way you used to behave when you were Governor." [*Laughter*]

Let me say a special word of thanks to the members of the Arkansas Legislature I see out here in the audience. One of them was in Washington the other day for a meeting, and he said, "You know, I kind of miss you, and I never thought I'd say that." [*Laughter*]

I remember coming here in 1977 when I was attorney general. This is how I really got interested in helping ASU. I came here to speak to a commencement. And it was supposed to be a beautiful day like this, and instead it rained, and we had to go inside to the old field house where there was no air conditioning. And the rain—you know how it is when it gets warm here. The rain just makes it worse. The humidity was sizzling around. No one could breathe. The faculty and the students were suffocating in their beautiful robes. And I gave a 6-minute speech. [*Laughter*] And I made up my mind that if God ever gave me the opportunity to serve long enough, I'd build us a place with air conditioning where I could give a longer speech. [*Laughter*] And that's how the Convocation Center got started.

I have enjoyed immensely being involved with this wonderful place. It was mentioned already, the Communications and Education Building and the Convocation Center, and now this library. I'll never forget the first time I went to an event in the Convocation Center. I've seen a lot of games, a lot of athletics. I remember the first time Jonesboro got to host the AAU national championship basketball tournament. And I came and saw two high school kids play basketball, named Chris Webber and Grant Hill, who later had a pretty good career, all because they had the experience of playing basketball here when they were 16 years of age.

I'd also like to say a special word of appreciation to all of you who have run all of the programs here, the extra-curricular programs here at the university. And I'd like to say a special word of appreciation to one of your students who became very, very famous this year in that remarkable, wonderful contribution to our understanding of American life, ''Hoop Dreams.'' Arthur Agee has really been a great example of what we could do with our dreams.

I'd like to say one other word of introduction. I was profoundly pleased to know that a special part of this new library has been set aside for a Delta Studies Center. As has already been said, the Delta region of our State has always had special meaning for me. When I was a boy coming home from college, I used to take a day of my Christmas vacation every year and just drive around in the Delta. I never saw a place that was so poor economically and so rich in spirit and people.

And when I was head of the Lower Mississippi Delta Study Commission, we made a common commitment to try to invest more in our people so that we could be rich in spirit and rich economically. And I know that this studies center will carry on the work of that commission and will continue its important mission.

I'd like to say also that—all of you know this, and it's already been said, but—I actually ran for Governor for a pretty simple and straightforward reason many years ago. I wanted to see the people of my State have the same opportunities as the people of the rest of this country had. And I believed that the only way we could do it was by concentrating on building the economy, maintaining our unique quality of life, and educating our people, and doing it in a spirit of partnership.

All my life I had seen our State held down by public leaders who played on our fears and divided us one from another. And for a good long time here in Arkansas now we've been working in the opposite direction, developing our economy, educating our people, preserving our quality of life, and working together.

I think it's pretty clear that that course has been more successful. If you look at the faces of the young people here, if you look at all of you here, not only from the cities of eastern Arkansas but from the smallest little hamlets who support Arkansas State University, if you look at the remarkable job growth our State has enjoyed just in the last few years, after a decade of struggling to modernize our economy, it is obvious that we made the right decision as a people.

I ran for President because just as I thought Arkansas was going to catch up to the rest of the country, our country was clearly having problems getting into the next century with the American dream of opportunity for all alive.

We live in a very unusual time, indeed, almost without precedent I think, in human history, where our economy is growing but most of our people say they feel insecure. How can that happen? How could we have 2 years where we'd have over 6 million new jobs, a dramatic drop in the unemployment rate, the lowest rates of inflation and unemployment combined in 25 years, and still, a majority of the American people say, ''I am really worried about my future.''

It has happened because of what America's role in the global economy is doing to the lives of ordinary Americans. It has happened because even as we create more jobs, most people haven't had an increase in their income, and there is increasing inequality in America.

From the year I was born at the end of World War II until the year I was elected Governor in 1978, America rose together economically. Every income group and every region was doing better, and they were rising together. But in the last 15 years, that's all changed. And it makes your mission even more important.

In the last 15 years, the wealthiest and best educated Americans have done right well as we've moved in the global economy. About a third of us are doing fine. But about 60 percent of us are working harder for the same or lower wages, so that even when we create jobs in America, many people wind up being insecure. They say, ''Well, maybe I'll be one of the people laid off.''

And as we move from big corporations to small businesses being our main employers, a lot of those big companies are laying people off. Is that cause for despair? Not at all. Don't

you forget this, this is still the greatest country in the world. We've still got the strongest economy. We're still producing more jobs. We've still got the greatest ability to adapt. We still do better at relating to one another across racial and religious and ethnic lines than any multifaceted country in human history. You should be optimistic about the future.

But what it does mean is that we must now nationally do what we tried to do here. As a country we should be focused on growing our economy, maintaining our quality of life, educating our people, and doing it together. There is a huge debate today about what the Government in Washington ought to be doing.

And you know, ever since the beginning of this Republic, we've all loved to cuss the Government, especially at tax time. Every one of us can tell at least one, and sometimes 50, stories, that just prove beyond any doubt that the Government would mess up a one-car parade. [*Laughter*] But the truth is, if you look over the 200-year history of this country, we're still here, the longest lasting democracy in human history, because most of the time we did the right thing. Most of the time we met the challenges of the day and did the right thing.

Just parenthetically, I'll tell you, I wish all of you could have been with me in Haiti a few days ago to see all our young men and women in uniform who revolutionized a country that was mired in violence and did it with barely a shot fired. Those young Americans are the best that we have to offer. And if we look at them and what works there, that'll work for our country as well.

So now that I'm living in Washington instead of down here with you, every day I hear this big debate up there. And the popular thing, of course, is just to talk about how the Government would mess up a one-car parade and tell everybody they're against it, and say, let's just cut everything. That's the new rage in Washington, ''If there were no Federal Government, we'd have no problem.'' And the old rage was that the Federal Government could solve all the problems.

Well, based on my experience with you, I would say both ideas are wrong and present a false choice. The great things about this country are things that the Government can't reach. They have to do with how we behave personally and with our families and our communities and what we do in the workplace.

But we need our Government as a partner. And I have tried to say I believe with all my heart, if you want us to do well in the 21st century, we got to do four things: We've got to have more jobs and higher income; we've got to educate our people; we need a Government that is smaller and less bureaucratic, that's more oriented toward the future than the past; and we have to have more security, more security in a profound sense.

I am proud of the fact that since I've been President there are no Russian missiles pointed at the children of the United States for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age. But I also know that our security is threatened when there is too much violence on our streets, too much violence in our schools. Our security is threatened by drugs. Our security is threatened by the strains on families. And our security is threatened when families who work hard and do the right things by their children are mistreated and abused, and don't have the chances they need to support a better future.

So I'd like to say to you in front of this library today, our country under Franklin Roosevelt began to create a safety net for the elderly. It was Social Security, and it included Medicare later. We developed a certain safety net for poor people. But in the future, if we are really going to become what we ought to be, we need a commitment to the middle class that will end this income stagnation, that will end this increasing inequality. That is a safety net for all Americans. And it is one word: education, education, education.

Today the people who believe that everything the Government does is wrong want to cut everything, either to balance the budget or to give a tax cut. Well, I'm for doing both. We've reduced this deficit $600 billion since I've been President. We're going to have 3 years of declining deficits for the first time since Harry Truman was President. I am for cutting unnecessary spending. We ought to do that.

And I believe we ought to cut taxes for people in ways that will raise their incomes today and tomorrow. That's why I think the best thing we could do is to give people a tax deduction for the cost of all their and their children's education expenses after high school.

But let me say, Arkansas is not where it is today because we cut education. And if we'd started investing in education and improving education 10 or 20 years earlier than we did, we'd be further ahead today. There's not a person in this audience who doubts the truth of that statement. And therefore I say to you: You should say to all of us, "Get that deficit down. Get this economy going. Be fair to American taxpayers, but do not cut education."

In the last 2 years, we have expanded Head Start. We have given our schools the opportunity to meet national education goals and still have more flexibility than the Federal Government used to give them. We helped States to establish apprenticeship programs for young people who don't go on to college but who do want good jobs. And we have dramatically expanded the availability of affordable college loans with better repayment terms to the young people of this country. We have started the national service program to give young people the chance to earn money for college while working in their communities. And some of our volunteers are over here in the audience today. They've worked with migrant workers in Hope. They've helped to reduce school dropouts in Texarkana. They've done a lot of really wonderful things.

And there are people today in Washington who think the answer to our problems is to restrict the availability of student loans, to cut Head Start, to reduce our commitment to the national education goals, to destroy the national service program, even, believe it or not, to cut the school lunch program or to eliminate the program to make our schools safer and more drug-free.

My friends, this has never been a partisan political issue. When we were in Little Rock working on education, we had Republicans and Democrats working on it together. Last year and the year before, every piece of legislation we passed for education in Washington had the support of Democrats and Republicans. This has not been a partisan political issue, and we dare not let it become one. If we walk away from education when the 21st century depends upon what we know and what we can learn, it will be just as dangerous as it would have been for us to disarm in the middle of the cold war. We didn't do that, and we shouldn't do this.

So let me say in closing, you know, I'm feeling a little sentimental today. I'm sitting here wishing I could focus on the hundreds of people I've already seen that I've walked so many roads with. Those of you who were working for me in 1982 in these 11 counties in northeast Arkansas know that if it hadn't been for you then, I wouldn't be here now as President.

But let me say that in spite of all the sentiment and warm feelings I have, the main thing I want to say is when I look at you, I think you have good common sense. I think you love your communities, and you love your families, and you love this country. The people I know up here have spent a lifetime trying to make things better for their families and their communities and their future. And I am telling you that we can't afford sentiment today because we've got to make some tough decisions.

Yes, we've got to cut unnecessary, wasteful, bloated Government. Yes, we have to get things under control in Washington. I've been working like crazy for 2 years to do it. But we dare not in the information age believe that the answer to America's growing insecurity about jobs and incomes is to undermine the very thing that will take us into the 21st century still the strongest country in the world, still the greatest country the world has ever known, still the home of the American dream that says no matter who you are or where you're from, if you work hard and play by the rules, you can live up to your God-given capacities and your wildest dreams. And that, my fellow Americans, is education.

Now, the country needs that strategy. And I ask you to support your Members of Congress, to support the people here, and to remind everybody that this is not rocket science. This is basic. And this is America's future.

I am delighted to be here. I'm honored to have played a role in this library and all the other things that are here at ASU. But the most important thing that's here at ASU is the speaker who introduced me and all the other students. They are our future. And all of us had better decide that our first commitment is to do right by them. If we do, the rest of us will do just fine.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:55 a.m. at the front of library. In his remarks, he referred to Molly Mayer, president, Arkansas State University student government; Eugene Smith, president, Arkansas State University; John Trout, Jr., editor and publisher, Jonesboro Sun; and Rodney Slater, Federal Highway Administrator.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Alaska's Mineral Resources

April 3, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1994 Annual Report on Alaska's Mineral Resources, as required by section 1011 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96–487; 16 U.S.C. 3151). This report contains pertinent public information relating to minerals in Alaska gathered by the U.S. Geological Survey, the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and other Federal agencies.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 3, 1995.

Interview With Pat O'Brien, Mike Krzyzewski, and Quinn Buckner of CBS Sports

April 3, 1995

Mr. O'Brien. Good evening, Mr. President. How are you?

The President. Fine, Pat, how are you?

Mr. O'Brien. I'm fine. It sounds like you're having a nice time back there watching the game.

Your thoughts, sir, on the first half?

The President. I can't hear you, I'm sorry.

Mr. O'Brien. That's okay, that happens. Your thoughts, on the first half, sir?

The President. Well, I think that it's a—I'm glad we're just one point behind. We made a lot of unforced errors, and as you were saying, UCLA had very quick hands. They played great defense, and I'm looking forward to an exciting second half.

I think that our team and their team—it's a wonderful game so far. But you've got to give it to UCLA. They played great defense, and they got a lot of very good shots on offense. And I think that's why they're a point ahead.

Mr. O'Brien. I know you've tried to watch a few of Arkansas' games this season. Do you have any fingernails left? The games have been such nail-biters throughout the tournament.

The President. Yes, they always give us a lot of thrills. Basketball is exciting enough on its own, but they give us a little extra every game. We try to have a cardiologist at every watching party that we have. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Buckner. Mr. President, Quinn Buckner. Did you fill out your brackets this year?

The President. Did I what?

Mr. Buckner. Did you get a chance to fill out the brackets at the beginning of the tournament?

The President. No, I didn't, and I wish I had. But I would have been wrong on all accounts except I expected these two teams to be in the finals. Otherwise, there were a lot of surprises along the way.

Mr. O'Brien. Mr. President, we know you're very athletic and earlier this week, on Friday I think, you were in Haiti. And we have some film, a tape of you shooting buckets out there on the grass with some of our good troops down there. And there you put up a bank shot. I don't know if you called it or not. [*Laughter*]

The President. You've got to call that one. [*Laughter*]

Mr. O'Brien. Then you shot around at Arkansas State with Arthur Agee, from the documentary film ''Hoop Dreams.'' And Mike Krzyzewski, who you rooted against last year, is going to go over your form on this. He's going to telestrate your form.

Mr. Krzyzewski. Well, if you don't mind——

The President. This is his chance to get even. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Krzyzewski. Mr. President, I'm sure you're accustomed to some criticism, so I'm going to critique you. [*Laughter*]

Here's Mr. President in the lane. He's not worried about three seconds. Good form. But he doesn't want to show that he's just an inside player; he goes outside. [*Laughter*]

And now he's in the outside. Watch that form. Take a look at his hand and the release. [*Laughter*]

Mr. O'Brien. Very good, Mr. President.

Mr. Krzyzewski. It's a very delicate release. And he puts it through.

Mr. O'Brien. What do you think, Mr. President?

Mr. Krzyzewski. That's not bad. What do you think?

The President. I think the feet were on the floor. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Krzyzewski. You know, quite honestly, sir, what did you take away from your visit with Arthur Agee today?

The President. Well, he's a remarkable young man, you know. And I—what I took away from it is, here's a young fellow that made up his mind he was going to make something of his life and try to live out his dream. He's committed to continuing his education until he gets his degree. He still wants to play pro basketball. But whatever happens to him, he's going to have a good life. And I hope that "Hoop Dreams" and I hope that Arthur Agee both, serve as a kind of an inspiration to kids all across this country who are growing up in very hard circumstances. They can make it. They can be something. And I'm very grateful that he came down to Arkansas to go to college. He's a terrific young man, and I wish him well.

Baseball strike

Mr. O'Brien. Mr. President, I know you're also very grateful that the baseball season will begin here at the end of April. I know you followed it very closely.

The President. You bet.

Mr. O'Brien. Would you like to throw out the first pitch at the end of April?

The President. I sure hope that I can do that. I'm looking forward to it. And I think it's going to be good for the country to get baseball back on track. I still hope they can get together and actually work out these differences. We don't need a cloud hanging over baseball for another whole season. And they ought to be able to do it. They're not that many people, and there's lots of money there. They can figure out how to divide it and give us the sport back.

Mr. O'Brien. Well, with the Masters coming up, Mr. President, I have to ask you, how many mulligans do you get when you play golf with your friends? [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, it depends, but I try not to take any anymore—maybe one off the first tee. [*Laughter*]

Mr. O'Brien. Okay, good for you. Good for you.

Mr. President, thank you. It's always a pleasure to talk hoops with you. Thank you for watching. We'll see you down the road.

The President. Thanks. Keep your fingers crossed. Bye-bye.

NOTE: The interview began at 8:34 p.m. The President spoke by satellite from Juanita's restaurant in Little Rock, AR.

The President's News Conference With Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom

April 4, 1995

The President. Good afternoon. Please be seated. I am delighted to welcome Prime Minister Major back to the White House.

Throughout this century, the United States and the United Kingdom have stood together on the great issues that have confronted our people. Our common cause has been at the heart of our success in two World Wars and, of course, in the cold war. In just the last 2 years British-American cooperation has played an essential role in allowing us to reduce the threat of weapons of mass destruction, in promoting peace around the world, and certainly in expanding free trade.

Today we have continued working in that tradition. We've had excellent discussions. We've covered a broad range of issues. We have, as always, found much to agree about.

On security issues, we agreed that the inevitable process of NATO expansion must proceed smoothly, gradually, and openly, without any surprises. This is essential for extending stability, democracy, and prosperity throughout Europe. We believe that, in parallel with the enlargement of NATO, the alliance must develop and maintain close ties with Russia.

We affirmed our shared commitment to a political settlement in Bosnia, based on the Contact Group plan. The conflict is being prolonged because of Bosnian-Serb intransigence. Renewed fighting will not end the conflict but only lead to more bloodshed and continued stalemate.

The Prime Minister and I also vowed to continue working together to contain the Iraqi threat to stability in the Persian Gulf region. We are deeply concerned that Saddam Hussein could be regaining the ability to build weapons of mass destruction. We are determined that Iraq must meet all its United Nations obligations. This is no time to relax sanctions.

The Iraqi people are suffering tremendously under Saddam's tyranny, and they do deserve the help of the international community. But easing up on a regime that oppresses people will not help them. So while there can be no compromise, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Argentina have put forward new proposals in the United Nations to get food and medicine to the people of Iraq. We hope other nations will join these efforts and support our Security Council resolution and pressure Saddam Hussein to stop the needless suffering of his innocent citizens.

Prime Minister Major told me a great deal about his recent trip to the Middle East. We both strongly believe this is a hopeful moment for broadening the circle of peace. The United States and Europe must continue to fight the efforts to derail the peace process by those who prefer destruction to peace. It is clear that for peace to take root in the region, more economic assistance is vital. Peace and prosperity depend upon one another. I applaud the United Kingdom's investment program in the West Bank and Gaza, as well as its debt relief measures for Jordan. We must all continue to support those who take risks for peace.

Nowhere is this more true than in Northern Ireland. I salute the Prime Minister for the tremendous efforts he is making to bring an enduring peace to Northern Ireland. Today, Northern Ireland is closer to a just and lasting settlement than at any time in a generation, thanks in large measure to the vision and courage of John Major. He and Prime Minister Bruton of Ireland together introduced the Joint Framework, which provides a landmark opportunity to move ahead toward a political settlement, one that will be backed by both of Northern Ireland's communities.

We also agreed that the paramilitaries of both sides must get rid of their weapons for good so that violence never returns to Northern Ireland. And we must work to increase economic opportunity in that area. Their prospects have been blighted by bloodshed for too long. Next month our White House Conference on Trade and Investment in Ireland will help to expand the ties between the United States, Northern Ireland, and Ireland's border counties. Building those kinds of bonds will help to lead to a better life for all the people of the region.

The Prime Minister and I discussed some other issues. We agreed on the need for an indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty at the review conference that begins this month. To further the cause of nonproliferation, the Prime Minister joins me in calling for full implementation of the framework agreement we negotiated with North Korea to end that country's nuclear program. And we discussed the need to adapt our international institutions to the challenges of the next century at the G–7 summit in Halifax.

I was particularly impressed by the thinking that the Prime Minister has done on this profoundly important issue. The United States and the United Kingdom, after all, helped to shape those institutions. They have served our interests for the last half century. With the extraordinary relationship between our two countries as important as ever, I am confident we can make the changes necessary and work together to advance our shared values and our common interests, to

promote peace and democracy and prosperity in the years ahead and, of course, in the century ahead.

Finally, let me say, we discussed the ceremonies that will mark the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. Because of my prior commitments, I've asked the Vice President to represent me and all Americans in London on May the 8th at services that will commemorate the great wartime bravery and sacrifice of so many Britons. And I look forward to seeing Prime Minister Major when we go together to Moscow on May 9th to pay our respect to the heroism of the Russian people in that conflict.

Mr. Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Major. Mr. President, thank you very much.

We've had the opportunity today for a good-humored, worthwhile, productive, and very far-reaching series of exchanges on a whole range of matters. The President has set out much of the agenda we discussed, and I won't reiterate what the President said, except to say that in his remarks he spoke not just for the United States but for the United Kingdom as well. I share the views he expressed, and I won't reiterate them.

We spent some time looking forward at two separate matters which I think are of some importance to both our countries, and of wider importance as well. The first of them the President just touched on, and that was the review of the Bretton Woods institutions and the United Nations that we agreed with the other G–7 heads of government at Naples last year that we should undertake and return to at Halifax later this year.

We've given a great deal of discussion to that, and I think for a range of reasons the time is right to look at a fairly comprehensive reform of some of those institutions. And we exchanged some ideas today on precisely how we might do that, and agreed that we would exchange further ideas before we came to the G–7 summit. I think there is—to rationalize some of the financial institutions.

We wish to look particularly, in addition to that, at the United Nations where there are a number of overlapping functions. I am a very strong supporter of the United Nations, and I wish to see the United Nations a successful organization for the year 2000. It does seem that, looking at it, some of the areas of the U.N. could well do with updating, refreshing, to make sure that they are entirely applicable to the problems they will have to face in the late 1990's and beyond the turn of the century. And I hope very much that we will be able to get together with some more of our ideas and float those in greater detail when we get to the Halifax summit later on this year.

We also spent some time looking at the commonality of interests that exists between the United Kingdom and the United States. There are a huge range of areas where there is common interest, and not just those that were discussed—the agreements that we have in terms of policy towards Russia, Iran, Iraq, the Middle East, Bosnia, and a range of other areas.

But beyond that, I think there's a commonality of interest in the future security and prosperity of the Central and East European states, and also with two other matters: First, the further extension of free trade, to which I wish to return in just a second; and second, with looking together and combating together some of the problems of instability, extremism, and terrorism that we can begin to see in parts of North Africa, parts of the Levant, and parts of the Middle East. And we spent some time considering how we might address some of those problems in the future.

It was necessarily a discussion that dealt with problems that may arise, and dealt in some cases, frankly, with generalities. But it was an opportunity to look forward, rather than to just discuss the immediate topical problems that we face at the moment.

One area of growing importance that we touched on was the possibility of seeing how we can build on the Uruguay round agreement of a year or so ago, and see how we can move forward to deal with much freer trade in financial services, for example, removing many of the nontariff barriers that still exist between Western Europe and the United States, and seeing how, step by step, we can move forward to a much greater element of free trade between North America and the Western European nations. That is something that needs to be done. I think it's something that's of immense benefit, and I

found our discussion on that immensely productive and it's one I know that we will both return to in the future.

So I found the discussion, not just on contemporary matters of use, but I found the sharing of ideas about how we deal with the development of the transatlantic relationship to deal with the problems that are going to arise in the future, and also the examination of the common transatlantic view on many of the international problems around the world to be a very worthwhile and a very refreshing discussion, and I'm delighted we were able to have it.

And I think the President and I will be happy to take any questions anyone may have.

The President. Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

Taxes

Q. Mr. President, I would like to ask you about two tax matters at home. Congress has sent you a bill that would provide health insurance tax deductions for self-employed people. But it also allows billionaires, a handful of billionaires, to avoid taxation by renouncing their citizenship. Will you sign or veto that measure? And secondly, the House tomorrow takes up the Republican tax bill that provides benefits to a range of businesses and also a $500 child tax credit for families earning up to $200,000 a year. I know you have your own approach, but can you live with the Republican approach?

The President. Well, as to the first question, I strongly support restoring deductibility to self-employed people for the cost of their health insurance. I think it's unconscionable to have a different standard for them than for corporations. And that was a big part of my health care reform bill last year. So I'm on record strongly in favor of that. As a matter of fact, I'd like to see it expanded.

I am deeply troubled that the conference committee took out a payment mechanism by simply asking billionaires who made their money as Americans and largely made their money in the United States to pay the taxes they owe and instead to let them evade American income taxes by giving up their citizenship now that they have it made. So I'm going to have to look at that very closely and examine whether there might be some other opportunities to achieve that objective. But it's just wrong for us to walk away from that. That's just wrong.

Now, on the second matter, you know what my views are on that. We have two objectives here. I support tax relief for the middle class. I support greater tax fairness. I think it should be much more focused on things that will raise incomes in the short term and in the long term, so I favor a sharp focus on educating people and raising children, on families and education. But we cannot afford a cut of that magnitude and do the right thing by the deficit. And we should not be cutting taxes in ways that benefit very wealthy Americans and require us in turn to cut education, which will weaken our country as a whole. Education is the middle class social safety net, if you will. It is the key to our economic future as well. So I think that's a big mistake. I think it's too big. I think it is—we need to focus on the deficit, and we don't need to be cutting education and investment in our future to give tax relief to people who don't really need it.

Prime Minister Major. Don MacIntyre [The Independent].

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Q. Could I just ask the President whether he accepts the British Government's pronouncements that Sinn Fein has not yet gone quite far enough on decommissioning of arms to justify a ministerial talk? And also, could I ask the Prime Minister whether he's satisfied with the administration on that issue?

The President. Well, I think it's a decision entirely for the British Government to make when in negotiations with Sinn Fein, when ministerial talks are appropriate. I will say this: I was very clear when the Adams' visa was granted with permission to fundraise that there must be an agreement, a commitment in good faith, to seriously and quickly discuss arms decommissioning. Without a serious approach to arms decommissioning, there will never be a resolution of this conflict.

And so I think that—I would hope that there would be no difference in our position on that because I think the Prime Minister

is right about that; we have to deal with this arms decommissioning issue. And I know that there is an attempt by the government to work with the paramilitaries on both sides to achieve that objective, and that's what I think should be done.

Prime Minister Major. Let me just add to that point. We've already started discussions at ministerial level with the loyalists paramilitaries on decommissioning, and those discussions are proceeding. What we're seeking to do is to have exactly the same discussions on exactly the same terms with Sinn Fein.

Now, if Mr. Adams is serious about moving towards peace—and he has repeatedly spoken about it—then he needs to discuss with the British Government the question of the modalities of decommissioning the arms. We need to know how it can be done, when it can be done, what needs to be done, a whole series of details. That matter has to be discussed.

Now, I think it is right for that matter to be discussed at ministerial level with Sinn Fein. And we've made it perfectly clear that, providing they are prepared to discuss that matter—and we've suggested what an agenda might be, and we're in discussion with them about that—then I think it is right for us to move to ministerial discussion on decommissioning of arms.

What is absolutely clear is that unless we are able to make progress on decommissioning of arms, there will be no possibility of Sinn Fein sitting down with the democratic political parties, the other democratic political parties in Northern Ireland. They simply won't be prepared to talk about meeting a settlement until there has been progress on decommissioning of arms. So I very much hope Mr. Adams will embark upon those discussions speedily.

Iraq

Q. Mr. President, I just wondered if you could elaborate on something you said in your opening remarks, about your concerns with Iraq and their apparent ability to build weapons of mass destruction.

The President. I didn't say they had the apparent ability. I said they could be regaining it. And what I mean by that—I want to be very specific about it—what I mean by that is, unless Mr. Ekeus and the international inspectors can certify that they're in full compliance with all the relevant United Nations resolutions, then we have no assurance that they are not regaining the capacity to move forward with weapons of mass destruction. That is what I mean, but that is all I mean about it.

Q. So you're saying you don't have evidence that they are actually——

The President. That they are doing that now? I do not. And I want to make clear—that's why I used the word ''could be regaining.''

The United States position, which the United Kingdom has supported and for which I am very grateful, is that we should not relax these sanctions until there is full compliance with the resolutions. The resolutions were not passed in a careless way. They are carefully worded resolutions designed to assure the international community that this cannot happen. And unless those resolutions are complied with, the international community cannot know that this cannot happen.

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, do you share that view?

Prime Minister Major. I share that view, absolutely. I think we need to await Mr. Ekeus's report. From all I hear, it's not going to be satisfactory about the way Iraq is behaving. We are concerned about the humanitarian aspect of people in Iraq. There is a Security Council resolution, which I trust is going to be passed, which will open up a better possibility for Saddam Hussein to sell oil in order to feed people in Iraq. It's an option that will be there. I very much hope he'll take that option.

But on the general relief of sanctions, until he has met the Security Council resolutions, met the Security Council resolutions in full, and we have seen independent verification that he has met the Security Council resolutions in full, then we entirely agree that there could be no relief whatsoever from the sanctions that have been imposed.

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, having broken bread with Gerry Adams——

The President. It's Mr. Major's turn.

Q. Well, it's to both of you. Having broken bread with Gerry Adams, could you, person-to-person, man-to-man, recommend that he speak with Gerry Adams himself?

The President. That's a decision for the Prime Minister to make in the context of the peace process. I have said—I said on St. Patrick's Day, when I spoke then, I will say again, we are where we are today because of the risks that John Major has been willing to take for peace. And they have been considerable risks to himself, to his party, to his government, because he knows that this matter must be resolved. And I applaud that. The details of the decisionmaking must be made by the participants. And that is a decision for him to make.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Prime Minister Major. I would—sorry.

The President. We didn't do a British——

Prime Minister Major. No, no, no—go after Helen. Ladies first. Adam Boulton [Sky TV] next. He will willingly wait, won't you, Adam? [*Laughter*]

U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy

Q. Mr. President, with all due respect, your nuclear policy is filled with inconsistencies, replete. You want to stop Russia from building a nuclear reactor in Iran. You want to ease sanctions against Pakistan, which we believe is developing nuclear weapons. You want Egypt to sign the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, and all other states in the area. And you never try to persuade Israel, which does have a nuclear arsenal, to sign the treaty. Can you explain?

The President. Well, first of all, I'm trying to remember if I can remember all those three things. [*Laughter*]

The United States does not want Russia to give the capacity to Iran because we don't want that to be the beginning of their increased capacity to develop nuclear fuel and technology for other purposes. And given their conduct, I think that is the right policy, and I don't have any problem with it.

With regard to Pakistan, the simple question there is whether the policy we have pursued in the last few years is achieving its objectives and whether we will be a stronger force for peace and reconciliation and ultimately for the defanging, in terms of weapons of mass destruction, in the area if we change our policy or if we stay with it. I think it's time for—I think we should seriously review the policy.

If you look at the number of people in those countries in South Asia, the potential they represent for the future and the powder keg on which they sit because of their problems, the United States, it seems to me, has an obligation to do the very best we can to bring about the best result and the most peaceful result. And that's all we're doing.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—producing weapons?

The President. We don't support that. We want everybody to be a member of the nonproliferation regime. We want everybody to do that. And that's why I said what I did to President Mubarak of Egypt. Our position is that we want the largest number of people possible to participate in the nonproliferation regime and to go forward with its requirements. And we want to keep as many states non-nuclear as possible. And we are doing our best to reduce the nuclear threat by reducing the number of nuclear weapons that we have, in agreement with the Russians and with the other former states—States of the Former Soviet Union.

And I think that our policy is consistent if you look at what the objective is. The objective is to reduce the threat of nuclear war to the world in the future and to reduce the threat of other weapons of mass destruction. There still is no more significant obligation I have to future generations, and that is the common thread running through all these policies.

Prime Minister Major. Adam.

Anglo-American Relationship

Q. Given that historically—[*inaudible*]—on opposite sides ideologically, and given that we understand Teddy Blair of Labor may be coming here soon, I wonder if I could ask you how important you think your personal relations are for the relations between our two countries.

The President. Well, first of all, I think that in foreign policy, the differences are not easily discernible by party. We have, as you heard today, broad overlap, and indeed, in

our country the differences among us here in America as Americans in foreign policy don't tend to break down along party lines. For example, the Speaker of the House and the Senate Majority Leader supported the position I took on debt relief for Mexico, which was opposed by a number of members of their party and a number of members of mine.

So I think there is—at the end of the cold war in this country, and I sense throughout Europe perhaps, there are forces arguing for kind of an inward-looking approach, a little bit more, if not isolationist, disengaged approach. And there are others who believe we must still continue to broaden the frontiers of relationships, to expand trade, in order to support democracy and prosperity. I am in that latter group. Prime Minister Major's in that latter group. Last year at the G–7 meeting, we were the two strongest proponents of expanding opportunities for economic integration of the countries there. So I just don't believe that there is a necessary partisan breakdown to our common objectives in the world community.

Secondly, I think we've got a good personal relationship, and I feel very comfortable about where it is. And I think it's honest and open. And it endures occasional disagreements, but the agreements are far more numerous, and over the long run, should be the shaping factors of our relationship.

Prime Minister Major. The fact of the matter is that we know well enough—we know one another well enough and the relationship is good enough to have those disagreements. And it doesn't affect the broad sway of agreement that exists between the two countries. I was fascinated to see that you referred to differences between parties and not within parties. And I think that's a great advance. [*Laughter*] I'm delighted—I'm delighted you put it that way.

Let me just make a broader point, really, about the Anglo-American relationship. At almost any time there's probably an issue—be astonishing if there wasn't, if there wasn't some measure of difference on an issue between two sovereign governments, whether they happen to be Conservative or Labor in the United Kingdom, Democrat or Republican in the United States. But against that, I think you have to look at the huge range of things in which the instinctive outlook between the United Kingdom Government and the United States Government is exactly the same.

If you run down most of the great issues of the moment—relationship with Russia, relationship with the Middle East, relationship on terrorism, relationship with Iran, relationship with Iraq—you won't find a scintilla of difference—present policy on Bosnia—between the British Government and the United States Government. If you look at the two nations that were foremost in propounding a free trade agreement, the GATT agreement, and taking that forward, you'll find the same relationship, the British and the American Government.

As for looking forward, I spoke a few moments ago of two areas where we've actually been looking forward today, together, of what we might actually do in the future. But as to whether the relation is good enough, perhaps I can just give you a practical example. If you were to spend a weekend, Adam, on one of our nuclear submarines, you would find a *Trident* missile on it. I'm not sure you could travel on anyone else's submarine and find a *Trident* missile on it. And I hope very soon in the future that you'll be able to see *Tomahawk* cruise missiles in the United Kingdom armory. And I'm not sure anybody will have those.

Now, they're practical illustrations of the extent of the closeness of the defense, of the security and other relationships between the United Kingdom and the United States. And the fact of the matter is, it is sufficiently close and has been sufficiently close for a large number of years to enable the President and I to have the occasional disagreement if we want without any harm coming of it.

The President. Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

Press Secretary McCurry. Make this the last one.

Russian Nuclear Cooperation With Iran

Q. If I could get back to the issue of Russia, you said that you do not want the Russians to go forward with their plans to sell a nuclear powerplant to Iran. What, if any-

thing, did you talk about in terms of putting some real pressure on them? Is there anything you can do at this point to stop it from going forward? And if they do go forward, will it put a damper on the Western relationship with Russia?

The President. Well, we're continuing to have negotiations and discussions with them about it. And I think that's all I can really say at this time because we're in the midst of our conversations.

I thought Helen was going to ask me the question I think you asked me the last time, which is, are we trying to discourage Russia from selling to Iran the technology we're trying to finance in North Korea. The difference is, when I became President, I found a full-blown nuclear program in North Korea, which I'm trying to take down. And I don't want to leave some future President in the United States and the people of Britain with a program in Iran that they have to try to take down. I'm going to do the best I can to deal with it.

Q. Well, a lot of Americans, sir, are questioning whether or not the United States can really rely on Russia in any way—[*inaudible*].

The President. Well, let's don't jump the gun here. We're having these serious discussions. We're working it through. We have a lot of interests in a democratic and a reformist Russia. And the Prime Minister and I talked about it at some length today. And I think that they have done better economically than either the Prime Minister or I thought they would a couple of years ago in terms of pursuing the path of reform. They have continued to honor their Constitution and their electoral system and obligations to democracy. And we're going to have differences from time to time, but I wouldn't assume we can't work this one out. We're going to keep working hard on it.

Prime Minister Major. Peter [Peter Riddell, Times of London].

Bretton Woods Institutions

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, the President mentioned your ideas on the Bretton Woods institutions in the U.N. How much have you worked that up in detail and what would it actually involve? I mean, is it a fully—a several-page plan, or what?

Prime Minister Major. It's developing rather than being developed. We agreed last year that we needed to look at some of the overlap there was in the Bretton Woods institutions and see how we could look at making the—bringing the United Nations a little more up to date.

If I could just give you a couple of illustrations—if you mean have we yet got a detailed, worked-out position between the United Kingdom and the United States, the answer is, no, we haven't. We've both been looking separately as we agreed we would do at the G–7 summit last year at the sort of ideas we might bring forward for discussion with partners at Halifax later on this year and the sort of things that we're looking at in—by "we" I now mean the United Kingdom—in terms of the financial institutions. You'll be aware of the idea we've had in the past of selling some IMF gold to help some of the poorer nations. That's still on the agenda as far as we're concerned. Looking at, perhaps, a greater degree of rationalization of some of the activities of the IMF, OECD, and the World Bank—that's an area we're looking at.

We'd like to look at the way in which poverty is dealt with through the U.N. There seem to us to be a number of overlapping agencies, a certain amount of duplication, which could credibly be looked at. In terms of trade, we'd like to see what can be done to bed down the World Trade Organization satisfactorily. In terms of environment, I would suggest that there are some areas of overlap as well. The U.N. environment program and the Commission for Sustainable Development, there seem to be areas of overlap.

Now, they're just specimen samples of the sort of things we are looking at. I emphasize, we are in the early stages of that examination. We haven't reached any conclusions. But I think those are matters we must examine.

Other things I'd like to see us examine at the summit would be to look more comprehensively at crime, drugs, and money laundering. We had a G–7 task force on money laundering some time ago. That's been successful. I think we should revisit that, given the nature of the problem and given the problem that exists internationally

with crime and drugs. And I think we'd like to look a little more carefully at what might be done in terms of conflict prevention.

Those are just broad headlines of some of the areas we're looking at. We shared them in general outline today. We will come to them in detail at the summit.

The President. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 90th news conference began at 2:53 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Saddam Hussein of Iraq; Rolf Ekeus, chairman, United Nations Special Commission (Iraqi Weapons); Gerry Adams, leader of Sinn Fein; and President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt.

Statement on the Buyout Program for Federal Employees

April 4, 1995

More than 2 years ago, I promised to fix the Federal Government. I was firmly convinced that we could do more with less, that we could create a Government that was "leaner but not meaner," and that we could make Government our partner rather than a problem.

I established the National Performance Review and put Vice President Gore in charge. He and his team have helped to transform Government, to cut bureaucracy and redtape, and to find ways to give the American people the service they deserve. At the same time, my economic plan is bringing down the deficit by more than $600 billion, and we are proposing another $81 billion in deficit reduction in the budget I recently sent to Congress.

A major element of my strategy was my commitment to streamline and cut the Federal work force. For too long in Washington, we have had too many layers of bureaucracy, too many workers whose main job was to check on the work of other workers rather than to perform useful work themselves. As the National Performance Review noted, we had good people trapped in bad systems. I promised to cut the work force, and that's what I'm doing. Through our efforts, we have already cut the work force by 102,000 positions and we are on track to cut it by a total of 272,900 positions, bringing it to its smallest size since John Kennedy was President.

While committed to cutting the work force, we want to do it in a humane way. We faced the same dilemma that confronted many private companies; they needed to downsize but wanted to avoid firing large numbers of loyal employees. Many of them have given people an incentive to leave by offering "buyouts." We wanted to do the same.

Early last year, Congress approved my request to allow non-Defense agencies to offer buyouts of up to $25,000 a person. The Defense Department and a few other agencies already could offer buyouts under existing law. Because normal attrition will help us downsize in the future, we offered buyouts only until March 31, 1995, which was last Friday.

Looking back, I can safely say that our buyout program has been a huge success. It achieved what we had hoped—to help us cut the work force in a fiscally responsible and humane way.

To reduce the work force by 102,000 positions by the end of fiscal 1994, we offered about 70,000 buyouts. Several non-DOD agencies have offered deferred buyouts that will take place between now and March 1997. Defense will be using buyouts as it continues to downsize through 1999. Counting those, we expect to buy out another 84,000 workers through 1997 as we reduce the work force by a total of 272,900 positions.

The buyouts were not offered in a random fashion, however. We targeted them to reduce the layers of bureaucracy and micromanagement that were tying Government in knots. We made sure that departments and agencies tied their buyout strategies to their overall plans to streamline their bureaucracies. As a result, almost 70 percent of our buyouts in the non-Defense agencies have gone to people at higher grade levels, such as managers.

I'm proud that our buyout program was so successful. It shows that we can, in fact, create a Government that works better and costs less.

Proclamation 6781—National Child Abuse Prevention Month, 1995

April 4, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Childhood should be a special time. Every child should grow up in an atmosphere of love and respect. Children should have a chance to learn, to explore and develop, to look forward to becoming successful, happy, and loving adults. Yet tragically, for a growing number of children in the United States, childhood is an ordeal of violence, pain, and broken promises—a time to endure, not one to cherish.

Child abuse and neglect in America are on the rise. Nationwide, nearly 3 million children are reported abused and neglected each year, and more than 1,200 die from the effects. Although public concern about violence against our Nation's youth is extremely high, many Americans don't know what role they can play in protecting them. For that reason, each April, communities across the country join together to raise public awareness, to call for an end to child abuse, and to let everyone know what they can do to help.

This year, National Child Abuse Prevention Month focuses on the simple truth, ''The more you help, the less they hurt.'' The goal is to teach all Americans how they can help end the cycle of abuse and neglect that tears at the very fabric of our families, our communities, and our country. Because the effects of child abuse are felt by whole communities, the search for solutions must be a community-wide effort—and every citizen must get involved.

Child abuse prevention efforts succeed because of partnerships among social service agencies, schools, religious organizations, law enforcement agencies, and the business community. I encourage you to get involved. Volunteer on a crisis hotline for parents who are under stress, or help start a parents' support group. Perhaps you could find space in your community to establish a ''drop-in center'' where parents can get information and support. You could urge your religious or neighborhood group to sponsor a home visitor program for new parents. Or you might help your local school and youth organizations arrange for speakers and events about preventing violence against children.

These are just some of the steps we can take to help protect our children and to strengthen our families. If we don't change things, our children—more of them each day—will lose their chance at life. And our Nation will lose the tremendous potential that every young life holds.

America's children are products of the world we have made for them. Their well-being is a reflection of our commitment, maturity, and wisdom. If we nurture our children and fill their lives with genuine caring and respect, we will see our love realized in a world of enduring hope and promise.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim the month of April 1995 as ''National Child Abuse Prevention Month.'' I call upon all Americans during this month and throughout the year to help keep our children safe from harm.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fourth day of April, 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, 4:18 p.m., April 5, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 5, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on April 7.

Remarks to the National Conference of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL–CIO

April 5, 1995

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for that wonderful welcome. Thank you, Bob Georgine, for that fine introduction, all the distinguished affiliated presidents up here on the platform and all of you

out there in the audience, and I thank those of you who brought your children. Since most of what we're doing and a lot of what I have to say is about them, I'm glad to see them here.

I forgive the person in the back who shouted, "UCLA." [*Laughter*] I told the Gridiron Dinner the other night at the Press Club—I said, my worst nightmare was a final with Arkansas and UCLA. My worst nightmare, the team I love against a team with 54 electoral votes. [*Laughter*]

It was a great tournament, a great game. They won it fair and square, and I congratulate them.

You know, a lot of us here have a lot in common. Bob and I have something in common. We were both raised by strong mothers who believed in hard work and optimism and practiced what they preached and made sure that we practiced what they preached. It was our first lesson in organized labor. [*Laughter*]

I'm deeply honored to be here with you today. I want to thank you for the support that you have given to our programs to train America's workers for the future. I believe that good, strong unions and collective bargaining can help us to meet the challenges that are just ahead if all of us are willing to embrace those challenges and to do what has to be done to make sure that we compete and win in the global economy.

That's why one of the very first things I did as President was to rescind the anti-union Executive orders of the last 12 years, and why last month, I also signed an Executive order which bars Federal agencies from doing business with companies that hire permanent replacement workers.

I have been saying as I'm going around the country that we know what works in our own lives. What works in our own lives is when we are well-educated, well-trained, we work hard, and we work together. There is no future in this country in pitting management against labor. All of us are caught up now in a common destiny in the global economy. All of us will have more job security or more job insecurity, as the case may be, depending on how well we adapt to the challenges of today and tomorrow.

That is the way we have to look at this. We are going up or down together. And it is time we stop looking for ways to be divided, one from another, and start at looking harder for how we can resolve these divisions in an open and honest way so we can get about the business of building our future. That's what we ought to be doing in this country, and that's what I'm trying to do for you every day at the White House.

I look at the unions represented here, the carpenters, the painters, the bricklayers, the electricians, the others, you built our homes, our cities, our factories, the biggest industrial system in the world. You have built our country, and then you have had to rebuild our country. One of the greatest wonders I have seen since I have been President is the swift handiwork of your members who rushed in after the natural disasters, from Florida to the Midwest to California. You did a very good job. And we now are doing a better job with our Emergency Management Agency to try to make sure we do our part and the money gets out there to rebuild places who are torn down through no fault of their own.

Many of you have become heroes to folks whose lives were devastated in those disasters, who wouldn't have a bridge to cross a river or roads to get them to work or offices to work in or roofs over their head if you hadn't worked hard to make sure that the American dream could be restored.

All through 1992 when I was out running for President, I met a lot of people who wondered about the state of the American dream, including construction workers, farmers, office workers, mothers and fathers. I talked with them and listened to them; I worked with them. I walked a picket line with them at the Caterpillar workers in Illinois. What I found was that most people felt that they were out there on their own, struggling against forces that were bigger than they were without anybody very much concerned about what was going to happen to them.

I ran for President because I felt strongly that the end of the cold war and the dawn of the information age gave us opportunities for peace and prosperity, gave our children opportunities to live out their dreams never before known in human history, but that we also had some very, very profound challenges

that unless they were faced, the American dream for all of our people would be at risk.

I wanted to make sure that middle class Americans and their children were not forgotten. I wanted to make sure that poor people would have chance to work their way into the middle class. I wanted to make sure that we could keep alive opportunities for entrepreneurs to become wildly successful without forgetting that this country was built and this country will endure by the broad middle class and by the fact that they work hard, play by the rules, raise their children, and deserve to be rewarded for it, and must be rewarded for it if we're going to keep the American dream alive. That is why I ran for this job.

I also, very frankly, ran to challenge middle class America, because there are many things that Government cannot and should not do. The most important things in the world to us, our commitments, our values, our work, our family, our communities, by and large operate independent of the Government.

Today we're having a great debate here in Washington about what role our National Government should play and how far we can go in working together and moving together. Really, the debate has been going on for at least 15 years now, a debate that, frankly, I'm getting kind of tired of: an old debate that defends Government at every turn; a new debate that attacks Government at every turn; an old view that says we should spend more on everything; a new view that says we should spend less on everything; an old view that said we should do more of everything; a new view that says we should do less of everything. Both views defy our common experience, our common sense, and what we see about what's working, not only here in the United States but around the world.

What works is when the Government, in my judgment, focuses on four things: First of all, creating economic opportunity, jobs, working for better jobs and higher incomes, and demanding responsible behavior from citizens in return. I had an economic meeting in Atlanta last week, and Hugh McColl, from North Carolina, the chairman of NationsBank, pointed out that about that time, he said, ''Tonight your basketball team and mine are going to have a basketball game. And the referee is going to throw the ball up, make sure the playing field is level, enforce the rules, and otherwise get out of the way. And that's about what the Government ought to do.'' But we have to make sure the playing field is level, that there are rules that are enforced, and we get out of the way.

The second thing that we have to pay attention to is the security of our people, our security from attack from abroad and our security from within. I'm proud of the fact that since I have been President, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age there are no Russian missiles pointed at the children of the United States of America. I am proud of that. But I know and you know that our security is also threatened by crime and violence and drugs on our streets. And our security is also threatened by the things which are breaking our families apart and punishing people who are doing their best to do the right things.

That's why we worked so hard to pass that crime bill with 100,000 police on the streets and with prevention programs to give our kids something to say yes to and why we should not walk away from our commitment to putting 100,000 police on the street. Violent crime has tripled in the United States in the last 30 years; the police forces have expanded by 10 percent. You don't have to be a rocket scientist to know that we could lower the crime rate if we did what city after city after city is doing now and put more police on the block, working with kids, trying to prevent crime and catch criminals quicker. And we must not back away from that commitment to our security.

And there is another element to our security, too. It's what happens to families. Are we really going to reward work? Are we going to permit people to be successful workers and successful parents? Most places today, whether they're single-parent or two-parent households, all the parents are working. That's why I fought so hard for the Family and Medical Leave Act—I saw that as a question of family security—why I want to see all the children in this country immunized; why in the economic plan last year we insisted that we give tax breaks for families with incomes just above the poverty line so we would not encourage anybody to slip back

into welfare, and because nobody who works full-time and has children in the home should live in poverty in this country. If you work hard, you ought to be able to have a decent life.

The third thing we have to do is to reform the Government. We do have to change it. It ought to be smaller. It ought to be less bureaucratic. We ought to give more decisions back to the State and local government. We ought to give more decisions back to private citizens in their own lives. We ought to have Government that meets tomorrow's problems, not yesterday's.

That's why we've worked hard at deregulation and why we have given more responsibility to States in the area of welfare and health care reform than—in 2 years—than the last two administrations combined did in 12 years. We have been the administration that has pushed the decentralization of authority for solving a lot of our problems. And we've reduced the size of Government. There are over 100,000 fewer people working for the Federal Government today than there were on the day I became President.

And we have also decided that we have to solve some problems too long ignored. In a little-known action at the end of the last Congress, there was a reform in the United States pension systems which saved the pensions of 8½ million working Americans who were in danger of losing their pensions and protected the pensions of over 30 million more. We still have work to do, and when we have to do it, we should do it well.

The fourth thing we have to do, and maybe the most important of all, is to help our people make the most of their own lives by making sure that everywhere—everywhere—we have a system of lifetime education and training that will permit people always to find work and always to compete and win in the global economy. That is what I think the job of Government is: create jobs, get better paying jobs, increase the security of the American people, make the Government smaller and less bureaucratic, but do the job that has to be done, and give people the skills they need to make the most of their own lives. That should be our road map.

If we could create opportunity and we can insist on more responsibility from the American people—and I believe that strongly; that's what welfare reform is all about—we'll help you if you're in trouble but not for a lifetime. You've got to go to work some time. I think that's what child support enforcement is all about. If you've got the money, you ought to be taking care of your kid, not asking the taxpayers to do it. That's what enforcing the student loan program is all about. I increased the availability of student loans, but when I became President, it was costing you $2.8 billion a year because people weren't paying the loans back. We've cut that down to a billion dollars a year. If people borrowed money from the Government to go to college, they ought to pay it back when they get a job so other kids can borrow the money when they come along.

I have called this new arrangement the New Covenant. What it means to me is simple: The Government should try to create more opportunity, but the citizens of this country are going to have to behave more responsibly in seizing it. And if you put the two together, there will be no stopping the United States.

Now, if you look at what's been accomplished in the last couple of years, I think the most important thing is that we have changed the direction of economic policy in this country. We went beyond the old debate. There's no more tax and spend, but there's not more trickle-down, either. This is invest and grow economics. And look at the results.

Two years ago when we were fighting for the economic plan, the people who were against it said the sky would fall. If the President's plan passes, the economy will be wrecked. Everything will be terrible. Some said I was cutting too much. Some said it was an error to raise taxes on the wealthiest Americans to put against the deficit because that would hurt the economy. Well, 2 years later, we have over 6 million new jobs and the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 25 years.

In reducing the deficit by $600 billion, we took $10,000 in debt off the future of every family in the United States. In cutting taxes for 15 million working families, this year, on average, families with two kids with an income of $25,000 a year or less will pay about $1,000 less in taxes than they would have if

that economic plan hadn't passed. We made it possible for our country to say, ''If you work 40 hours a week and you have a child in your home, you will not be in poverty.'' That is important, folks. If you want people to get off welfare, we have to reward work. And it's also why, by the way, we ought to raise the minimum wage, because people can't live on it.

And we didn't just spend more money on everything. We cut 300 programs, and the new budget I proposed cuts or consolidates 400 more.

We've also done what we could to help those of you in labor who have been taking responsibility all along. Last year, the AFL–CIO listed all the bills supported by organized labor that I signed into law. As of last fall, there were 32 of them, motor voter, family and medical leave, the assault weapons ban, to name just a few. Laws that increased our security as workers, parents, and citizens.

But you know, in spite of all this, there's still a lot more to do. I have people all the time come up to me in kind of bewilderment and say, ''Well, things are going well in my business. Things are going well for our country. This country is in better shape than it was 2 years ago.'' Why are people still so negative about the future of the country? When you ask people what about the direction of the country, they say they are worried. I was interviewed by a magazine the other day saying their annual readers poll said that people understood that things were getting better, but they were more worried about their personal security than ever before. Why is that?

Well, there's a reason for that. The global economy has imposed new challenges and new burdens on our country and every wealthy country in the world and runs the risk in our country of literally splitting apart the American idea. Let me explain what I mean by that.

From the time I was born at the end of World War II until the year I was elected Governor of my State for the first time, 1978, the American people moved forward in absolute lock-step. That is, if you break the economy into people who are in the lowest 20 percent and the second and so forth on to the top 20 percent, all of them had about the same increase in their incomes. Incomes roughly doubled in America from 1950 to 1978 evenly across the board, except the poorest 20 percent had an increase of 140 percent. So we were all going forward, and we were actually coming together.

Since 1978 that's all changed. Wages have been stagnant and not kept up with inflation on average for hourly wage earners. And in the last 15 years, half of the American people are now living for the same or lower earnings that they were making 15 years ago when you adjust for inflation. Why? Because of the way the technology revolution and the global economy, where management and money and technology can fly across national borders, have divided opportunity, so that people with high levels of skill in growth industries tend to do well, and people with lower skill levels tend to get hurt. And then, if our Government walks away from its obligations to invest in our future, even more people get hurt.

The other thing that's happened is because the economy is changing so fast, even a lot of people that are doing well today think they're waiting for the other shoe to drop. So many big companies getting smaller all the time. You ought to read my mail about it. People my age, even young people I grew up with—not so young anymore—writing me, saying, ''You know, I've worked for this company for 25 years. I've got to send my kids to college. We're doing great now, but what happens if they lay me off?''

So there is this uncertainty in our country today, even though we are clearly in better shape than we were 2 years ago. We've turned away from the false choice between tax and spend and trickle-down economics. We're moving in the right direction. The question is, how can we get everybody involved in the American dream? How can we reward everyone's work? How can we make people more secure in living with all these changes that are rifling through the world? That is the burden that I carry to the office every day, because I know—I know that if everybody in this country had a chance to live their lives the way most of you have lived your lives and raised your kids, this country would be fine, and our future would be unlimited.

The key to the 21st century, more than anything else, is clearly, education for young people, lifetime job training for adults. It is clear that if we can raise the skill levels of our people, constantly and permanently, and continue to change the job mix so that we're always getting America's share of those high-wage jobs, we can keep the America dream alive, and we can stop the middle class from splitting apart, so that everybody can grow and prosper. That is our great challenge. And that is the one we must not walk away from.

You have been working on this for years. You've had opportunities to train a new generation of builders. I want to especially commend the outreach programs that you've had with the Housing and Urban Development Department, reaching deep into our cities, taking thousands of young people from housing projects, teaching them the skills, and clearing away the obstacles to job opportunities. You have done some things that the Government could not do. And I thank you for that. I know that Bob really cares a lot about this outreach program because he spent his own early years in housing projects in Chicago. This is the kind of partnership we need more of.

For Government's part, we have to do more, as well. In 1994, the educational experts said that the United States Congress, in passing our education program, did more for education than had been done in Washington in 30 years. We expanded Head Start. We established the Goals 2000 program, which writes the national education goals into law but gives our local schools more flexibility in how they spend Federal money to achieve excellence. We dramatically increased the number of programs around our country for apprenticeships from young people leaving high school who aren't going on to college. And we expanded the availability of college loans to the middle class, at lower cost and better repayment terms.

And of course, our national service program AmeriCorps, is now bigger than the Peace Corps ever was. And there are 20,000 young people all across America working in community service projects, doing things that need to be done and earning funds to go on to college.

Those are the kinds of things we must do more of. Those are the kinds of things that are important. That's why I said a moment ago that if we work on education and we work on incomes, the rest of this will pretty much take care of itself, I think. That's why I hope the Congress this year will not only raise the minimum wage, but with all this tax cut talk, we can't afford a lot of these tax cuts. We've got too big a deficit. But we ought to give the middle class a break. And the most important thing we could do is give people a tax deduction for any costs they or their children have for any education after high school, because that will raise incomes over the long run.

Let me just ask you one other thing I want you to think about. There are a lot of exciting things going on in this town these days. And as I said, we are debating the role of Government, but there must be a distinction made. If you don't believe in tax-and-spend economics and you don't believe in trickle-down economics and you do believe in invest-and-grow economics and you've seen how it is working the last 2 years, then you also have to reject this debate that we should spend more money on everything or we should spend less money on everything.

We have to make judgments up here based on what is important. Therefore, I would say, let's cut more spending. I have cut and cut and cut, and I want to cut some more. We've got to get this budget deficit down further. We can bring this budget into balance, and we can do it in a fair way. But we have to make judgments. We should not be cutting Head Start. We should not be cutting aid to the public schools. We shouldn't be cutting the apprenticeship programs. And we certainly shouldn't be limiting the availability of college loans to the middle class. We shouldn't be adding to the cost of college education for working families. These are proposals that I think are wrong. We shouldn't be eliminating national service. And we certainly shouldn't be doing all these things either to pay for a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans or because we refuse to find other things to cut. That is wrong. Let's make decisions, and let's do it right, and let's stick up for education and training.

And you have issues in this Congress—Bob referred to one of them, the Davis-Bacon law. We need to make this economy more competitive. But we need more high wages. We don't need a low-wage strategy. We need a high-wage strategy for the future. We need a high-wage strategy.

Like every other law, it shouldn't be abused. We should not pretend it's something it's not. But it is a decent thing to say that the Government should stand on the side of good wages and the real wages in the community that are good and fair.

I've made appointments, like Bill Gould to the National Labor Relations Board, and Fred Feinstein to be the General Counsel, who now have given you a board that believes in the process of collective bargaining and one that believes we can be fair to workers. These are the kinds of things that we ought to do if you believe our future is in working together.

I'm not for repealing Davis-Bacon. I also believe that we should not walk away from our commitment to safety in the American workplace. In 1993 there were more than half a million construction injuries and over 900 fatalities. We can reform OSHA in ways that you feel better about it and employers feel better about it, where it works better and makes more sense and helps you get more jobs and gain more income and helps them make bigger profits. But we cannot walk away from the fundamental fact that before we were committed to worker safety, a lot more people died in the workplace, a lot more people were permanently maimed in the workplace, a lot of more people were hurt in the workplace. There is a right way and a wrong way to reduce the burden of Government.

I could just—let me mention one other thing that affects some of your industries. I believe with all my heart if we hadn't passed the environmental protection legislation in the 1970's, the air would not be as clean, the water would not be as pure as it is today, and the legacy we're going to pass along to our children would not be as good. I believe that. I also believe, like any Government bureaucracy, there are things about the EPA that ought to be changed. So we're going to more market-based incentives to give companies incentives to clean up the environment. And Carol Browner, our Administrator, is reducing by 25 percent the paperwork burden of the EPA. It will free up 20 million man-hours of work next year. That's a lot of time in a lot of industries that all of you work in.

We're trying to give small businesses a break. We're saying to small businesses—I was at a union print shop in Virginia a couple of weeks ago to announce this—if you worry about whether you've got an EPA violation and you're afraid to call because you're afraid they'll fine you, now we're going to set up a compliance center, and if you call there and ask, if you ask, you can't be fined for 6 months. And you're going to be given a chance to clean up the problems.

I think we can change the way Government regulation works to make it less nutty. But let's not forget that we have a common public interest in a safe workplace. We have a common public interest in a clean environment. And we have a common public interest in having a high wage, high growth partnership economy, not a low-wage, stagnant, divided economy.

So I say to you, engage the Members of Congress, tell them you welcome the debate about the role of Government. But Government has certain responsibilities: first of all, to change and get rid of the past stuff that doesn't work; to create more opportunity; to provide more security; to insist on more responsibility, but to give people the education and training and skills they need to make it in the 21st century.

I'm telling you that if we take advantage of this time, if we keep the economic strategy that we have adopted—that I hammered through the Congress by the narrowest of margins, with all the doubters saying, "Well, we had to either have tax-and-spend or trickle-down," and I knew this was the right thing to do—if we will stay with this economic strategy, and then, aggressively go after strategies to raise wages, raise incomes, educate and train people, and if we don't throw out the baby with the bath water, this country is going to do just fine.

I am looking for a future for America like the ones most of us who are my age in this audience used to take for granted. And we can give it to our kids, but only if we are

tough enough and wise enough and compassionate enough to do what we know in our heart is right. You help, we'll do it.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:20 a.m. in the Grand Ballroom at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Bob Georgine, president, Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL–CIO.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt

April 5, 1995

President Clinton. Good morning, everybody. Good afternoon.

Q. Good morning. What's on the agenda today?

President Clinton. A lot of things. But we're going to have a press briefing afterwards, so you'll get to ask all the questions.

Q. That's what you said yesterday, Mr. President. [*Laughter*]

President Clinton. And we did it, didn't we?

Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

Q. President Mubarak, will you support the extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty?

President Mubarak. We were one of the founders who participated in the drafting of the NPT since 1968. So we support the NPT 100 percent. We have no problem with the United States, anyway, concerning the NPT.

Q. Do you have a problem with Israel?

President Mubarak. No, we would like to find a solution so as to keep our area free of all mass destructive weapons. That's all.

Q. It sounds like you're going to sign.

President Mubarak. I'm not going to tell you now anything.

Q. Was President Clinton persuasive?

President Clinton. We just met 2 seconds ago. We're going to have a press briefing soon.

Q. Thank you.

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

President Clinton. Good afternoon.

Egypt-U.S. Relations

Q. How would you describe the Egyptian-American relations?

President Clinton. I think it's very good. I've enjoyed working with President Mubarak, and I'm looking forward to this discussion. And of course, afterward, we'll have an opportunity to take your questions.

Q. President Clinton, will you ask Israel to fulfill its obligation and to deploy its forces from the West Bank and Gaza?

President Clinton. I'll answer the questions in the press briefing after I visit with President Mubarak.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:07 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks to the United States-Egypt Presidents' Council

April 5, 1995

President Clinton. Let me begin by welcoming you all to the White House and here to the Roosevelt Room and thanking you for your willingness to participate in this council.

I think all of you know that the United States and Egypt have had and continue to have a very close relationship, and we believe that our future interests are very much bound up together. We believe we have to do more in the economic area. We need more partnerships and more success stories. And for my part, I am very, very committed to trying to further the work of increased economic interaction, bringing about more prosperity, more opportunity.

So I want to thank both the Americans who are here and the Egyptians who are here for your willingness to serve and commit the resources and the efforts of this Government to the success of this endeavor. And I know I speak for the Vice President, the Secretary of State, and of course, our Trade Ambassador and Secretary of Commerce. We are convinced that this is an important part of our common future.

Mr. President.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. A tape was not

available for verification of the content of these remarks.

The President's News Conference With President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt

April 5, 1995

President Clinton. Good afternoon. Please be seated. As always, it's a great pleasure to have President Mubarak back at the White House. For 14 years, he has been a valued friend and partner to the United States. He was one of the first foreign leaders to visit me here after I became President, and I began my trip to the Middle East last fall by visiting him in Cairo to seek his counsel. Under his wise leadership, Egypt has been an ally, as well as a source of stability in the region and throughout the world.

In the last 2 years, we've witnessed the dawn of a new era in the Middle East. Without President Mubarak's tireless efforts on behalf of peace, these landmark achievements would not have occurred. Thanks to his persistence, the promise of Camp David, where Egypt took its stand against war, has been redeemed. In the months and years ahead, we will continue to look to President Mubarak to play a vital role in broadening the circle of peace. We're determined to do everything we can meanwhile to deepen our own partnership for peace and prosperity.

He and his government have already made great strides toward reforming and restructuring the Egyptian economy. I got a very impressive report on the progress that has been made at the luncheon we just concluded. But more is necessary to stimulate the economy so that it can provide good jobs and a future of hope for the hundreds of thousands of young people who enter the Egyptian work force every year.

The United States is committed to helping. Vice President Gore just returned from his second visit to Egypt in the last 6 months. On my behalf, he began a dialog for growth and development with President Mubarak that is unprecedented in its scope and ambition. Today he and I have taken another step forward in this partnership by meeting with the new members of our Presidents' Council at their first gathering. These top American and Egyptian businessmen will advise us on several vital issues: expanding the private sector, building stronger commercial ties between our peoples, creating better conditions to attract United States investment to Egypt.

We're also working together to bring more prosperity and stability to the entire region, efforts that are essential for peace to establish firm roots. We reaffirmed our support for greater regional cooperation and development, especially the economic initiative that began at the Casablanca summit. We also had a good discussion about the need to lift the boycott of Israel and ways to accomplish this as soon as possible.

Egypt and the United States share a determination to confront and to defeat all those who would undermine peace and security through the use of terror and weapons of mass destruction. President Mubarak told me of Egypt's regional proliferation concerns and of its commitment to a strong, universal Non-Proliferation Treaty and to a Middle East that is free of all weapons of mass destruction. The United States shares those goals.

To create the confidence and security that will make those aims a reality, we must continue to do all we can to bring a comprehensive and lasting peace to the Middle East. For the same reason, I believe we must ensure that the NPT is strong and as enduring as possible. Indefinite and unconditional extension of NPT is vital to achieving the goals that we both share.

When President Mubarak and I first met here 2 years ago, he told me that together we could help to make a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. He was right. We have worked side by side to fulfill that vision. Doing so, we have deepened the friendship between our two nations. Our goal is now within grasp, and America is proud to be Egypt's partner on this great mission.

Mr. President.

President Mubarak. Thank you. Once again I meet with my good friend President Clinton in order to pursue our joint endeavor for the benefit of our two nations.

We discussed all issues of mutual interest in the spirit of friendship, candor, and mutual confidence. Our views were similar on var-

ious issues. Our paramount commitment is to strengthen the structure of world peace and security and to promote cooperation among nations. Our two countries are destined to play a pivotal role throughout the world and in their regions, respectively. We are determined to pursue our mission with vigor and determination. We realize that the challenge is awesome, but our commitment to our noble goals is firm, and quite firm.

President Clinton, together we worked tirelessly for decades to promote peace and security in the Middle East. We achieve tangible success year after year, and we remain determined to pursue this goal until a just and comprehensive peace is reached throughout the area. We should never allow enemies of peace to threaten the gains which were made in the recent past. We will never hesitate to condemn terrorism and all forms of violence. Our aim is to eliminate the sources of hatred and conflict.

As we move to cement the structure of peace and security in the Middle East, we should do our utmost in order to remove all potential threats. Our purpose is to build together a new future of hope and promise for this troubled region. With this in mind, I deemed it necessary to propose in 1990 the establishment of a Middle East free of all weapons of mass destruction. My objective was and still is to make every Arab and Israeli feel more secure and less worried about the future and that of his children.

I explained to President Clinton and his able assistants our position on the NPT. We remain among the most enthusiastic supporters of the treaty. We consider it one of the pillars of the stable world order. Hence, we would like to reinforce the moral authority of the NPT. By the same token, we have a certain concern which emanates from the existence of nuclear programs in our region.

Our view is that since peace is spreading throughout the region, all the parts ought to work together towards the elimination of the potential threats, especially the spreading of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. This is the true application of the principle of the universality and adherence to the NPT. All states of the region should realize that it serves in their own interests to accede to the treaty. Unless this is done, no one would have control over the spread of such lethal weapons in a fragile and vulnerable region which has suffered long enough from war and devastation.

We propose, for our common good, to achieve that through serious but friendly negotiations between Egypt, and perhaps other Arab countries, and Israel. It is our sincere hope that Israel will approach this issue in a positive and constructive spirit. The U.S., under the leadership of President Clinton, can help attain this objective.

Our bilateral relations, Mr. President, are excellent. We work together in various fields in harmony and mutual trust. As we have been partners in peace and security, we are establishing a new solid partnership for economic growth and development. Thanks to President Clinton and Vice President Al Gore, we have developed a new concept for this partnership. The idea is to stimulate growth and productivity. It is vital to create jobs for our young people. We shall do that through promoting trade and investment.

We have already begun the implementation of this concept, and we are determined to make it a success story. We are encouraging the private sector to play a major role in this endeavor. As you know, our economy is becoming more and more business-friendly. This is a cornerstone of our economic reform program. We are fully committed to pursue this reform until it bears fruit.

In conclusion, I would like to thank President Clinton for his warm reception and hospitality. We are most appreciative of the understanding and the cooperation we have been receiving from every American. We will leave this great country with a renewed assurance of the solidity of the friendship and the depth of our cooperation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

President Clinton. Thank you.

I'd like to alternate questions now between the American and the Egyptian press. We'll start with Ms. Santos [Lori Santos, United Press International].

Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

Q. Mr. President, did President Mubarak assure you that he will sign the extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and

stop urging other Arab nations not to sign unless Israel does?

President Clinton. Let me tell you the position that I took on it. And I think I'll let President Mubarak speak for himself. We believe that the NPT should be universal. And we believe that the Middle East should be free of all weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, biological, chemical. We also believe that cannot be accomplished overnight and that Egypt and Israel, as the first two parties to make peace in the Middle East, should work on this together. And I'm encouraged that the Foreign Ministers, Mr. Moussa and Mr. Peres, are going to meet soon on this issue.

The reason we believe, however, that we should vote for an NPT extension that is indefinite, without regard to whether every country in the world that we think should be in the NPT is in it, is that it seems to us that with the indefinite extension of the NPT, that will allay a lot of the security concerns of countries that are not in it and encourage them to get in it, whereas if we don't indefinitely extend it, then countries that are not fully participating may think they should hedge their bets for the future. So that's our policy; that's why we support it and why we hope it will prevail.

Mr. President, would you——

President Mubarak. I would like to say something about the NPT. In 1968, we were one of the 18 countries who participated in drafting the agreement of the NPT. We are supporting the NPT. We know that the NPT is for the welfare of the whole world in the new world order. And we know it's very important that all parties should join the NPT. We are working very hard for that, and we will never withdraw from the NPT—just to make sure of what you may mean that way.

Egyptian-Israeli Relations

Q. President Mubarak, the new peace between Jordan and Israel is warming up fast. The first peace between Israel and Egypt is still somewhat chilly. Will you come to Israel for the first time and personally warm it up so we can move ahead together?

President Mubarak. Jordan has about 3 million population, Egypt about 60 million. Jordan and Israel are living with each other, let us be very realistic and frank, long time ago. They have so many Palestinians here and there. But believe me, without the key of peace which was started by late President Sadat, I don't think that neither Jordan nor Palestinian would have the courage or would have thought of opening peace with this country.

Peace is not cold, as some people could say, but sometimes it's affected by a statement here or there. But believe me, there is much more progress on the cooperation with the Israelis between Israel and Egypt now. And this is the cornerstone.

President Clinton. Someone from the Egyptian press.

Q. Mr. President——

President Clinton. Go ahead.

Q. As the national security is top priority for the United States and Egypt and we are friends and allies, how can the United States help Egypt to secure its national security while there are nuclear weapons at its borders, a few kilometers from its borders? And my question is to both Presidents.

President Clinton. Well, I will restate what I said before. I believe that we—Egypt's security is best served in terms of what the United States can do in three ways, first of all, by continuing the general search to rid the entire region of all kinds of weapons of mass destruction. And we realize that we deal with the history and the facts of the countries as we find them, that it cannot be done overnight, but that that must be our goal and we must be working on that. And universal application of NPT is one of the ways we think that should be done.

The second thing is a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. If we can resolve the issues still outstanding among the other countries in the Middle East, that clearly will help to bolster Egypt's security.

Then the third thing I think we can do is what we are doing here by trying to strengthen our economic ties, so that the reform policies that have been adopted by President Mubarak and his government will be rewarded and people who live inside Egypt will feel more personally secure with their own opportunities.

I think all those things have to be pursued, but I don't think that we can—any of us can

pretend that we can do it without regard to the past history of the countries involved.

President Mubarak. I think I agree to all of what President Clinton already mentioned, and I have nothing to add more than that.

Q. Mr. President——

President Clinton. Go ahead, Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

CIA and Guatemala

Q. Mr. President, the Senate is holding hearings today on CIA dealings in Guatemala, and I know that you've ordered an investigation. Can you say if the CIA's activities were appropriate in Guatemala, and were the White House and Congress kept fully and properly informed?

President Clinton. Well, I cannot answer the questions fully until I see the investigation. I think both those questions are—they're still open questions. I wish I could say absolutely yes to both of them. But because I can't say, with absolute conviction, yes to both of them, I have ordered an investigation that, as you know, is reasonably unusual in its scope and in terms of who's doing it. And so, I'm going to keep working until we get to the bottom of it. And then when I do, I'll give you the best answer I can.

Yes, ma'am.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Egypt and the United States have played a pivotal role in the peace process since its inception. What, in your views, are—this is for both Presidents—the steps that should be taken by all parties concerned to further the peace process, especially that the Israeli and the American elections are soon, close?

President Clinton. Do you want to go first? [*Laughter*]

President Mubarak. As you like.

About the peace process, you know there is a Declaration of Principles, first of all, with the Palestinians, and we consider that the Palestinian problem the main problem in the whole Middle East issue.

The implementation may be a little bit lagging behind, because some terroristic action taking place—[*inaudible*]—and the Israelis are looking for their security. My proposal is—and I spoke with Mr. Arafat and Mr. Rabin—they should both cooperate. The two authorities should cooperate to avoid all this terroristic action, because if we surrender to these people, they will feel it is a success for them and the whole peace process will be a failure. I think both understand this very well, and I hope that they could do well in that direction and to continue the implementation of the Declaration of Principles.

If it is in the course of the Syrians, I know that the Syrians are now negotiating on the level of ambassadors here. I hope that there will be progress in the future. I am very sure that President Asad want reach a settlement to the problem and want sign—to reach an agreement, peace agreement with Israel.

President Clinton. I agree with the points that have been made. I would only make two other points. With regard to the Palestinians, it's also important that we try to resolve—as we resolve the security issues, that we try to work on getting economic investment back into Gaza and to Jericho, so that there is some opportunity for people there, some alternative to the destructive behavior that many are urging.

And with regard to the Syrians, I agree with what President Mubarak said, but—I think President Asad does want peace, and I think Prime Minister Rabin wants peace, but I think it is important that they reach an agreement fairly soon for the reasons that you said.

And let me say further, let me reiterate something I said in my opening statement. I think we've got a good chance to keep implementing the principles, with all the difficulties the Palestinians are having. I think we've got a good chance to reach an agreement with Syria and Israel. And I don't think either thing would happen if it weren't for the intense involvement of both the United States and Egypt.

Go ahead.

Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

Q. This is a question for both of you. Are you saying that it would be acceptable if Israel would agree to sign the NPT at some point in the future, say, at the time a comprehensive Middle East peace is reached?

President Clinton. Well, I think President Mubarak should answer that, since it's really a question about whether it would be acceptable from his point of view. My position is that all countries should joint the NPT; that the Middle East should be free of all weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, biological and chemical; that that objective will be more easily achieved, notwithstanding the differences between Israel and the other countries, if we have an indefinite extension. That is the position of the United States and the position that I strongly believe to be the correct one. At any rate, I hope we'll be able to prevail with that position when the vote comes with a healthy majority.

The President of Egypt has his own views and convictions, and what he said is absolutely true: Egypt has been a complete and consistent supporter of the NPT regime from its inception. So I think I should let him answer for himself.

President Mubarak. We have no problem even with the United States concerning the NPT, as I have already mentioned before. The NPT—as I said, we were one of the 18 countries who drafted, participated in the draft. The point is, there is peace in the area. Egypt signed peace agreement, and we are in peace with Israel. Jordan signed peace agreement. Palestinian Declaration of Principles has been implemented now. Syria is on its way to reach an agreement. So there will be peace in the whole area.

So I don't think that Israel will be in need for any nuclear weapons in the future. But we are negotiating this issue to find any kind of formula to be agreed upon. We are not asking them to join the NPT now or tomorrow. We would like to know what we are going to do just for our national security. I think the ministers are going to meet tomorrow. I hope, with the help of the United States, we could narrow the gap and reach something concerning this issue.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. My question is for President Clinton. The Middle East continues to give rise to cynicism regarding the wider peace. Do you think that this might be due to lack of forceful American engagement?

President Clinton. Because of the continuing problems?

Q. Yes, because of the feeling that nothing is happening.

President Clinton. Well, first of all, a very great deal has happened in the last 2 years, and more than at any time in the last 15 years since the Camp David accords. So we have accomplished a great deal. We're about half of the way home toward a complete resolution of it.

The Secretary of State just got back from the Middle East. The Vice President has been to Egypt twice in the last 6 months. I am sending another envoy out today. I have been in regular and extensive contact with President Asad and Prime Minister Rabin, who was just here to see me recently. So we are working at it very, very hard.

I was concerned and, frankly, I would have agreed with a little bit of your question until about a month ago. About a month ago we got some new energy, some new direction, some new sense that both parties were really committed to trying to resolve this in the reasonably near future. So I'm more optimistic now, and I just think we have to keep working and people have to believe that there is not an unlimited amount of time within which to resolve this before other factors intervene.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network].

104th Congress

Q. Mr. President, if I could ask you a domestic question. The 100 days of the Republican Contract is about to end. Could you give us your assessment of these 100 days, what lessons have you learned, and where are you planning to go from here?

President Clinton. Well, I think, for one thing, I thought it got off to a pretty good start. From my point of view and my convictions, it's not ending as well as it started, because I don't agree with this tax bill. But it got off to a good start. The first three issues that were really taken up in earnest were issues that I also campaigned on: Applying to Congress the same laws they apply to the private sector—that's been passed and I've signed it; reducing the ability of the Federal Government to pass mandates on to State and local governments that cost the taxpayers

there—I've signed that into law and I applaud the Congress for doing that; and both Houses have passed a version of the line-item veto, which I think is badly needed to control unnecessary spending. So those things I think are quite good.

In terms of a lot of the other measures which have made their way through the House, I think it depends on what the Senate does to them in terms of whether I think they're good for America. I do not believe that it's wise to have a tax cut of this magnitude where—with the deficit we've got and with our need to invest in our future and our children, where one percent of the people get 20 percent of the benefits and 12 percent of the people get half of the benefits, and in order to pay for it we run the risk of exploding the deficit or devastating our commitment to our children, to our educational system, and to our support for families, all of which are critical to our future economic growth.

I mean, we don't want to go back to trickle-down economics here under another term. The reason I ran for President was to get out of the old fight between tax-and-spend economics and trickle-down economics. I wanted to invest and grow the economy. So we reduced the deficit and increased our investment in education and technology and our efforts in trade. That economic strategy is working to lift Americans' incomes. Now we have to add an educational component. And this tax approach is just wrong in my judgment.

So I'm going to keep working. Let's see what happens in the next 100 days and the 100 days after that and the 100 days after that. But our goals should be to lift the future prospects of the American people and grow the middle class again. And that's my assessment at this point.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. President Clinton, in the serious effort that your administration is dedicating to our Israeli-Palestinian peace, you are to be commended and your administration. And in the attempt to assist the Palestinian Authority in receiving the needed funds to build its infrastructure, can you please call, you and President Mubarak, on the Israeli Government and Mr. Rabin to end the closure of the Gaza Strip and the territories, and allow more workers to enter Israel seeking employment as a way of injecting more funds in Gaza and the West Bank and all of the territories and help improve the economic conditions of the Palestinians that you are also working hard on that? Thank you.

President Clinton. We talked about this at some length together. I think it's the toughest issue, frankly, that we face between the Israelis and the Palestinians for this reason. When the borders were open, it made Israel more vulnerable to terrorism. When innocent people are killed, it undermines support in Israel for the peace process and weakens the government's ability to go forward. When the borders are closed, the incomes of the Palestinian people drop dramatically, and it makes young people more vulnerable to the appeals of the terrorists.

So it is an almost insoluble problem in that sense. It is the most difficult problem. And it is—obviously, the enemies of peace know this, and they seek to be rewarded whether the borders are open or the borders are closed. They think they will get their reward.

So I would say to you that I wish I had an easy answer. We are working on this problem. We are certainly talking to the Israelis about it. But it is the most difficult aspect of this process. And it is something that we have to be—I'm very sympathetic with the Palestinians who are within Gaza, and with the instability there, which undermines our ability to get, for example, Palestinian-Americans to invest there.

On the other hand, I understand Prime Minister Rabin's situation. I saw what it did to Israel when these acts of terror started occurring again, what it did to the psychology of the people, their feeling of confidence that peace could make a difference for them. So I won't presume to give you a final answer today, except to say I am very focused on this, and I know that this is the toughest part of the problem and that we're going to have to resolve it.

President Mubarak. I think what—we discussed this at length with President Clinton and we had long talks about it, realizing the situation will be much more difficult in Jericho and the Gaza because the income of

the people nearly stopped. And we're wondering how are they going to live. And this may complicate the whole situation. That's why we have—already I have contact Mr. Rabin several times, and I spoke with Arafat. They should find a way for these people to have their income. Otherwise we'll return to terrorists, as the President already said, and it will be very difficult after that to solve the problem because complications will continue and the terrorist groups will feel that they succeed.

President Clinton. Brian [Brian Williams, NBC News].

President's Role in the Legislative Process

Q. Mr. President, one more domestic question. I'm curious as to your role over the next 100 days. Do you see it changing from that of dissenter to something, for lack of a better word, more proactive, more proactive legislatively?

President Clinton. Well, we were quite active in the—first of all, I agreed with—let me go back to the three areas which have passed. With regard to the bill applying to Congress the laws they put on the private sector, there was no activity for us to undertake, since I agree with the bill as it was drafted by the congressional leadership.

With regard to the bill on unfunded mandates, we were quite active in the Senate there and in the conference committee to try to get a bill which would permit us to protect the national interest and still give relief to State and local governments.

And with regard to the line-item veto, I personally lobbied a number of Democratic Senators very hard to make sure that we would be able to get a line-item veto through the Senate so we could go to conference and get one to my desk. Now, as I said, all three of those things I have worked very hard on.

All the other contract items that have passed with which I disagree, we are working in the United States Senate and we will work in the conference committee to try to get bills that are consistent with the principles that I hold to my desk so that I can sign them, not veto them. I do not want a pile of vetoes.

In the next 100 days, you're going to see a very exciting debate about welfare reform, something I've been involved in for 15 years. I have laid out my principles very, very clearly on that. You're going to see a debate about the larger budget that will run for the next 6 months, I think, in which I have very strong feelings about what we should be doing. I hope that I can focus the attention of the Congress on the need to lift the incomes of the American people, which means that if we're going to have a tax cut it ought to be for middle-class people to raise their children and educate themselves and their children, because that will raise incomes over the long run. And I hope I'll be able to persuade the Congress to raise the minimum wage. So I think I'll be involved in this debate with Congress.

Meanwhile, we're going to be pursuing our efforts to reform Government that we can do through the executive branch and our efforts to expand the American economy and our efforts to make the American people more secure. We will be pursuing those things just as we always have. And it will be a very exciting time.

I'm enjoying this, but I'm determined to see that the American people come out the winner. I do not want us to go back to trickle-down economics and to go back to the old debate, which is we should spend more on everything or less on everything. The less-on-everything crowd now has a majority in the Congress. What we should do is spend less on some things and more on some things and invest in things that will grow our economy and raise our incomes.

So I'm looking forward to being part of this debate. And I'm determined to see that it's a positive thing for the American people.

One more question from an Egyptian.

Antiterrorism Efforts

Q. Mr. President, Egypt has been—has a very good record combating and containing terrorism inside the country. What could the neighbors of Egypt in North Africa and the Middle East learn from the Egyptian experience?

President Mubarak. This question to me?

Q. Yes.

President Mubarak. Each country has its own tradition, its own way of living, its own

way of dealing with the problems. We could manage to put down all the terroristic action to a great extent by law. We are not violating the law. Our neighbors, they have different characters, different situation, and they have their own idea that could make a good estimation of a situation to adopt what decision which could suit them to put an end to terrorism that's completely different from ours.

President Clinton. Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 91st news conference began at 2:44 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Minister of Foreign Affairs Amre Mahmoud Moussa of Egypt; Foreign Minister Shimon Peres of Israel; President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria; Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel; and Yasser Arafat, Palestine Liberation Organization Chairman.

Memorandum Announcing the Charter of the Special Adviser for Assistance to the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union

April 4, 1995

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Charter for Special Adviser to the President and to the Secretary of State on Assistance to the New Independent States (NIS) of the Former Soviet Union and Coordinator of NIS Assistance

The United States has a vital stake in the success of reform in the New Independent States (NIS) of the former Soviet Union. Ensuring effective support for the transformation underway in the NIS remains among the highest foreign policy priorities of my Administration. Over the past two years, bilateral assistance programs under the FREEDOM Support Act have played an important role in promoting democratic and economic reforms in the NIS, while projects funded through the Cooperative Threat Reduction (Nunn-Lugar) Act have promoted our denuclearization and nonproliferation policies. Despite remarkable progress, however, the success of reforms across the former Soviet Union is by no means assured. This fact, combined with budget realities that constrain the level of our financial aid to the region, make it imperative that our assistance be as targeted, relevant, and efficient as possible.

To assure maximum coordination of efforts to promote such reforms and policies within the Executive branch, I hereby designate Richard L. Morningstar as Special Adviser to the President and to the Secretary of State on Assistance to the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union and Coordinator of U.S. Assistance to the NIS in accordance with Section 102 of the FREEDOM Support Act. Mr. Morningstar will also act as Chairman of the previously established interagency NIS Assistance Coordination Group. In fulfilling these duties, Mr. Morningstar will preside over the allocation of U.S. assistance resources and direct and coordinate the interagency process on the development, funding, and implementation of all U.S. Government bilateral assistance and trade and investment programs related to the NIS.

To ensure that Mr. Morningstar will be able to carry out his responsibilities effectively, the Departments of Defense, Treasury, Justice, Commerce, Agriculture, Health and Human Services, and Energy, the Agency for International Development, United States Information Agency, Peace Corps, Environmental Protection Agency, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Trade and Development Agency, and Export-Import Bank, and any other Executive departments and agencies with activities related to NIS bilateral assistance and export and investment activities are directed, to the extent permitted by law, to bring all programs and budget plans for such assistance and activities to Mr. Morningstar for review before submission to the Office of Management and Budget and before implementation. Mr. Morningstar shall be responsible for ensuring that all such plans are consistent with Administration priorities and policies. Heads of such entities shall designate an official at the level of Assistant Secretary or its equivalent to assist Mr. Morningstar in accomplishing the objectives of this mandate.

Mr. Morningstar will work with the U.S. Ambassadors to the NIS to strengthen coordination mechanisms in the field and increase the effectiveness of our assistance and

export and investment programs on the ground. Assistance activities in the field will be coordinated by Ambassadors or their designates.

Mr. Morningstar will serve as a member of and consult with the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission and the Policy Steering Group for the New Independent States to ensure that U.S. assistance and related activities are consistent with and support broader foreign policy objectives.

In carrying out these duties, Mr. Morningstar will report to me through the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs and the Secretary of State, with policy guidance from the Policy Steering Group on the New Independent States.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 6.

Statement on Intent to Sign Self Employed Health Insurance Legislation

April 6, 1995

I intend to sign H.R. 831 because it reinstates and expands a much needed law that allows 3.2 million self-employed Americans and their families to deduct 25 percent of the cost of their health insurance, increasing to 30 percent in 1995.

This legislation is good for the country. I included it as part of my health reform bill last year because it restores fairness and security to an important group of Americans who work hard and play by the rules. Absent my approval of this legislation, almost 3.2 million self-employed workers—doctors, lawyers, farmers, artists, accountants—would not be able to claim this deduction for health insurance premiums on their 1994 income tax returns. By making this deduction permanent, we are treating them more like other businesses, and we are making them more competitive. And by making health care more affordable, we are shrinking the ranks of the uninsured and expanding coverage for more middle class Americans.

Because this health care benefit is so important, I will sign this legislation. But I am troubled by the fact that the conference committee took out a provision of law that simply would have required billionaires who made their money in this country to pay the taxes they owe. Instead, they decided to let them evade American income taxes by giving up their American citizenship. This is wrong. Billionaires who make their fortunes in this country ought to pay taxes here like everyone else. I am going to work to change this law in the future.

In addition, this bill carves out a special exception for one pending deal. This is the kind of dealing that goes on all the time in Washington.

That's why we need a line-item veto that covers both spending and special tax provisions. When I get it I can assure you I will use it to weed out special interest loopholes like the one in this bill.

But because of the important benefits of this legislation to our Nation's self-employed and their families, I could not justify a veto. The economic and health care interests of 3.2 million Americans and their families are too important to be held hostage.

Proclamation 6782—National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day, 1995

April 6, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

In the centuries since our Nation was founded, our citizens have been called on time and again to defend the blessings of American democracy. Although the enemies of freedom have often risen from distant shores, the valiant men and women who wear our Nation's uniform have made freedom's fight their own. From Europe to the Pacific, Korea to the Persian Gulf, these Americans and their families have suffered through the darkest hours of humanity so that the cause of human dignity might endure.

It is in gratitude that we pause each year to recall the courage and to honor the service of the sons and daughters of America who have been held as prisoners of war. Few words can express the depth of their sacrifice

or the worthiness of their mission. Often subjected to extreme brutality in violation of international codes and customs governing their treatment, many of our people have come home with disabling wounds and injuries. Too many of our people have not come home at all.

Today, the lives of these extraordinary Americans and the stories of their indomitable spirits are at the core of our national character. The citizens of the United States will always remember the proud individuals who traded their liberty to preserve our own. We will build on the triumphs of democracy that they have helped to ensure. And in speaking of their bravery, we will tell our children and grandchildren that though bodies may be imprisoned, hearts can remain ever free.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim April 9, 1995, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day." I urge State and local officials, private organizations, and U.S. citizens everywhere to join in honoring the members of the United States Armed Forces who have been held as prisoners of war. I call upon all Americans to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 3:17 p.m., April 6, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 10.

Message to the Congress on Environmental Policy

April 6, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

The United States has always been blessed with an abundance of natural resources. Together with the ingenuity and determination of the American people, these resources have formed the basis of our prosperity. They have given us the opportunity to feed our people, power our industry, create our medicines, and defend our borders—and we have a responsibility to be good stewards of our heritage. In recent decades, however, rapid technological advances and population growth have greatly enhanced our ability to have an impact on our surroundings—and we do not always pause to contemplate the consequences of our actions. Far too often, our short-sighted decisions cause the greatest harm to the very people who are least able to influence them—future generations.

We have a moral obligation to represent the interests of those who have no voice in today's decisions—our children and grandchildren. We have a responsibility to see that they inherit a productive and livable world that allows their families to enjoy the same or greater opportunities than we ourselves have enjoyed. Those of us who still believe in the American Dream will settle for no less. Those who say that we cannot afford both a strong economy and a healthy environment are ignoring the fact that the two are inextricably linked. Our economy will not remain strong for long if we continue to consume renewable resources faster than they can be replenished, or nonrenewable resources faster than we can develop substitutes; America's fishing and timber-dependent communities will not survive for long if we destroy our fisheries and our forests. Whether the subject is deficit spending or the stewardship of our fisheries, the issue is the same: we should not pursue a strategy of short-term gain that will harm future generations.

Senators Henry Jackson and Ed Muskie, and Congressman John Dingell understood this back in 1969 when they joined together to work for passage of the National Environmental Policy Act. At its heart, the National Environmental Policy Act is about our relationship with the natural world, and about our relationship with future generations. For the first time, the National Environmental Policy Act made explicit the widely-held public sentiment that we should live in harmony with nature and make decisions that account for future generations as well as for today.

It declared that the Federal Government should work in concert with State and local governments and the citizens of this great Nation ''to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans.''

Over the past 25 years, America has made great progress in protecting the environment. The air is cleaner in many places than it was, and we no longer have rivers that catch on fire. And yet, this year in Milwaukee, more than 100 people died from drinking contaminated water, and many of our surface waters are still not fit for fishing and swimming. One in four Americans still lives near a toxic dump and almost as many breathe air that is unhealthy.

In order to continue the progress that we have made and adequately provide for future generations, my Administration is ushering in a new era of common sense reforms. We are bringing together Americans from all walks of life to find new solutions to protect our health, improve our Nation's stewardship of natural resources, and provide lasting economic opportunities for ourselves and for our children. We are reinventing environmental programs to make them work better and cost less.

My Administration is ushering in a new era of environmental reforms in many ways. Following is a description of a few of these reforms, grouped into three clusters: first, stronger and smarter health protection programs such as my proposed Superfund reforms and EPA's new common sense approach to regulation; second, new approaches to resource management, such as our Northwest forest plan, that provide better stewardship of our natural resources and sustained economic opportunity; and third, the promotion of innovative environmental technologies, for healthier air and water as well as stronger economic growth now and in the future.

Stronger and Smarter Health Protection Programs. Throughout my Administration, we have been refining Government, striving to make it work better and cost less. One of the best places to apply this principle in the environmental arena is the Superfund program. For far too long, far too many Superfund dollars have been spent on lawyers and not nearly enough have been spent on clean-up. I've directed my Administration to reform this program by cutting legal costs, increasing community involvement, and cleaning up toxic dumps more quickly. The reformed Superfund program will be faster, fairer, and more efficient—and it will put more land back into productive community use.

Similarly, EPA is embarking on a new strategy to make environmental and health regulation work better and cost less. This new common sense approach has the potential to revolutionize the way we write environmental regulations. First, EPA will not seek to adopt environmental standards in a vacuum. Instead, all the affected stakeholders—representatives of industry, labor, State governments, and the environmental community—will be involved from the beginning. Second, we will replace one-size-fits-all regulations with a focus on results achieved with flexible means. And at last, we're taking a consistent, comprehensive approach. With the old piecemeal approach, the water rules were written in isolation of the air rules and the waste rules, and too often led to results that merely shuffled and shifted pollutants—results that had too little health protection at too great a cost. With its new common sense approach, EPA will address the full range of environmental and health impacts of a given industry—steel or electronics for example—to get cleaner, faster, and cheaper results.

Better Stewardship of our Natural Resources. Just as representative of our new approach to the environment—and just as grounded in common sense—is the Administration's commitment to ecosystems management of the Nation's natural resources. For decades ecologists have known that what we do with one resource affects the others. For instance, the way we manage a forest has very real consequences for the quality of the rivers that run through the forest, very real consequences for the fishermen who depend on that water for their livelihood, and very real consequences for the health of the community downstream. But until recently, government operations failed to account adequately

for such interaction. In many cases, several Federal agencies operated independently in the same area under different rules. In many cases, no one paused to ponder the negative consequences of their actions until it was too late.

Often, these consequences were catastrophic, leading to ecological and economic train wrecks such as the collapse of fisheries along the coasts, or the conflict over timber cutting in the Pacific Northwest. When I convened the Forest Conference earlier this year I saw the devastating effects of the Federal Government's lack of foresight and failure to provide leadership. Here, perhaps more than anywhere else, is a case study in how a failure to anticipate the consequences of our actions on the natural environment can be devastating to our livelihoods in the years ahead. Our forest plan is a balanced and comprehensive program to put people back to work and protect ancient forests for future generations. It will not solve all of the region's problems but it is a strong first step at restoring both the long-term health of the region's ecosystem and the region's economy.

Innovative Environmental Technologies. Environmental and health reforms such as EPA's common sense strategy and natural resource reforms such as the forest plan provide an opportunity, and an obligation, to make good decisions for today that continue to pay off for generations to come. In much the same way, sound investments in environmental technology can ensure that we leave to future generations a productive, livable world. Every innovation in environmental technology opens up a new expanse of economic and environmental possibilities, making it possible to accomplish goals that have eluded us in the past. From the very beginning, I have promoted innovative environmental technologies as a top priority. We've launched a series of environmental technology initiatives, issued a number of Executive orders to help spur the application of these technologies, and taken concrete steps to promote their export. Experts say the world market for environmental technology is nearly $300 billion today and that it may double by the year 2000. Every dollar we invest in environmental technology will pay off in a healthier environment worldwide, in greater market share for U.S. companies, and in more jobs for American workers.

Innovations in environmental technology can be the bridge that carries us from the threat of greater health crises and ecological destruction toward the promise of greater economic prosperity and social well-being. Innovation by innovation, we can build a world transformed by human ingenuity and creativity—a world in which economic activity and the natural environment support and sustain one another.

This is the vision that Jackson, Muskie, and Dingell articulated more than two decades ago when they wrote in the National Environmental Policy Act that we should strive to live in productive harmony with nature and seek to fulfill the social and economic needs of future generations. We share a common responsibility to see beyond the urgent pressures of today and think of the future. We share a common responsibility to speak for our children, so that they inherit a world filled with the same opportunity that we had. This is the vision for which we work today and the guiding principle behind my Administration's environmental policies.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 6, 1995.

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 7.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Dallas, Texas

April 7, 1995

The President. Thank you very much. "Fishbait" Favre. [*Laughter*] It's got kind of a nice ring, doesn't it? [*Laughter*] I knew he was born in New Orleans before he ever said it. I love to listen to people from New Orleans talk.

I thank you for that kind introduction. Your convention program chair, Bob Haiman, and your incoming president, Bill Ketter, ladies and gentleman, I'm very glad to be here.

I thought that in addition to me you were going to hear from three people who had run, are running, and were about to run for President. But only Bill Weld showed up. I hope he stays in the about to run. He and Steve Merrill are very impressive men, and I'm glad that they came here and gave the Republican point of view.

It's a privilege to be here. I'd like to begin by saying that I am very proud, and I know you are, for the work that the Interamerican Press Association has done in its Declaration of Chapultepec. I know that you and the Newspaper Association of America have worked tirelessly for press freedoms all throughout the Americas. And just before I came out here I was proud to sign a Charter of Endorsement for the Declaration of Chapultepec. And I thank you for giving me that opportunity and what you have done to advance the cause of a free press.

I was talking to a friend of mine the other day who said, "Well, in the '94 election we discovered the limits of liberalism, and now we're about to discover the limits of conservatism." And it put me in mind of a story I once heard about the—and actually, I thought about it because I met Mr. Favre—about the late Huey Long, who, when he was Governor and he was preaching his share the wealth plan was out in the country one day at a little country crossroads. And he had all the people gathered up. And he was going on about how the people were being plundered by the organized wealthy interests in Louisiana.

And he saw a guy out in the crowd that he knew and he said, "Brother Jones, if you had three cadillacs, wouldn't you give up one of them so we could gather up the kids and take them to school during the week and take them to church on the weekend?" He said, "Sure, I would." He said, "And if you had $3 million, wouldn't you give up just a million of it so we could put a roof over everybody's head and make sure everybody had food to eat?" He said, "Well, of course, I would." He said, "And if you had three hogs—" He said, "Wait a minute, Governor, I've got three hogs." [*Laughter*]

Anyway, that's the limits of liberalism. Now we're about to discover the limits of conservatism.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are at a historic moment in our country's history: on the verge of a new century, living in a very different kind of economy with a bewildering array of challenges and opportunities. In 1992 and in 1994, the voters spoke out and demanded bold changes in the way we govern and the policies we pursue. They know better than anyone else that they are living in a time with new challenges that demand new answers.

In the last 2 years, my administration has begun to meet those challenges. I ran for President because I felt we were being victimized by 12 years of gridlock in which the deficit had gone up, the wealthiest Americans had done quite well, the middle class had stagnated, and the poor were in trouble, in which the American dream was really at risk because half of the American people were working for the same or lower wages that they had made 15 years earlier.

I had a clear mission. I wanted to grow the middle class, shrink the under class, and speed up the opportunities for entrepreneurs. I wanted to promote the mainstream values of responsibility and work, family, and community. I wanted to reform the Government so that we could enhance opportunity, shrink bureaucracy, increase our security, and most important of all, empower people through education to make the most of their own lives.

In the first 2 years we've made good progress. The economy is up, and the deficit is down. We've expanded educational opportunities from Head Start through more college loans that are more affordable. The American people are marching toward more security because there are no Russian missiles pointed at the children of our country for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, because we passed a serious crime bill that will lower the crime rate in many of our communities throughout the country, and because we've begun to address some of the problems of family security with the Family and Medical Leave Act. And certainly, we have done a lot to shrink and to reform the Government's bureaucracy.

But it is not enough. Too many Americans don't yet feel any of those benefits. Too many still feel uncertain about their own future,

and too many people are overwhelmingly concerned about the social and the underlying moral problems of our society. And so in 1994, they voted to give the Republicans a chance to run the Congress.

In the last 100 days, the House of Representatives has passed a series of bold initiatives. We will soon begin the second 100 days of this Congress. In the first 100 days, the mission of the House Republicans was to suggest ways in which we should change our Government and our society. In the second 100 days, and beyond, our mission together must be to decide which of these House proposals should be adopted, which should be modified, and which should be stopped.

In the first 100 days, it fell to the House of Representatives to propose. In the next 100 days and beyond, the President has to lead the quiet, reasoned forces of both parties in both Houses to sift through the rhetoric and decide what is really best for America. In making these decisions, it is absolutely vital that we keep alive the spirit and the momentum of change. But the momentum must not carry us so far that we betray our legacy of compassion, decency, and common sense.

We have entered a new era. For years, out here in the country, the old political categories have basically been defunct, and a new political discussion has been begging to be born. It must be now so in Washington, as well. The old labels of liberal and conservative, spender and cutter, even Democrat and Republican, are not what matter most anymore. What matters most is finding practical, pragmatic solutions based on what we know works in our lives and our shared experiences so that we can go forward together as a nation. Ideological purity is for partisan extremists. Practical solution, based on real experience, hard evidence, and common sense, that's what this country needs.

We've been saddled too long with a political debate that doesn't tell us what we ought to do, just who we ought to blame. And we have got to stop pointing fingers at each other so that we can join hands.

You know, our country has often moved forward spurred on by purists, reformists, populist agendas which articulated grievances and proposed radical departures. But if you think about our most successful periods of reform, these initiatives have been shaped by Presidents who incorporated what was good, smoothed out what was rough, and discarded what would hurt. That was the role of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson in the aftermath of the populist era. That was the role of Franklin Roosevelt in the aftermath of the La Follette progressive movement. And that is my job in the next 100 days and for all the days I serve as President.

We stand at a crossroads. In one direction lies confrontation and gridlock; in the other lies achievement and progress. I was not elected President to pile up a stack of vetoes. I was elected President to change the direction of America. That's what I have spent the last 2 years doing and that's what I want to spend the next 100 days and beyond doing. Whether we can do that depends upon what all of us in Washington do from here on out.

So I appeal today to Republicans and to Democrats alike to get together, to keep the momentum for change going, not to allow the energy and longing for change now to be dissipated amid a partisan clutter of accusations. After all, we share much common ground.

For example, in 1992, I was elected to end welfare as we know it. That was part of my New Covenant of opportunity and responsibility. In 1994, the Republicans made the same demand with their contract. In the last 2 years, I have already given 25 States, one-half of the country, the opportunity to do just that on their own. And I introduced the most sweeping welfare reform the country had ever seen. I want to work with the Congress to get real welfare reform.

In 1992, I was elected to slash the deficit. That also was part of my New Covenant. In 1994, the Republican contract called for a continuing deficit reduction and movement toward a balanced budget. Well, I cut the deficit by $600 billion, cut 300 programs; I proposed to consolidate or eliminate 400 more. I want to cut the deficit. Except for the interest run up between 1981 and 1992, our budget would be in balance today. My administration is the only one in 30 years to run an operating surplus. I will work with the Republicans to reduce the deficit.

In 1992, I was elected to shrink the size of the Federal Government which I have done. That, too, was a part of my New Covenant. In 1994, the Republican contract said we should shrink the Government. I have already cut 100,000 bureaucratic positions, and we are on the way under budgets already passed to reducing the Government by 270,000, to its smallest size since President Kennedy occupied this office. I want to work with Congress to reduce the size of Government.

We both want tax cuts, less intrusive Government regulations, the line-item veto, the toughest possible fight against crime. These were a part of the New Covenant and a part of the Republican contract. In 2 years, we have made real progress on all these fronts, but we can, and we should do more.

We are near many breakthroughs. The real issue is whether we will have the wisdom and the courage to see our common ground and walk on it. To do that, we must abandon extreme positions and work together. This is no time for ideological extremism. Good-faith compromising, negotiating our differences, actually listening to one another for a change, these are the currency of a healthy democracy.

In that spirit, I come here today to outline where I stand on the remaining items in the Republican contract and the unfinished business of my New Covenant.

Let's begin with taxes. In 1993, I made a down payment on the middle-class tax cut I advocated when I ran for President. We cut taxes for 15 million working families. What that means on average is that this year a family of four with an income of $25,000 a year or less will have about $1,000 in lower tax bills. We did this to ensure that nobody who works full-time and has children should live in poverty. If you want to reform the welfare system, you must reward work and parenting.

So I want a tax cut to expand, to include more members of the middle class. Why? Because half the American people are working for the same or lower incomes they were making 15 years ago. And we've had a recovery that's produced 6.3 million new jobs, the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 25 years, and we need to spread the benefits of the recovery.

But this $200-billion tax cut, which is really more than 3 times that if you look at it over a 10 year period, is a fantasy. It's too much. It's not going to happen. We can't afford it. A realistic cut would be somewhere around a third of that. That's something we can afford. In the world we're living in up there, if we go beyond that, what you're going to see is no success at deficit reduction, or horrible injustice to the most vulnerable people in our country. So we can't pass that. Let's get over it and talk about what we can pass and work on doing it. Let's target a tax cut to the right people and for the right purpose.

We have to choose: Do you want a tax cut for the wealthy or for the middle class? The Republican plan gives half of the benefits to the 10 percent of the people who are best off, and most importantly, to the 10 percent of our people who have done very, very well in the last 15 years. Twenty percent of the benefits go to the top one percent of our people. They have done very well in the new global economy. The middle class has suffered the stagnant incomes. Let's direct the tax benefits to those people.

But we also have to choose what kind of tax break. Shall we just put money in people's pockets? Or shouldn't we do something that will strengthen families and increase the whole wealth and success of the United States over the long run? Let's help our people get the education and job training they need.

The technology revolution, the global economy, these are dividing opportunity at home and abroad. The middle class is splitting apart. And the fault line is education. Those who have it do well; those who don't are in trouble. So let's use the tax cut as I propose in the middle class bill of rights as sort of a scholarship given by America to people for their cost of education after high school. And let's provide for an IRA that people can withdraw from tax free to meet the exigencies that their families face: college education, health care costs, first-time home, care of an elderly parent. These things will strengthen our country and we can afford it.

Let's take welfare reform. As I said, both of us, both the Republican contract and my

New Covenant, have focused heavily on welfare reform. What do we agree on? That there ought to be a limit to welfare; that there ought to be flexibility for the States; that we ought to have the toughest possible child support enforcement; and that people have to take more responsibility for their own lives and for the children they bring into this world.

But the current House bill focuses primarily on cutting costs. It's weak on work and tough on kids. It punishes young people for past mistakes. We must require them, instead, to look to the future and in the future to be responsible parents, to be responsible workers, to be responsible students, and then give them the opportunity to do that.

The House bill also punishes young children for the sins of their parents. I think that's wrong. Rich or poor, black, white, or brown, in or out of wedlock, a baby is a baby, a child is a child. It's part of our future, and we have an obligation to those children not to punish them for something over which they had absolutely no control.

Now, that's where I disagree. But look what we agree on. We are near historic change. We can do this. We can make a difference. We can break the culture of welfare, and we can do something good for our country to support the values we all believe in. And we can give these children a better future. But to do it, we're going to have to talk through our differences and get beyond the rhetoric to how these real lives work and not stand on the sidelines posturing for political gain.

Let's take cutting the deficit. The balanced budget amendment is dead. But now we have to get specific. How are we going to cut the deficit and move this budget toward balance? If we can focus on cuts, not making partisan points, that's the first step. There are cuts I can't live with. There are cuts the Republicans can't live with. Let's avoid them and make cuts we can all live with.

We shouldn't cut help for our children. That builds our future. We shouldn't cut their education, their immunization, their school lunches, the infant formulas, or the nutrition programs. There's no need to cut them. So far, based on the action they've taken, the Republicans want the poor in this country to bear the burden of two-thirds of their proposed cuts and only get 5 percent of the benefit of the tax cuts. It is not right. It is wrong. But that doesn't mean we don't have to cut the budget and reduce the deficit.

The rescission package that passed the Senate last night gives us a model about how we should proceed. The House passed a rescission package with completely unacceptable cuts in education, child nutrition, environment, housing, and national service. The Senate Republicans, to their credit, restored several of these cuts. I insisted on restoring even more and replacing them with better cuts. And almost every one of the Democrats in the Senate agreed.

So yesterday, over the course of the debate, they worked that out. Those cuts were restored as well. There will still be a $16 billion reduction in the deficit this year. The bill passed 99–0 in the Senate, and I will sign the Senate bill if the House and the Senate will send it to me. That's how we should be doing the business of America.

Let's talk about the line-item veto. As I said before, that was in the Republican contract, and I campaigned for President on it in 1992. I appeal to Congress to pass it in its strongest form. I appeal to members of my own party who have reservations about it to support it as well. The line-item veto has now passed both the Senate and the House.

If you look at how it passed the Senate, that's an example of how we can make this system work. I strongly supported it. I campaigned to Democratic Senators and asked them to support it. They worked out their differences, and it passed overwhelmingly in the Senate.

The President and the Congress both need the power to cut spending. If you doubt it—if you doubt it—look at the bill that Congress recently passed to restore to 3.2 million self-employed Americans, farmers, small businesspeople, professionals and all their family members, the 25 percent deduction for the cost of their health insurance.

That was a part of my health care plan. I desperately want to do that. We ought to do more. They ought to be treated just like corporations. It is imperative to sign it. But hidden in that bill was a special tax break

for people who did not need it. If I had the Senate version of the line-item veto, I could sign the bill and help the people who are entitled to it, and veto the special break. This is the kind of thing that's been hidden in bills of Congress forever. We can now do something about it, and we ought to do it.

Political reform, something that was also in the Republican contract: Two of the 10 items in the Republican contract have actually become law. And two, term limits and the balanced budget amendment, have been defeated. Of the two that have become law, they were both about political reform, and they were also both part of my 1992 commitments to the American people. One applies to Congress the laws they impose on the private sector. The other limits the ability of Congress to impose unfunded mandates on State and local government. I was proud to sign them both. They will advance the cause of responsible Government in this country.

But political reform means more. It must include, I believe, both lobbying reform and campaign finance reform. If you doubt how much we need lobby reform just go back and refer to the story that was rightly printed just a few days ago about how, in this session of Congress, you have lobbyists actually sitting at the table with Congressmen, writing bills for them and then explaining to them what the bills mean. It seems to me that since these bills help the people the lobbyists represent, but drastically restrict the ability of the Government to act in the areas of the environment, in protecting our people, we need some significant reform in our lobbying laws. So I don't think we should stop there.

Regulatory reform, another big item in the Republican contract: There are lots of horror stories. Every one of you probably knows a story that shows where a bureaucrat overreached, or there were too many regulations, or there was too little common sense. I am committed to changing the culture of regulation that has dominated our country for a long time. I have gone around espousing to everybody that they ought to read Mr. Howard's book, ''The Death of Common Sense.''

But for 2 years, we have been working through the reinventing Government initiative that the Vice President has headed to change the culture of regulation. We deregulated banking. We deregulated intrastate trucking. We have reformed the procedures of the SBA. We scrapped the 10,000-page Federal personnel manual. We have dramatically changed the way the General Services Administration operates in ways that have saved hundreds of millions of dollars for the taxpayers and put more competition into the process, thanks to the GSA Director, Roger Johnson, who happens to be here with me today. We are working on these things to move forward.

But we must do more. And yet, surely, the answer is not to stop the Government from regulating what it needs to regulate. If the Republicans send me a bill that would let unsafe planes fly or contaminated meat be sold, or contaminated water continue to find itself into city water systems, I will veto it. I will veto it. But if Congress will just sit down with me and work out a reasonable solution for more flexible regulatory reform, we can create an historic achievement.

I agree that Congress has a role to play. I agree that Congress sometimes hears things about the way regulations work that people in the executive branch don't. Congresswoman Johnson and Congressman Bryant and Congressman Geren flew down here with me today. They're out there all the time talking to their members. They may hear things we don't. That's why I approve of the Senate's 45-day override legislation. But I will veto any bill that lets a bunch of lawyers tie up regulation for years. We've got too much of that as it is.

So I say, flexibility, yes; reform, yes; but paralysis and straightjacketing, no.

Let's talk about legal reform. Are there too many lawsuits? Of course, there are. Do jury awards once in a while get out of hand? Yes, they do. Does this affect the insurance system in the country? It has an impact on it. But at a time when we're giving more and more responsibility to the States in which one of the signal ideas of the Republican contract that I largely agree with is that the State and local governments should have more responsibility, do we really want to take the entire civil justice system away from the States for the first time in 200 years? I don't think so.

Let me give you a couple of examples. Should we put justice out of the reach of

ordinary people with a ''loser pay'' rule? No. Think about it this way: ''Loser pays'' will keep ordinary citizens from exercising their rights in court just as a poll tax used to keep ordinary people of color and poverty from exercising their right to vote. I will veto any bill with a ''loser pay'' requirement such as that that was in the House bill. I don't think it's right.

Punitive damages: they could stand some reform but not artificial ceilings. Punitive damages are designed to deter bad future conduct. Now, if you have a national ceiling of $250,000 think what that means—$250,000 may be too burdensome for a small-business person who loses a lawsuit. You don't want to put them out of business unless they're malicious. But does anybody seriously believe that $250,000 will have any kind of significant deterrent impact on a giant multinational corporation? So let's negotiate realistic reforms that improve the system, but don't wreck it.

Crime: Crime was a big part of the New Covenant, a big part of why I ran for President. The personal security of the American people should be our first concern. And we delivered. After 6 years we broke gridlock, and I signed a crime bill that was endorsed by all the major law enforcement organizations in the country, the cities, the counties, the prosecutors, the attorneys general, everybody. And it had bipartisan support, too, until we got close to the last election; Republicans and Democrats cosponsoring all major provisions.

What was in the crime bill? It had more punishment, ''three strikes and you're out,'' expansion of capital punishment. It had more police, 100,000 police on our street. And I might say that over half of the communities in this country have already received grants under the police program just since last October. We're ahead of schedule and under budget. There are already about 17,000 police officers authorized and funded to be hired. It had more prisons, something the Republicans very much wanted, as long as the States agreed to change their sentencing procedures. And it had more prevention programs, something the police demanded. The police said, ''You cannot police and punish and imprison your way out of the crime crisis. You have got to give these children in our country something to say yes to. You've got to give them a reason to stay off drugs, a reason to stay in school, a reason to believe they can have a future.'' So it had all those things.

Now, if the Republicans wish to continue to try to repeal the commitment to 100,000 police, or to repeal the assault weapons ban, they have a perfect right to do it. But if they send me those provisions, I will veto them. On the other hand, while the rest of their crime bill needs some work, and I disagree with some provisions of it, it has some good points. If we can build on the '94 crime bill instead of tear it down, we can continue our efforts to make the American people more secure. So let's do that. Let's pass a crime bill we can be proud of, that builds the country up and makes our citizens safer.

The environmental protection area: A big part of my New Covenant was protecting our environment and promoting our natural resources. It's something we can all give to our children whether we die rich or poor. And it is our obligation to our future economic health, because no nation over the long run succeeds economically unless you preserve your environment.

I just got back from Haiti, and I can tell you one of the biggest obstacles to the survival of democracy in that country is they have ripped all the trees off every hill in the country, and we need to plant tens of millions of trees. We could put half the young people in the country to work for a year just trying to undo the environmental devastation. And unless we do it, they're not going to be able to regain their economic footing.

I cannot and I will not compromise any clean water, any clean air, any protection against toxic waste. The environment cannot protect itself. And if it requires a Presidential veto to protect it, then that's what I'll provide.

I will also veto the House-passed requirement that Government pay property owners billions of dollars every time we act to defend our national heritage of seashores or wetlands or open spaces. If that law were on the books in every State in the country today, then local governments would completely have to give up zoning or be bankrupt every

time they try to change a zoning law. That is why every time it's been on the ballot in a State—and it's been on the ballot 20 times, including in conservative, Republican States—it has been defeated. The people of Arizona voted against it by a 20-point margin last November.

Well, the people do not have to vote—do not have a vote on this issue in Congress. But I do, and I'll use it. This is not a good law.

Peacekeeping: Decades from now when we have our next Republican President—[*laughter*]—he or she will be very grateful that I refused to approve the so-called peacekeeping legislation passed by the House. The United Nations and the world community did not struggle through 45 years of stagnation because of Soviet vetoes to have to deal with a new stagnation because of an American congressional veto.

The United Nations is 50 years old this year. But it's only 4 or 5 years old as a real force for international stability and security as it was imagined by Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower and Arthur Vandenberg, responsible Republicans and Democrats. So let us learn from the United Nations mistakes in Somalia and the United Nations successes in Haiti and throughout the world, about how we can best keep the peace in partnership with our neighbors throughout the world.

In Haiti there were almost 30 countries in there with us and the multinational force, and under the U.N. mission there now, well over 30 countries, people who came from a long way away because they know the world must work together to promote humanity and peace and democracy and decency. Let us not walk away from the United Nations and isolate America from the world.

There's some other things I want to talk about. Those are the items in the Republican contract, many of which were also in my New Covenant and where I stand on them. But I want to talk about some other items as well, the unfinished business of the agenda that I ran for President on.

I was elected to fix a broken Government, to relight the dormant fires of the economy, to make sure that working families reap the just reward of their effort and are able to pass their children the same dream they had, and to end the sort of something-for-nothing mentality that had crept into our country by restoring the values of responsibility and work and family and community.

The Republican contract, even where I agree with it, does not deal with much of what is really at the heart of America's challenges today, opportunity and security for working Americans. So let me talk about these issues.

Health care: In the State of the Union I said I had learned that I bit off more than I could chew last year, and we have to reform health care a step at a time. But I haven't forgotten the need to reform health care. Everybody knows we still have problems. It costs too much. There are a lot of people who have inadequate coverage. There are a lot of people who have no coverage at all, and there are millions of Americans who could lose their coverage at any time. So I call on Republicans to join me in taking this one step at a time, beginning with things the majority of them have long endorsed:

First, making benefits portable so you don't lose your health care when you change jobs.

Second, requiring coverage for families with a preexisting condition so the whole family doesn't lose health care just because there's been one sick child.

I saw a couple from Delaware on the street in Washington a couple of months ago when I was taking my jog, the best-looking family you ever saw. The young man and woman looked to be in their late thirties. They had five children. Their fourth child had a birth defect, and he was a small-business man. None of them had any health insurance. That's an intolerable situation in this country, and we shouldn't put up with it.

The third thing we ought to do is to establish voluntary pools, such as those established in Florida and many other States, which allow small businesses and self-employed people to buy health care on the same terms as those of us who work for Government or big corporations can buy it, to put some competitive power behind their need.

The fourth thing we should do is to expand home care for the elderly, so that families who are struggling to keep their elderly par-

ents and grandparents at home in a more independent living setting have some alternative before putting them into a nursing home when it will almost certainly cost the government much, much more money.

And finally, we ought to do our best in the way of coverage to help families keep their coverage when they're unemployed for an extended period of time. And we should do all this within the context of a determination to hold down the costs of health care, still the biggest problem for most Americans. We can do this without a tax increase and while working to bring the deficit down. We have been working very hard on this. The numbers clearly make that apparent.

The second issue I want to raise on our unfinished agenda is the minimum wage. The minimum wage is the key, first, to welfare reform. Unless work pays, why will people do it? There is some evidence that not only will the minimum wage increase I proposed not cost jobs, it might actually increase employment by drawing people into the ranks of the employed who are hanging out now.

Not only that, working people simply cannot live and raise kids on $8,500 a year. Now, the Republicans want—and they've wanted for a long time—they want to index tax rates against inflation, which has now been done. Now they want to index capital gains against inflation. They want to guard the defense budget against inflation. But they're willing to let minimum wage workers fall to their lowest real incomes in 40 years? That's what will happen if we don't raise the minimum wage. The lowest real incomes in 40 years, is that your idea of the legacy for working people in the aftermath of the cold war, in the information age, leading America into a bright, new time?

The minimum wage, again, has always before been a bipartisan issue. The last time we raised the minimum wage, it got an enormous vote in the Congress from Republicans and Democrats. Let's make the minimum wage a bipartisan issue again and raise it to a decent level, so that working people and their children will not have to worry about being punished for doing the right thing.

The last issue I want to talk about is education and training. I've already said most of what I want to say about it. The Secretary of Education is here with me today, along with many other people in the White House, my Chief of Staff, Mr. Panetta, and others. We've all worked very hard on education. Why? Because I believe that the most important job of Government today is to give people the tools they need to succeed in the global economy.

With all these changes that are going on, everybody knows the Government can't guarantee everybody a job. We haven't been able to do it in a long time, and our ability to guarantee the same job for a career is less than ever before. I can work to create healthy conditions in which large numbers of jobs will be created, but guaranteeing a particular job to a particular person for a lifetime, it is out. It's not possible.

The only thing we can do is to make sure that for a whole lifetime people will always be able to get the skills they need, beginning at the earliest possible time with good education. That means that as we cut the deficit and cut the budget, we must not cut education. We shouldn't cut Head Start. We shouldn't cut aid to public schools to meet national standards of excellence. We shouldn't cut apprenticeships to help young people who don't go on to college get good training so they can get a job with a growing income, not a shrinking income.

We sure shouldn't cut and make more expensive the college loan program when we need more people going to college, and the cost of going is higher than ever before. And we should not cut our national service program, AmeriCorps, which lets people earn college money through community service. Cutting education in the face of global economic competition, as I have said repeatedly, would be just like cutting the defense budget at the height of the cold war. It undermines our security as a people, and we shouldn't do it.

I advocated in the middle class bill of rights a deduction for the cost of all education after high school; the ability to withdraw tax-free from an IRA to pay for the cost of education after high school; and a GI bill for America's workers that would collapse literally dozens of these Federal programs that are here, there, and yonder in job training into one block grant, and not give it to the

States, give it to the people. Let Americans who are unemployed or grossly unemployed have a voucher for cash money which they can use at any education or training facility of their choice as long as it's decent and meets good standards, so that we can have a continuous, seamless web of lifetime of education and training opportunities for the people of the United States.

Well, there it is. That's what I'm for and what I'm against. I do not want a pile of vetoes. I want a pile of bills that will move this country into the future. I don't want to see a big fight between the Republicans and the Democrats. I want us to surprise everybody in America by rolling up our sleeves and joining hands and working together. I believe this is a time of such profound change that we need a dynamic center that is not in the middle of what is left and right but is way beyond it. That's what I want, and that's what I'm working for.

If you want to know how I'm going to make other decisions—if I left one out—I would refer you to what I said in my address to the Nation on December 15th. My test is: Does an idea expand middle-class incomes and opportunities? Does it promote values like family, work, responsibility, and community? Does it strengthen the hand of America's working families in a global economy? If it does, I'll be for it, no matter who proposes it. And if it doesn't, I will oppose it.

The future I want for America is like the one I imagined I had when I was the age of these children that are here in this audience. We can give this to our children. In fact, we can give a bigger future to our children. I am absolutely convinced that if we are tough enough and wise enough and unpolitical enough to put the interests of ordinary Americans first, and to really focus on the future, that our best days are before us, better than we can even imagine. But it all depends on what we do at this crossroads. Let's get busy.

Thank you very much.

[*At this point, the President took questions from newspaper editors.*]

Community Dialog

Q. Mr. President, you talk about a civilized conversation in this country leading towards a new common ground. How would you challenge American newspapers to forward that conversation, doing things that we aren't doing now?

The President. Well, I don't know what each of you are doing or not doing now. But I will give you some examples. I'll give you three examples. I think you should try to replicate in your communities the kind of conversation that Newsweek reprinted based on questions they asked Speaker Gingrich and me about what the role of Government is and what it should be. I don't think that we—I think both of us are a little bit frustrated about it, because we didn't know—we just answered questions, and then they had to turn it into an article, but it was the beginning of an interesting conversation about what the role of Government ought to be.

The second thing I would advise is to take each one of these issues—I saw in the, I think it was in the Dallas Morning News, one of the papers today, I saw that I read had a portrait of a family on welfare. Take each of these big issues and try to figure out how to go from rhetoric to reality so that people can understand what all these labels mean. Because if all you hear about these debates is what sort of pierces through in 10 or 15 seconds on the evening news, chances are your opinion will be more dominated by the rhetoric. And if it happens to comport with the facts, that's fine, but if it doesn't, that's not so good. Newspapers can do that. Newspapers can analyze in depth real, hard evidence on various problems.

And the third thing I think maybe you ought to consider doing is sponsoring conversations within your community of people of different political and racial and other stripes—just people who are different. Because we are running the risk—interestingly enough, we have more information than ever before, but the way we get it may divide us from one another instead of unite us.

And I think it might be really interesting if all the newspapers in the country sponsored community discussions. I don't mean bring people like me or people who want to be President, or even maybe people from Congress in from outside, but I mean the people in your local community who would represent different political points of view

and live in different neighborhoods and are from different racial backgrounds and have an agenda of common topics that are being discussed all around the country, and let people listen to each other and talk to each other.

My experience has always been that the difference among us, except on a few issues, are not nearly as profound as we think they are. And then report that to your readers, because we have to establish some sense of common ground. If all of our public discourse is about segmenting the electorate and then trying to make sure that by election day you've got the biggest segment, and there's never an opportunity to redefine where we are in common, that may work okay in a stable time because the policies are more or less set, the direction is more or less set; nobody's going to veer too much one way or the other anyway. But in a time of real profound change where the information revolution has made all of us actors, it is important that we try to establish more common ground. So those would be my three suggestions.

V–J Day Anniversary

Q. Mr. President, we're coming upon the ceremonies to commemorate the 50th anniversary of V–J Day. And someone suggested that it's time to try to heal the wounds of that war, and that the United States should take the first step by apologizing for dropping a bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Should we apologize, and did President Harry Truman make the right decision in dropping the bomb?

The President. No. And based on the facts he had before him, yes.

Cuban Refugees

Q. Mr. President, last week you went to Haiti where the military operation of our troops and other nations really helped restore order and to stop the refugees from coming to our State and to our country. Several miles away, there are several thousand Cubans trying to flee that oppressive regime who are now being detained indefinitely in Guantanamo. What's the way out for our policy and for those Cubans?

The President. First, we are doing our best to deal with the situation at Guantanamo, which is a very difficult one, for reasons because of where you're from you understand as well as I do. We have moved quickly, or as quickly as we could to review the cases of the children and the elderly people who are there, and we have moved quite a lot of people into the United States. We are now having detailed discussions about what we should do about the remainder of the people who are there at Guantanamo. Meanwhile, we've done what we could to make their conditions as livable, as bearable as possible.

As to our policy, even though I recognize most countries disagree with it, I think being firm has been the proper policy. And I do not believe we should change it except within the confines of the Cuban Democracy Act. I would remind everyone here who's interested in this that the Cuban Democracy Act, while it stiffened sanctions against Cuba, also for the first time explicitly laid out in legislative language the conditions under which the United States might change various actions toward Cuba in return for actions by the Cubans.

Let me give you just one example. We have established, for the first time, direct phone service into Cuba. And the lines are quite jammed, as I understand it. It's cut the cost of calling home and calling relatives for Cuban-Americans. And it's enabled the Cuban Government to earn some money, because in all direct telephone conversations internationally, countries—at least, many countries, put a fee on such conversations. We did that because we thought it was the appropriate thing to do given the state of our relations and because of some things that had changed. Cuba is now establishing a more genuine farmers market that shows some movement in that area.

But the Cuban Democracy Act gives us a framework for future movement, and I—and also a firmness in our policy. And I think we should stay with both, both the firmness and the framework of the act.

Multiracial Families

Q. We have heard from several people here that there ought to be a multiracial box on the U.S. census forms so that people with parents of two races wouldn't have to deny

one of them. What do you think should happen here?

The President. I wouldn't be opposed to that. That's the first time I ever heard it, but it makes sense. It's interesting that you raised that because of a related debate that's going on in Washington today, which is whether we should pass a Federal law which makes it clear that we should not discriminate against parents of one race in their attempts to adopt a child of another race. And I personally strongly support that position. And we've been trying to work through it to make—I though we had adopted that position last year at the end of the year. We did in large measure. We're talking about whether we need any other legal changes to achieve that.

But I—we are clearly going to have more and more multiracial, multiethnic children and families in this country. You're the first person who ever asked me that question. But I think it ought to be done. I can't see any reason not to do it.

Telecommunications Legislation

Q. One of the issues we've been examining at this convention, Mr. President, is the new information age and our own role in it. And one of the issues that's likely to come up in the next 100 days to which you referred is a broad reform of telecommunications policy. Do you think that a pragmatic, practical compromise solution in this area, which affects how people get their dial tones and what is on the dial tone, is likely to come out of these discussions?

The President. I do. I think it is likely. Let me say that I very much wanted to pass a telecommunications act in the last session of Congress. And we came within a hair's breath of being able to do it. Some rather—to me anyway—rather minor problems hung it up in the Senate. And as you know, it's not difficult to hang a bill up in the Senate. And so it got hung. If we can pass the right kind of telecommunications act it can be good for American consumers and it can pump billions of more dollars into this economy and create a very large number of jobs.

It's interesting that you would ask me this. The Vice President and I had lunch yesterday, our weekly lunch, and we talked about this for quite some time. My concern about the bill in its present form in the Senate is that I believe, as written, it would lead to a rather rapid increase and a rather substantial increase in both telephone and cable rates in ways that I do not believe are necessary to get the benefits that the telecommunications bill seeks to achieve. So I would like to see some provisions in there which deal with that.

I can also tell you that the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department has some fairly serious reservations about how far it goes. Now I have in several areas been willing to see, because of the globalization of the economy, some modifications in our antitrust laws. But I'm concerned—and I think they're warranted. But I think that this may go too far. But the most important concern I have is, are we going to have a very large and unnecessary increase in cable and phone rates immediately if the bill, as passed, is adopted? That is my major concern. But I think we can get one, and we certainly need to get one.

First Lady's Role

Q. Mr. President, yesterday on the front page of the New York Times was this headline, "Hillary Clinton a Traditional First Lady Now." Could you tell us, was there a point where you sat down with the First Lady to discuss her role for the remainder of your term? [*Laughter*]

The President. No.

Q. And if so, what was the content of that discussion and what prompted it? [*Laughter*]

The President. I was trying to think of something really funny to say, but it would be a polite way of saying I don't discuss my private conversations with my wife. [*Laughter*]

Actually, while I was very pleased with the First Lady's trip and with the way my wife and daughter were treated and what they learned, and very, very pleased with the coverage, I don't really agree with that. I mean, I think that I very much wanted her to go to India, to Pakistan, to Bangladesh, Nepal, to Sri Lanka because that part of the world is a very important part of the world to us. And for various reasons,we have not been as closely involved, even with the democracies

there, as we might have been, largely as a legacy of the cold war.

But one of the biggest obstacles to the modernization of those countries and to the vitality and preservation of democracy are the challenges faced by women and children there. I did not consider the trip either too traditional or unimportant. I thought what they were doing—what Hillary was doing was profoundly important. And after getting a blow-by-blow description of the trip for a good long while yesterday from both my wife and daughter, I still feel that way.

So I—when my wife was an unconventional First Lady of Arkansas, and working full-time, and as she told that lady in the Bangladesh village, making more money than her husband—[*laughter*]—still her first concern was always for the welfare of mothers, children, and families. She founded an organization called the Advocates for Families and Children in our State. She was on the board of the Children's Hospital. We built an intensive care nursery there, the first time the State had ever been involved. This is a 25-year concern of hers, and I wouldn't overread the significance of it.

I also wouldn't underestimate the significance of having a First Lady who can galvanize a global discussion about the role of women and young girls on our planet and for our future.

Electronic Information Regulation

Q. You alluded to our being in the information age. Many of use in this room are investigating and developing ways of disseminating information electronically. There are thousands outside this room who are doing the same. What role, if any, does the Federal Government have in censoring or regulating that information and news?

The President. Let me begin by saying I support what you're doing, and I've tried to bring the White House up to date electronically. You know, we have a pretty sophisticated E-mail operation. And now you can take a tour of the White House and all the Federal agencies on the Internet and find out more than you ever wanted to know. So we're trying to be there for you in virtual reality land.

I guess you're asking me about the bill that Senator Exon introduced on trying to regulate obscenity through the E-mail system, or through the electronic superhighway. To be perfectly honest with you, I have not read the bill. I am not familiar with its contents, and I don't know what I think. I do believe—about this specific bill. [*Laughter*] I'll tell you what I think about the issue.

I believe that insofar as that Governments have the legal right to regulate obscenity that has not been classified as speech under the First Amendment, and insofar as the American public widely supports, for example, limiting access of children to pornographic magazines, I think it is folly to think that we should sit idly by when a child who is a computer whiz may be exposed to things on that computer, which in some ways are more powerful, more raw, and more inappropriate than those things from which we protect them when they walk in a 7-Eleven.

So as a matter of principle, I am not opposed to it. I just can't comment on the details of the bill, because I do not know enough about it. And I do not believe in any way shape or form that we should be able to do on E-mail, or through the electronic superhighway, in terms of Government regulation of speech, anything beyond what we could elsewhere. I think the First Amendment has to be uniform in its application.

So I'm not calling for a dilution of the First Amendment. But if you just imagine, those of us who have children and who think about this, you just think about what's the difference in going in the 7-eleven and hooking up to the computer. I think that we have to find some resolution of this. And within the Supreme Court's standards, which are very strict, I am not—am philosophically opposed to some action.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:55 a.m. at the Loews Anatole Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Robert J. Haiman, board of directors, William B. Ketter, incoming president, and Gregory Favre, outgoing president, American Society of Newspaper Editors; Gov. William F. Weld of Massachusetts; and Gov. Stephen Merrill of New Hampshire.

Statement on the Nomination of Dennis J. Reimer as Chief of Staff of the United States Army

April 7, 1995

I am pleased to announce my intention to nominate General Dennis J. Reimer, U.S. Army, as Chief of Staff, United States Army, succeeding General Gordon R. Sullivan, who is retiring.

General Reimer currently serves as the Commanding General, U.S. Army Forces Command. In this capacity, he is responsible for over 60 percent of America's Army including Active, Reserve and National Guard units. During his distinguished career, General Reimer served two tours in Vietnam, was the Army's Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations during DESERT STORM, and played a key role in the transformation of the cold-war Army to today's power projection Army. He brings to the job of Chief of Staff a clear vision of the national security environment the United States will face through the remainder of this decade and into the next century. This insight will enable him to address the full range of challenges confronting the U.S. Army, including readiness challenges, the impact of emerging technology, expanded mission requirements, and improving the quality of life for our soldiers and their families.

General Reimer takes over as Chief of Staff during one of the most important and demanding periods in the rich history of the U.S. Army. I know that I can count on him to continue the outstanding leadership demonstrated by General Sullivan and to maintain his high standards of stewardship to ensure that the U.S. Army remains fully ready and able to accomplish its important responsibilities under our national security strategy.

Proclamation 6783—Cancer Control Month, 1995

April 7, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Almost all of us have been touched by the devastating effects of cancer. In its many forms, cancer has been one of the most persistent and deadly health problems of this century. With the coming of spring—a time of rebirth—it is especially appropriate for us to renew our commitment to fighting cancer, to take pride in the progress we have made in combatting this disease, and to recognize the work still to be done.

In the 24 years since the signing of the National Cancer Act, we have made significant strides against cancer. Through diligent research, we have identified major risk factors for the disease—including diet, lack of exercise, and smoking—and we have worked to educate Americans to minimize these risks in their lives. New approaches to treatment have been developed in recent years, and new medicines are continually being refined and tested.

Among women in the United States who develop cancer, lung cancer claims the most lives, followed closely by breast cancer. An estimated 1 in 8 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer at some point in their lives—up from 1 in 20 just two decades ago. In this decade, an estimated 2 million women will be diagnosed with breast cancer or cervical cancer, with more than 500,000 of these women dying as a result. Cancers of the uterus, ovaries, and colon are also on the rise among women in this country.

We are making progress, however. For example, from 1989 to 1992, the numbers of women dying from breast cancer actually declined—the largest short-term decrease since 1950. With the advances in treatment upon early detection, screening mammography has never been more important. My Administra-

tion is launching a nationwide campaign to increase awareness of Medicare coverage for screening mammography. Additionally, most States now have laws requiring private insurers to offer coverage for biannual screening mammography, and third-party reimbursement is increasing. Together, these measures are helping more women to benefit from this potentially life-saving procedure.

Remarkable progress has also been made against childhood cancers as a result of the unflagging persistence of researchers in laboratories and hospitals across the country. Although the number of children affected by cancer is increasing, the number of deaths from childhood cancer continues to drop dramatically. Improved diagnostic and prognostic techniques and important advances in treatment have given renewed hope to children with leukemia, Wilms' tumor, neuroblastoma, and brain tumors. We are seeing a steady increase in the number of adult survivors of these childhood cancers.

Every one of us has a part to play in the fight against this disease and much work remains to eradicate it. Continuing research is essential to reducing the incidence of cancer for all our citizens.

In 1938, the Congress of the United States passed a joint resolution requesting the President to issue an annual proclamation declaring April as ''Cancer Control Month.''

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the month of April 1995 as Cancer Control Month. I invite the Governors of the 50 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Mayor of the District of Columbia, and the appropriate officials of all other areas under the American flag to issue similar proclamations. I also ask health care professionals, private industry, community groups, insurance companies, and all other interested organizations and individual citizens to unite in support of our Nation's determined efforts to control cancer.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this seventh day of April, 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, 4:41 p.m., April 7, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 11.

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.

April 4

In the morning, the President returned to Washington, DC, from a weekend stay in Little Rock, AR.

In the afternoon, the President hosted a working lunch for Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom in the Residence.

In the evening, the President attended a fundraising dinner at Senator Edward M. Kennedy's residence. Following the dinner, he met with Prime Minister Major at Georgia Brown's restaurant.

The President announced his intention to appoint William Podlich as Chairman and Loretta Armenta, Glenn Biggs, Linda Griego, Dionicio Morales, and Penny Pritzker as members of the Community Adjustment and Investment Program Advisory Committee for the North American Development Bank.

April 5

In the afternoon, the President hosted a working lunch for President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt in the Residence.

The President announced his intention to appoint the following individuals to the Advisory Committee on the Arts of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts:

—Judith Aronson;

—A. Arthur Davis;

—Sandra Stillman Gartner;
—June S. Hamra;
—James H. Newberry, Jr.;
—Neal K. Okabayashi;
—Sally R. Peltz;
—Edna Louise Saffy;
—Bettylu K. Saltzman;
—Carol T. Toussaint.

April 6

In the morning, the President met with members of the House Southwestern Regional Democratic Caucus in the Roosevelt Room.

The White House announced the President has named Richard L. Morningstar as Special Adviser to the President and to the Secretary of State on Assistance to the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union and Coordinator of U.S. Assistance to the New Independent States.

April 7

In the morning, the President traveled to Dallas, TX.

In the afternoon, the President attended a luncheon at the Mansion at Turtle Creek. He then traveled to Sacramento, CA.

In the evening, the President attended a California State Democratic Party fundraiser at a private residence.

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 April 3

Vera Alexander,
of Alaska, to be a member of the Marine Mammal Commission for a term expiring May 13, 1997, vice Jack Warren Lentfer, term expired.

Submitted April 4

Nancy Friedman Atlas,
of Texas, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, vice James DeAnda, retired.

John Garvan Murtha,
of Vermont, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Vermont, vice Franklin S. Billings, Jr., retired.

George A. O'Toole, Jr.,
of Massachusetts, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Massachusetts (an additional position).

Leland M. Shurin,
of Missouri, to be U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Missouri, vice Scott O. Wright, retired.

Submitted April 6

Roberta L. Gross,
of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, vice Bill D. Colvin, resigned.

Karl N. Stauber,
of Minnesota, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Research, Education, and Economics (new position).

A. Wallace Tashima,
of California, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, vice Arthur L. Alarcon, retired.

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 March 31

Transcript of a press briefing by Ambassador William L. Swing on the situation in Haiti [1]

[1] This release was not received in time for inclusion in the appropriate issue.

Released April 3

Transcript of a press briefing by Secretary Mike McCurry

Released April 4

Transcript of a press briefing by U.S. Ambassador to the Court of St. James, William J. Crowe, Jr. and Senior Director of West European Affairs, Sandy Vershbow

Released April 5

Transcript of a press briefing by Ambassador Robert Pellentreau, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, and David Satterfield, NSC Assistant Director for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs on President Mubarak's visit

Released April 6

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the appointment of Richard L. Morningstar as Special Adviser to the President and the Secretary of State on Assistance to the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union

List of members of the Southwest Regional Democratic Caucus meeting with the President

Released April 7

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on The Netherlands decision to purchase U.S. helicopters

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.