

But I would remind you of this: number one, we still have a sizable deficit, even though I have cut it by \$600 billion, and we now have a Government that, except for the interest on the debt that was piled up in previous years, your Government has an operating surplus for the first time in 30 years. We do that.

But our interest payments on our debt are so great we have to keep bringing this deficit down. That limits the size of any tax cut. We have to continue to finance a strong national defense. That limits the size of any tax cut. We have to continue to invest in education. That will limit the size of a tax cut. So we have to ask ourselves, what kind of tax cut do we need and who ought to get it?

My view is we shouldn't give a tax cut to people like me, in upper income groups, who did just fine in the eighties and the nineties. We ought to give it to middle class people whose incomes stagnated in the eighties and nineties who need the money. That's who ought to get it. And we ought to give it to people and not just give them a check that they can spend and then the money's gone; the money should be devoted to helping strengthen our families and to support education so that we raise people's income in the short run with a tax cut and in the long run by improving their earning skills. That's why I think the best tax cut would be giving the American people a tax deduction for the cost of themselves and their children for all education after high school. That is the best investment in our future.

Now, I also believe that we ought to have the individual retirement accounts, the IRA's, available to more Americans, and people ought to be able to withdraw from them tax-free to use money for education or for health care emergencies or for a first home or for the care of an elderly parent. That's the sort of tax cut we ought to have.

Now, believe me, my fellow Americans, we can afford that and still reduce the deficit, still increase our investment in education, and still have a strong defense. That is a responsible approach.

So I say to you without regard to your political party, this is a time of great change in our country. I want to work with this new Congress. I agree with them about a lot of

things they want to do. But we can't go too far. We can't say that there's no difference in Government spending. Education is different. National defense is different. Things are different. Some things matter more than others. We can't say that everything the Government does is bad and everything that happens in the private sector is good. We need a partnership. And we know if California's economy is going to come back we ought to invest in defense conversion. We ought to do what we can to help the people in this State who have great talents and great resources, who can no longer use them in the defense plants but can use them in the economy of tomorrow.

And most importantly of all, we ought to look around at all these young people and say they deserve to believe in the American dream, in the promise of tomorrow. They deserve to be able to do whatever their God-given capacities and their willingness to work will let them do. Nothing, nothing, nothing is more important than that.

So, to all of you who have been at this base, who have worn the uniform of our country, who have stood up for the security of the United States, what did you do it for? So that freedom and opportunity might be passed on forever in this country. This is a very great country. There is nothing we cannot do if we do the best we can to do right by the young people who are here and all over America. That must be our mission. It is mine, and I believe it is yours.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:50 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. Ronald W. Yates, Commander, Air Force Materiel Command; Gen. John F. Phillips, Commander, Sacramento Air Logistics Center; Lt. Gov. Gray Davis of California; Mayor Joseph Serna, Jr., of Sacramento, CA; Sacramento County Supervisor Roger Dickinson; and Brad Sherman, chairman, California State Board of Equalization. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Statement on the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak)

April 7, 1995

The service reductions announced by Amtrak are tough but necessary choices in the

face of stark fiscal realities and, along with the adjustments Amtrak announced last December, represent an urgent attempt to move the passenger railroad toward a stable economic future.

This administration remains committed to the future of rail passenger service in this country and has included significant capital support for Amtrak in its 1996 budget.

To address the pressures Amtrak faces and to promote a more business-like approach, the Department of Transportation today transmitted to Congress the Amtrak Restructuring Act of 1995.

I encourage rail labor, Congress, Governors, mayors, and other constituents to continue to work closely with Amtrak as it works to develop rail passenger service for the 21st century. We look to our partners in Congress to support the Amtrak Restructuring Act of 1995 and for continued financial support of rail passenger service.

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

The President's Radio Address *April 8, 1995*

Good morning. I ran for President because I believe the American dream was at risk for millions of our fellow citizens. I wanted to grow the middle class, shrink the under class, create more opportunities for entrepreneurs to succeed, so that our economy would produce the American dream. I wanted to promote mainstream values of responsibility, work, family, and community. And I wanted to reform Government to make it smaller, less bureaucratic, put it back on the side of ordinary Americans.

We're working at making progress on all these fronts—unemployment down, jobs up—real progress in giving people in the under class a chance to work their way into the middle class. But there's still a lot of challenges we face. There's no greater gap between mainstream American values and Government than the failed welfare system.

Last night the Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, spoke eloquently about the need to reform the welfare system. And I ran for President saying that I would work to end

welfare as we know it. This has been a big issue for me for long time. I've worked to move people from welfare to work for 15 years now. So the Speaker and I have a lot in common. We both want bold welfare reform. We both think that we need to make people leave welfare after a specific number of years. We both want to require welfare recipients to work to get benefits. We both want States to have a lot of flexibility to adopt their own programs.

I've gone a long way toward doing that by letting 25 States adopt bold new reforms for their own welfare systems. And we both want tough steps to enforce child support. The welfare reform plan I sent to Congress last year included the toughest possible child support enforcement. And now the Speaker and his colleagues in the House have taken our child enforcement measures and put it into their bill, including our plan to ask States to deny driver's licenses and professional licenses to deadbeat parents.

In spite of these similarities we still have two key differences I want to talk to you about. They relate to work and to children. First, cutting costs is the primary goal of the Republican welfare bill. By arbitrarily cutting future welfare costs the Republicans get money to pay for their tax cuts. Well, I agree we need to cut costs, but we also have to be sure that when people leave welfare they have the education, training, and skills they need to get jobs, not simply to be off welfare and turn to lives of crime or to remain in poverty.

If we cut child care, how can we expect mothers to go to work? If we cut job training, how will people learn to work? If we cut job programs and these people can't find jobs in the private sector, how can we require them to work?

My top priority is to get people off welfare and into jobs. I want to replace welfare with work, so people earn a paycheck, not a welfare check. To do that, we have to take some of the money we save and plow it into job training, education, and child care.

I want tough welfare reform, but we've got to be practical. If we're going to make people on welfare work, we have to make it possible for them to work. If we're going to make people self-reliant, we have to make it pos-