Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, June 12, 1995
Volume 31—Number 23
Pages 967–1012

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

Faces of Hope reunion luncheon—1004
Friends of Art and Preservation in Embassies, reception—1000
Maryland, National Governors' Association in Baltimore—983
National homeownership strategy—969
National Performance Review—1002
Police swearing-in ceremony—997
Radio address—967
Safe and drug-free schools recognition program—989

Bill Vetoes

Emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions for fiscal year 1995, message—994

Communications to Congress

See also Bill Vetoes
Belgium-U.S. extradition treaties, messages transmitting—1008
Line-item veto legislation, letter—995
Switzerland-U.S. extradition treaty, message transmitting—1009

Communications to Federal Agencies

International Fund for Ireland, memorandum—1000

Communications to Federal Agencies—Continued

New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union, memorandum—972

Executive Orders

Recreational Fisheries—995

Interviews With the News Media

Interview with Larry King—972

Letters and Messages

Rescue of Captain Scott O'Grady, message—997

Proclamations

National Homeownership Day—968

Statements by the President

Antiterrorism legislation, Senate passage—993
Commission on Immigration Reform—993
Foreign affairs legislation, House action—1000

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1011
Checklist of White House press releases—1011
Digest of other White House announcements—1009
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1010

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

Week Ending Friday, June 9, 1995

The President's Radio Address

June 3, 1995

Good morning. I want to talk with you today about the conflict in Bosnia and the United States policy with regard to it for the last 2½ years since I've been President.

Let me begin by saying that I know all Americans join with me in sending their prayers to the family and loved ones of an American pilot who was shot down yesterday while doing his duty flying over Bosnia.

When I became President, we found a war going on in Bosnia that was fueled by ancient, bloody divisions between Bosnian Serbs, Muslims, and Croats. The United Nations had a mission there whose purpose was not to fight the war but to help prevent the slaughter of civilians, to deliver humanitarian assistance, and to try to limit that conflict as much as possible while the peace process moved forward to end the conflict diplomatically and to preserve the Bosnian state.

I determined that the role of the United States should be to vigorously support the diplomatic search for peace and that our vital interests were clear in limiting the spread of the conflict. Furthermore, our interests were in doing what we could, short of putting in ground forces, to help prevent the multiethnic Bosnian state from being destroyed and to minimize the loss of life and the ethnic cleansing.

I determined that we certainly should not have ground forces there, not as a part of the military conflict, nor as a part of the United Nations peacekeeping mission, but that instead, we should do everything we could to limit the conflict to its present parameters and to support our other objectives.

In our efforts to limit the conflict, we have stationed some troops in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to make sure that we don't have a Balkan-wide conflict. We must remember that the Balkans are a troubling area and that it was trouble in the Balkans that sparked World War I.

Secondly, we have used our air power in three ways in Bosnia. First, we have conducted the longest lasting humanitarian airlift in all history, and we've saved a lot of lives doing it. Second, we have enforced the no-fly zone in order to stop the bombing campaign and at least take the war out of the air. That has saved a lot of lives, too, and that is what our brave young pilot was doing yesterday when his plane was shot down. And thirdly, with our NATO allies, we have made our air power available to maintain a fire-free zone around Sarajevo and other populated areas and to support the collection of heavy artillery. This, too, has largely been a successful effort, which has minimized the fighting and the killing and the dying.

This policy has not only worked to minimize the loss of life but also to maximize the chances for peace in a very troubling area. I know it's frustrating to everyone, as it is to me, that we can't completely solve all the world's problems and that more progress toward peace hasn't been made in Bosnia. Sometimes we have to do what is appropriate to minimize disasters that we confront, while we work over the long run on resolving them through diplomacy.

But let's look at what has been done. In 1992, the year before I became President, some 130,000 people were killed in the Bosnian conflict. In 1994, because of the policies that our allies and the United States have pursued together, including the presence of the United Nations troops in Bosnia, the causalities have dropped from 130,000 in 1992, to about 2,500 in 1994—still tragic, but dramatically reduced. And all of this has been accomplished without any involvement of American ground forces in combat or peacekeeping missions. The British, the French, the Dutch, the Canadians, and others have carried that burden.

This has not been a perfect peace. Recently, after the peace in Sarajevo broke down and 1,000 or more shells were dropped on the city, the United Nations asked for air support, as they have in the past, with success. We gave it, and unfortunately, the Serbs captured U.N. personnel. I have made it very clear to the American people all along that actions like this could occur because of the vulnerability of the U.N. peacekeepers who are spread out in small numbers all across the country. Now we are doing everything we can to secure the release of the U.N. personnel.

But let's not forget this policy has saved a lot of lives. And in the end, the conflict will only be resolved by diplomacy. Now, the United Nations faces a choice: It can either get out, or it can strengthen its forces in order to fully support the mission.

If our allies decide to stay, we want to support them but within the very careful limits I have outlined. I want to make it clear again what I have said about our ground forces. We will use them only if, first, if there is a genuine peace with no shooting and no fighting and the United States is part of policing that peace. That's exactly what we've been doing in the Middle East since the late 1970's without incident. It's worked so well that I imagine most Americans don't even recall that we still have forces there.

Second, if our allies decide they can no longer continue the U.N. mission and decide to withdraw, but they cannot withdraw in safety, we should help them to get out with our unique capacities. They have borne the risk for the world community of working for peace and minimizing the loss of life. And I think that's an appropriate thing for us to do.

The third issue is the remote, indeed highly unlikely event that Britain, France, and other countries, with their considerable military strength and expertise, become stranded and could not get out of a particular place in Bosnia. The question has been raised about whether we would help them to withdraw as a last resort. I have decided that if a U.N. unit needs an emergency extraction, we would assist after consulting with Congress. This would be a limited, temporary operation, and we have not been asked to do this. I think it is highly unlikely that we would be asked to do it. But I do believe that these people who have put themselves at risk are entitled to know that the U.S. will stand with them if they need help to move to safety.

Now, as this conflict continues and as the diplomatic efforts go on, we must remember that our policy in Bosnia has reduced the level of violence, has reduced the loss of life. In the last several days, our allies, in the face of their hostages being taken, have said that they expect those people to be released but that they do not want to give up their efforts to bring peace to Bosnia. They do not want us, they do not expect us to put American ground troops into Bosnia. But we do have an interest in doing what we can short of that to contain the conflict and minimize and eventually end the human suffering. I believe this is the appropriate, acceptable, proper policy for the United States.

Thanks for listening.

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

Proclamation 6807—National Homeownership Day, 1995

June 2, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Throughout the more than two hundred years since our Nation was founded, Americans have embraced the dream of homeownership. Strengthening families, establishing communities, and fostering prosperity, homeownership is the cornerstone of our economy and a common thread in our national life. Thanks to a tradition of cooperation between government and industry, the doors of homeownership have been opened to millions of Americans. And the United States is one of the first countries in the world to make homeownership a reality for a majority of its people.

For the better part of this century, America has made homeownership a priority of national policy. The National Housing Act of 1934 created the Federal Housing Administration's home mortgage insurance program,

empowering more than 23 million Americans to buy their own homes. In 1944, the GI Bill of Rights set up the Veterans Administration's home loan guaranty program, enabling millions of veterans to start a new life for themselves and their families. The Housing Act of 1949 declared that every American family should enjoy a "decent home and a suitable living environment"—an ideal that has been reaffirmed in myriad ways since then.

Our country's long-standing commitment to this goal is a testament to the tremendous rewards of homeownership. Homeownership spurs the production and sales of goods and services, generating new jobs and brightening America's economic horizon. It encourages savings and investment, promotes economic and civic responsibility, and enhances the financial security of the American people. Perhaps most important, homeownership gives Americans pride in their neighborhoods and hope for a brighter tomorrow.

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 June 5, 1995, as "National Homeownership Day." I urge all of our citizens to observe this day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities that celebrate the great American Dream.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this second day of June, 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, 10:33 a.m., June 5, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 5, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on June 6.

Remarks on the National Homeownership Strategy

June 5, 1995

Look at it this way, Jean, all your other speeches will be easier now. [*Laughter*] You did very well, and I thank you and Jim for coming.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have looked forward to this day for a long time, and I care a lot about this issue. I'm glad to see so many distinguished Americans here. I welcome Congressman Bono who was, before he became a Congressman, a mayor and, therefore, has an intimate personal experience with this whole issue. And I'm, of course, delighted to see my good friend Millard Fuller here who has done as much to make the dream of homeownership a reality in our country and throughout the world as any living person. And we thank you, sir, for your work.

Before I get into my remarks, I think it's important for me to make a brief reference to another subject. Congress is coming back to work today after a break, and the anti-terrorism bill that I sent to Congress is being considered in the Senate. It will give law enforcement the tools it needs to crack down on terrorists that they, people in law enforcement, asked me to seek from Congress, first, a couple of months before the Oklahoma City tragedy, to deal especially with the problems of international terrorism coming in to the United States, and then some more things that were asked for in the wake of Oklahoma City.

This is very, very serious legislation. The Congress not only has the right, it has the responsibility to review the bill and to hear those who think that in some ways its law enforcement provisions are too tough. There ought to be a full debate. But we cannot afford to let scores of unnecessary amendments drag down this process. In that I agree with the statements made by the majority leader of the Senate, Senator Dole. So, I call upon my fellow Democrats and Republicans to limit amendments, curb politics, ignore narrow interests, to agree to the simple pact that there should be no excuses, no games, no delays. The time is now to enact this important legislation.

You can be sure that terrorists around the world are not delaying their plans while we delay the passage of this bill. It is within our reach now to dramatically strengthen our law enforcement capabilities and to enhance the ability of people in law enforcement to pro-

tect all kinds of Americans. We have an obligation to do that. And so I would urge the Congress to take this bill up and to get on with it, to limit the number of amendments as soon as possible so that we can go forward.

Now, let me get back to the subject at hand. I am delighted to be here. You might ask why do I care about homeownership? After all I live in America's finest public housing. [*Laughter*] The answer is I once had a life, and I hope to have one again some day. [*Laughter*] When I was 19, I built a home as part of what I did that summer.

When I was trying to coax my wife into marrying me, we were both living in Fayetteville, Arkansas, teaching at the University of Arkansas, and I had not gotten a definite answer. I think that's the most delicate way I can put this. [*Laughter*] And Hillary had to go away to somewhere—I can't remember where she was going now. But anyway she was taking a trip on an airplane, so I was driving her to the airport. And we drove by this wonderful old house. It was an old, old, very small house, and she said, ''Boy, that's a beautiful house.'' And I noticed that there was a little for sale sign on it. So, I took her to the airport, went back and bought the house. And when she came home after the trip, I drove by the house. I said, ''See that house you liked. I bought it while you were gone. Now you have to marry me.'' [*Laughter*] And it worked, 20 years ago this fall it worked. Most people do it the other way around, but you know. [*Laughter*]

I still remember that home cost $20,500. It had about 1,100 square feet, and I had about a $17,500 mortgage on it, and my payments were about $176 a month, as I remember, something like that. And that was 20 years ago this fall that I signed that fortuitous contract. Those prices aren't very much available anymore, but the objective for young people with their futures before them and their dreams fresh in their minds, starting out their families, to be able to own their home and to start a family in that way, that's a worthy objective. Just as worthy today, and I would argue to you more important today than it was 20 years ago—more important today than it was 20 years ago.

We just had a report come out last week asserting that it may be that up to one-third of our children are now born out of wedlock. You want to reinforce family values in America, encourage two-parent households, get people to stay home? Make it easy for people to own their own homes and enjoy the rewards of family life and see their work rewarded. This is a big deal. This is about more than money and sticks and boards and windows. This is about the way we live as a people and what kind of society we're going to have. And I cannot say enough in terms of my appreciation to Secretary Cisneros, who is a genuine visionary, to the Vice President for all the work he and the National Performance Review have done on this, and to all of our partners who are here, all the people in public and private life whose work is homeownership.

Since the day I asked Secretary Cisneros to build this strategy, he has done about everything a human being could do. And I can say without knowing that I'm overstating it, that if we succeed in doing this, if we succeed in making that number happen, it will be one of the most important things that this administration has ever done, and we're going to do it without spending more tax money.

Two years ago I met a couple having their own first home dream come true. They're here today. Patty and Matt Murray had just bought a home in Frederick, Maryland where I was visiting, promoting my economic plan along with the realtors to bring down the deficit, to bring down interest rates, to bring down home mortgage rates so people can afford to buy their own home. Now, they have a stake in a better life, and I'm glad that they're here today. I would like to ask them to stand. I would also like to ask now all the other young couples that came here. I just want you to see them. That's where I was 20 years ago. I want all of you to stand here, all these first-time homebuyers that we invited to come here. [*Applause*]

We have to remember that there are millions of people just like them who believe that homeownership is out of reach. They may be paying monthly rents that could cover a mortgage payment. They may scrape to save, but a downpayment is still out of reach. They are locked out by rigid restrictions or by a home-buying system just, as Jean said,

too difficult or too frightening. And that is not right.

One of the great successes of the United States in this century has been the partnership forged by the National Government and the private sector to steadily expand the dream of homeownership to all Americans. In 1934, President Roosevelt created the Federal Housing Administration and made homeownership available to millions of Americans who couldn't afford it before that.

Fifty-one years ago just this month, Harry Truman rewarded service men and women with the GI bill of rights, which created the VA Home Loan Guarantee Program. That extended the dream of homeownership to a whole new generation of Americans. For four decades after that, in the greatest period of expansion of middle class dreams any country has ever seen anywhere in human history, homeownership expanded as incomes rose, jobs increased, the educational level of the American people improved.

But in the 1980's, as the Vice President said, that dream began to slip away. I ran for President in large measure because I wanted to restore that dream, to grow the middle class, shrink the under class, promote the mainstream values of work and responsibility, family and community, and reform Government in a way that would enhance opportunity and shrink bureaucracy.

We've made good progress, but we have to do a lot more. I ask all of you just one more time to look at that chart. And I wish I had a lot of other charts to show you that would reinforce that. Homeownership declines then stabilizes at a lower level. At the same time, more and more American families working harder for the same or lower wages every year, under new and difficult stresses. It seems to me that we have a serious, serious unmet obligation to try to reverse these trends. As Secretary Cisneros says, this drop in homeownership means 1.5 million families who would now be in their own homes if the 46 years of homeownership expansion had not been reversed in the 1980's.

Now we have begun to expand it again. Since 1993, nearly 2.8 million new households have joined the ranks of America's homeowners, nearly twice as many as in the previous 2 years. But we have to do a lot better. The goal of this strategy, to boost homeownership to 67.5 percent by the year 2000, would take us to an all-time high, helping as many as 8 million American families across that threshold.

This is the new way home for the American middle class. We have got to raise incomes in this country. We have got to increase security for people who are doing the right thing, and we have got to make people believe that they can have some permanence and stability in their lives even as they deal with all the changing forces that are out there in this global economy.

No person, even the President, can look at these young people and say, I will guarantee you, no matter what happens in the global economy, you will always have the job you have today, and you'll make more money next year than you did this year. You know no one can guarantee that in the global economy. That's not the way the world works anymore.

But we can guarantee to people that we're going to empower them to help themselves. We'll make homeownership more accessible. We'll make lifetime education and training more accessible. We'll make the things that make life work for people who are trying to do the best they can for themselves there. We have to begin with the basic things that make it worth doing.

As the Vice President and I said in a book we put out in the election campaign in 1992, our economic strategy includes a commitment to work to provide decent, safe, affordable homes to all Americans, and to do it with an alliance of the public and private sector.

I want to say this one more time, and I want to thank again all the people here from the private sector who have worked with Secretary Cisneros on this: Our homeownership strategy will not cost the taxpayers one extra cent. It will not require legislation. It will not add more Federal programs or grow Federal bureaucracy.

It's 100 specific actions that address the practical needs of people who are trying to build their own personal version of the American dream, to help moderate income families who pay high rents but haven't been able to save enough for a downpayment, to

help lower income working families who are ready to assume the responsibilities of homeownership but held back by mortgage costs that are just out of reach, to help families who have historically been excluded from homeownership.

Today, all across the country, I say to millions of young working couples who are just starting out: By the time your children are ready to start the first grade, we want you to be able to own your own home. All of our country will reap enormous benefits if we achieve this goal. Homeownership encourages savings and investment. When a family buys a home the ripple effect is enormous. It means new homeowner consumers. They need more durable goods, like washers and dryers, refrigerators and water heaters. And if more families could buy new homes or older homes, more hammers will be pounding, more saws will be buzzing. Homebuilders and home fixers will be put to work.

When we boost the number of homeowners in our country, we strengthen our economy, create jobs, build up the middle class, and build better citizens.

I thank Millard Fuller especially for the work that Habitat for Humanity has done in building better citizens. I remember the day we dedicated the very first Habitat house built in my home State that went to a woman who went to church with me and worked for the State government and still her income was so low she was eligible to the considered there. And I was so proud of her because she and her children, for the first time, felt that all these incredible years of sacrifice and labor she had endured were about to be rewarded. And it made her a better citizen, and it made everybody that put a hammer to a nail a better citizen, and it made all of who saw it unfold better citizens.

H.L. Mencken once wrote that, ''a home is not a mere transient shelter, its essence lies in its permanence, and its quality of representing in all its details the personalities of the people who live in it.''

What we are doing today will allow more homes to be blessed by more families. I hope it will start all these young people on a path that will take them to great joys in their personal lives, and perhaps to other homes, but something they will always know that their country wanted them to have because they were entitled to it as a part of the American dream.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:50 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Jean Mikitz, a new homeowner who introduced the President, and Millard Fuller, founder and president of Habitat for Humanity International.

Memorandum on Assistance to the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union

June 5, 1995

Presidential Determination No. 95–25

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Assistance Program for New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union

Pursuant to section 577 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1994 (Titles I–V of Public Law 103–87), I hereby certify that Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States continue to make substantial progress toward the withdrawal of their armed forces from Latvia and Estonia.

You are authorized and directed to notify the Congress of this certification and to publish it in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 3:28 p.m., June 9, 1995]

NOTE: This memorandum will be published in the *Federal Register* on June 13.

Interview With Larry King

June 5, 1995

Mr. King. Good evening. We have checked all of our history books, and as best we can figure out, this is the first time ever a sitting President and Vice President have ever been on a program, radio or television, together while in office.

We'll be entertaining your calls later. Also, later in the program we'll be giving you a number for Save The Children. I'm wearing a Save The Children tie in conjunction with our 10th anniversary. We'll be associating Save The Children programs throughout the month, and we'll tell you later where you can order beautiful ties like this. The President and Vice President have them as well, but are not wearing them tonight, but they both have or are in possession of these ties.

Vice President's Role

We'll talk about lots of things, but the most obvious to me—if something, God forbid, happened to you, how long would it take to brief you?

The Vice President. Oh, that's not a hypothetical that I'm comfortable with, but there are procedures that are in place that we've discussed because it's our duty to the country and the Constitution.

Mr. King. Are you and—is he——

The President. I know what you're asking. The answer is, no time at all. I think it's clear that the Vice President is more closely involved with all the decisions of this administration than any of his predecessors. In the——

Mr. King. So you could take over——

The President. Absolutely. I think that we were very fortunate when Harry Truman became President—he'd just been in office a little while, and at that time Vice Presidents weren't as involved as they now are. But he turned out to be a great President. But we were lucky, because he wasn't in the loop on a lot of things. And then, of course, when President Johnson had to become President, he had been Senate majority leader and there was a little more of a—he had a more active role. But Presidents Carter, Reagan, and Bush, I think, all tended to give the Vice President a much larger role. And then, because of the relationship we have and because of my conviction about what the Constitution really requires me to do, and because it's good for the American people, Vice President Gore is the most involved Vice President in the history of the country.

Mr. King. So you never feel, Mr. Vice President, out of the loop?

The Vice President. No, never. And it's been a great privilege, really.

Mr. King. Do you talk every day?

The Vice President. Every day, many, many times.

Mr. King. You're not—if you're in different parts of the world you talk every day?

The Vice President. Just about. There are times when we don't. If he's on another continent than I am, but even then, sometimes we do.

1996 Election

Mr. King. And are you two definitely running again as a ticket? I don't think we've officially——

The Vice President. He's not ready to make any announcements.

Mr. King. Oh, come on, make it. Everybody makes it here; make it. [*Laughter*]

The President. I haven't asked him yet, but if he's willing, that would be my intention.

Mr. King. Okay, your intention is to run again and ask him to serve again.

The President. Absolutely.

Mr. King. And would you serve again if asked?

The Vice President. Well, I enjoy this job a great deal, and I count it a privilege to have this learning experience and to be able to work for and with President Clinton. You shouldn't have any doubt about that. But we're waiting on any formal announcements.

U.S. Pilot Missing in Bosnia

Mr. King. I just wanted to know.

Anything you can tell us about the pilot?

The President. No, except that we're working on it very hard.

Mr. King. Is he signaling? Is there a report of signals out of Bosnia?

The President. Well, you know what the news reports are, but I can tell you that I have been keeping on top of this ever since the first report of the missing plane. And we're doing everything we can, but it's best that we say as little as possible.

Mr. King. Is this, Mr. Vice President, as some diplomat called it today "a great failure of Western diplomacy," all Western diplomacy?

The Vice President. Well, clearly, this is a tragedy that has been unfolding for a long time, some would say for 500 years. But certainly, it was a full-blown tragedy before we ever got here. But I think that it's important to realize that NATO, the most successful alliance in history, never really did that great a job when it was outside of the NATO area, dealing with a conflict between two countries, neither of whom was a part of NATO. And that's the situation here.

They have done a great deal. And I think a lot of people have not paid much attention to the change that has come about since President Clinton's policy was put into place. Some of the numbers aren't very well known, but the change has been pretty significant.

The President. Let me just say this. First of all, I disagree with that.

Mr. King. You disagree with the Vice President?

The President. No, I agree with him, and I disagree with those who say——

Mr. King. Oh—it's failed.

The President. ——that the whole thing has been a great failure. It has not been a success. But remember, how long has this war been going on? Since 1991, in essence. That's 4 years. It's tragic; it's terrible. But their enmities go back 500 years, some would say almost a thousand years.

Now, what are our interests, and what are our objectives there? First of all, we don't want the war to spread beyond Bosnia. Secondly, we want to alleviate the human suffering and reduce the killing. And thirdly, we want to support a diplomatic process for peace.

Now, let me just follow up on what the Vice President said. The war hasn't spread. We've worked hard on that. We've worked with our NATO allies and with the U.N. in the longest humanitarian airlift in history and to keep the skies free of bombers to take the war out of the air, which is what our brave pilot was doing when he was shot down. We have worked with the U.N. peacekeepers on the ground to try to establish safe havens through the use, again, of only of our air power; we have no ground forces there.

In 1992, the year we had our interview in Orlando, about 130,000 people were killed in Bosnia. Last year, 1994, less than 3,000 people were killed there. That's still tragic, but I hardly think that constitutes a colossal failure, especially—now, let me just say one other thing. Look at—you're going to go to the Middle East on Thursday with your interviews——

Mr. King. We're going to talk to all of them.

The President. We look at the progress in the Middle East. We look at progress in Northern Ireland. We look at the joy we have in the elections in South Africa. All those conflicts went on for a lot more than 4 years. And I'm proud of the role the United States is playing in the peace process in all those places, but it became possible when people decided they wanted to make peace and they wanted to stop killing each other there. That's the point I want to make.

So, I'm not happy with everything that's happened in Bosnia. I wish there were some clear-cut answer. I don't think we should have ground troops there in combat or in the peacekeeping force.

Mr. King. At all?

The President. No. I've said where I think—if they make a peace, they stop fighting, they want us to help police it like we have in the Middle East since the late seventies, that's something that we would consider doing, after consultation with Congress. If our people—if the U.N. has to pull out, they're our NATO allies and they need us, I'd be inclined to help them. If they get stranded and they're in desperate conditions, I'd be inclined to help them. I think that's something we should look at. But we shouldn't be involved on the ground there. We have achieved these other objectives.

And if you go from 130,000 dead down to under 3,000 dead and you've still got a talk going, you've got a chance of a diplomatic solution, what is the difference in that and Northern Ireland, the Middle East, and these other places? It takes time.

Mr. King. If it spreads, do we have to go? Like to Macedonia, would we have to go?

The President. We have to do—we have troops in Macedonia because we are determined not to have a Balkan war. That, after all, is how World War I got started. We don't want this thing to spread across the Balkans,

and I think all Americans would understand that.

Mr. King. Do we have a moral obligation, Mr. Vice President, to these people? Moral, if not strategic?

The Vice President. I think the world clearly has an interest in doing what is reasonable and necessary to stop an ethnically based conquering by one country of another. And our NATO allies have shown tremendous courage and fortitude in putting their troops there on the ground. We've chosen not to do that. They are closer to it. It is on the continent of Europe. We've provided some support to them, but our allies are the ones that are there on the ground. And I think that that's the correct choice for them to make.

The President. But, Larry, first of all, we've spent a great deal of money there, running this humanitarian airlift, giving air support, trying to create free-fire zones, if you will, around Sarajevo and the other populated eastern enclaves, in doing all the things we've done to support the no-fly zone and to support the British, the French, the Dutch, the Canadians, and others there on the ground.

All of us have done this at a significant investment, and they are at some risk, as you see when several hundred of them got captured. If you reduce the casualties from 130,000 to under 3,000, and you at least have the possibility of cease-fires and ongoing negotiations and you continue humanitarian aid, it seems to me that that is fulfilling a moral obligation.

Do we have the capacity to impose a settlement on people who want to continue fighting? We couldn't do that in Northern Ireland. We couldn't do that in the Middle East. And I would submit, if you look at the population and the geography and the history of Bosnia, we cannot do that there. So I believe we're doing the right thing.

Mr. King. We're going to break. There's lots more to talk about. We'll be including your calls for the President and Vice President of the United States.

Barbra Streisand tomorrow night. Don't go away.

[*The network took a commercial break.*]

Mr. King. There's a lot of bases to cover. One more—are you now optimistic on Bosnia? Are you sounding like things are going to turn better?

The President. What I think is that we have to continue to pursue a strategy of diplomacy and keeping people alive and minimizing the brutality and trying to make the peacekeeping mission work. If it fails, then we'll have to consider what our options are then.

Mr. King. But no troops.

The Vice President. Anyone who is worried about the U.S. sending ground troops there should not be. That's not going to happen.

Middle East Peace Process

Mr. King. We have the Middle East program coming Thursday night with Hussein and Rabin and Arafat. You've been talking to people involved. How is it going? We've got a chance for Syria to get involved with the peace treaty.

The President. I think we've got a chance to make it this year. And I think that Mr. Arafat is trying to implement his part of the accords. I think he's making progress. Prime Minister Rabin has shown great courage. King Hussein has always wanted these days to come about, and he's working hard to work through the things that have to be done. President Mubarak in Egypt has been a great support. And I think President Asad wants peace. We're——

Mr. King. You do?

The President. Yes, I do. I am convinced he does. Now, there are a lot of difficult stones in the road, and we may not make it, but I think we've got a chance.

The Vice President. Well, let me just recall for you, Larry, that a lot has happened since this President came into office. The state of war between Israel and Jordan, after 46 years, was ended, right out here on the South Lawn of the White House, with President Clinton presiding over it. The long period of estrangement and no even—not even any talking between the PLO and Israel was ended with the famous handshake, again presided over by President Clinton.

He went to the signing of the agreement in the Middle East. The dialog with Syria

has now reached the point where people who follow this very, very closely, as we do, believe that there is the kind of movement that can really inspire a great deal of hope. This is a fundamental change. Now you have, on a regular basis, Arafat sitting down with Israeli leaders and beginning to work through all of the problems there. And all of the leaders there give President Clinton the credit for the progress.

The President. I would say this: In light of what we've been through in Oklahoma City and with the World Trade Center, if we could succeed in bringing a comprehensive peace to the Middle East, and then we could bring the benefits of that peace to all the people who live there, I believe that that would help us to defeat terrorism in all continents in the next century. I think it's a huge deal for all the people of the world.

Japan-U.S. Trade

Mr. King. Quickly, on the Tokyo thing, are we going to settle that before the date of imposition of tariffs?

The Vice President. Well, that's up to Japan.

Mr. King. Strictly up to Japan, no more meetings?

The President. Well, we'll be—we're prepared to meet and talk I think, but, look——

Mr. King. What's the date, June what—24th?

The President. Let me say—I have worked with four Japanese Governments. We have succeeded in pushing through a new world trade agreement. We have gotten, I think, 14 specific agreements with Japan, including agreements to import rice. But the real problem with the Japanese-American trade relationship, and with the Japanese trade relationship with many other countries, is autos and auto parts. It's 60 percent of our trade deficit with Japan. And we know we're competitive in price and quality. And we know there are indirect problems that are not covered by the specific letter of normal trade agreements. So we have to be firm here.

I have done everything I could for 2½ years to have a good, constructive, friendly relationship with Japan. We are allies, we are friends, but we must be firm on this.

The Vice President. I was watching television yesterday, and I saw an advertisement saying, "Free trade—these firm moves against Japan are a terrible mistake." And then at the end of the commercial, it said, "Paid for by Japanese Auto Association." And I would just say to them that if they, in any way, misjudge the strength and resolve of the President in pursuing this, they're making a serious mistake, because they're the ones that are acting contrary to what it would take to have more——

Mr. King. You're not going to give on this, is what you're saying.

The President. We want to open the market. We don't even—we just want to open the market. Let me say for the benefit of the Americans who are watching this, this is in Japan's interest as well. Japan has suffered from low growth. The Japanese people have apparently higher incomes than the American people, but their living standards are lower because they pay about 40 percent more for consumer products.

Mr. King. Are you saying their leaders are letting them down?

The President. I'm saying that their ingrained institutional resistance to change is not only hurting the American working people, it's hurting the Japanese people.

Mr. King. I've got to get a break. We'll come right back with the President and the Vice President of the United States on "Larry King Live." Don't go away.

[*The network took a commercial break.*]

Closing of Pennsylvania Avenue

Mr. King. What you're looking at now is the front of the White House, which is becoming a mall or an esplanade. No cars anymore on Pennsylvania Avenue because of security threats. There are the barricades. You have to go in through the side; you can't go in through the front anymore. Tragedy?

The President. Well, I wish it hadn't been necessary. But the truth is that, so far, it's increasing public access to the White House, and it hasn't interrupted traffic too much. On the weekends now, the whole Pennsylvania Avenue is just flooded with people. They're riding bikes, they're skating, they're skateboarding, they're on rollerblades.

Mr. King. Is this going to be like an esplanade? It's going to be like——

The President. We want it to be a big public space. You know, in a time of less security consciousness back in the thirties, the back lawn of the White House, the large back lawn used to be open every Sunday in the spring and summer for ordinary citizens to go and picnic and sort of be there in the atmosphere of it. Now we can do that in the front because of what's happened. I wish it hadn't been necessary, but we're going to make something good come of this.

The Vice President. There's a difference between access for people and access for cars and trucks. And actually, this space is more accessible to people now.

Antiterrorism Legislation

Mr. King. Where's your terrorism bill? Flying in the Senate, stopped in the House?

The Vice President. Well, the President's been working extremely hard on that, and I have to tell you—he won't say this the same way I do—I would personally like to say I'm very frustrated with what the House of Representatives is doing. The President's made it clear why this is necessary for our country, and it's not right for the House of Representatives to sit on this because some of the Members of Congress are scared that some of these antigovernment sentiments are so strong that they'll be expressed against them if they increase the ability of the Government to fight against lawbreakers.

The President. I'd like to say, though, that this is not just a—this is not necessarily a partisan deal. Senator Dole, so far as we speak tonight, has done what he's said he'd do. He asked me and the Democratic leadership to try to reduce the number of amendments offered by the Democrats. He said he'd try to reduce the number of amendments offered by Republicans. They did that today. They adopted a major amendment that I wanted to put taggets in illegal explosives, or explosives that could be held illegally, so we could trace them. They're moving that bill. And it seems to me that we're moving in the right direction in the Senate. I was quite disturbed at the people in the House saying, well, maybe we ought to go slow on this.

Look, I had an antiterrorism bill in the Congress 2 months before Oklahoma for foreign terrorists. Then the FBI and others said, we'd like some changes to deal with domestic terrorism, and we presented that. The bill is moving in the Senate. It must move in the House. We can't go slow on it. We can't.

Mr. King. What's stopping you in the House?

The President. Well, we don't know. Nothing has happened yet. We hope, if we can get this bill out of the Senate, that the House will then move rapidly.

Mr. King. What has Mr. Gingrich said about it?

The Vice President. Well, he said that they might have to go slow. And the terrorists aren't going slow.

Mr. King. So you're saying tonight to the House, get a move on?

The President. Look, this is a big deal, and this should not be partisan. And I know that some of these groups that hate the Government think that their civil liberties may be infringed here. The Congress has the right, indeed, the responsibility, to review the provisions of this act but not to go slow.

The people who do this terrorist work, they operate on their own timetable. They don't sit around and wait for Congress to enact laws.

We know that we can do a better job in stopping things from happening. Let me say, in spite of the horror of Oklahoma City and the World Trade Center, our people stopped another planned bombing in New York, stopped a plan to explode some airplanes flying out of the West Coast airports over the Pacific.

We can do more of this. In Israel now, with all of their problems with terrorism, they head off the vast majority of terrorist threats. We can prevent this, but we're not used to dealing with it. We need more tools. That's what this legislation is for, and we can't delay.

Mr. King. Are we still investigating Oklahoma City heavily?

The Vice President. Oh, yes. The President put together—let me just expand on that briefly. The President, immediately following the explosion in Oklahoma City, without a moment's delay, was on the telephone

to the Attorney General, the FBI, and the law enforcement community. And from the first half-hour, you saw assembled the most impressive law enforcement team ever put together in the history of the United States of America. I was there last week, watching them comb through every piece of the rubble of that building, down to pieces this big, getting every scrap of evidence that they could possibly find. It is an incredibly impressive operation.

Mr. King. Do you believe it was just two people?

The President. I believe we should let the investigation unfold.

Mr. King. We'll be right back with more of the President and the Vice President. We'll talk about some more domestic issues and include your phone calls on ''Larry King Live.'' Don't go away.

[*The network took a commercial break*]

Habeas Corpus Legislation

Mr. King. In this segment, concerning legislation, there's apparently a confusion over whether you're for or against an amendment regarding habeas corpus.

The President. Well, in addition to the antiterrorism legislation, we've been trying to pass, and I tried to pass last year and failed to do it, a bill which would reform the habeas corpus procedure, the criminal appeals procedure.

Mr. King. So?

The President. In death penalty cases, it normally takes 8 years to exhaust the appeals; it's ridiculous. And if you have multiple convictions, it could take even longer. So there is a strong sense in the Congress, I think among Members of both parties, that we need to get down to sort of one clear appeal, we need to cut the time delay on the appeals dramatically and that it ought to be done in the context of this terrorism legislation so that it would apply to any prosecutions brought against anyone indicted in Oklahoma. And I think it ought to be done.

You know, we have some differences about exactly what the details are and what the best and fairest way to do to apply to all criminal cases, but I think it definitely ought to be done. We have—for 15 years, I have been trying to get Congress to clarify this. And I have strongly believed it for a very long time, since I was an attorney general and a Governor and I had been on the receiving end of these interminable appeals.

Mr. King. Are there those in Congress who think you're against this?

The Vice President. There are some in both parties who, in good conscience, think it would cause problems for a criminal procedure.

Mr. King. Constitutional——

The Vice President. Well, they're worried about it. But the President's for it. And if they want to put the right version of it on this bill, fine.

The President. There are some good and bad—we don't have time to get into all of the details of it. There are things that I like better in some versions than others.

Mr. King. But you're, in essence, for it?

The President. I'm not only for it, we need to do it. You can't justify this lengthy appeals process.

Mr. King. Are we going to have the full Waco story come out?

The President. Yes, but I think we already have had it. I mean, after all, we had an independent panel review what the ATF people did there. We've already had 10 congressional hearings on Waco. And I think the American people should remember that. I'd just like to remind you of the facts. There was action taken based on mistakes made. There is new leadership at the ATF. The facts were made known of what they did and the FBI did and others did, and there were 10 congressional hearings last year.

If they want to have other hearings, fine. But let's not lose the forest for the trees here. All this renewed interest in Waco came up by people who were worried about the fact that there would be a renewed interest in exploring the kind of militant groups that the suspect in the Oklahoma City bombing was involved with. So if they want to look into Waco, fine, but let's not forget what the real problem is here. The real problem is what happened at Oklahoma City.

At Waco, whatever else the facts are, it's clear there was a valid warrant. The people in the cult shot first and killed innocent Federal law enforcement officials. When the FBI went after them, based on their best available

intelligence at the time—they killed the children there, the people there, not the Federal officials, the people in the cult did. And when they finally had their place inspected, what did we find? We found illegal machine guns, illegal explosives, and the capacity to build another 100 high-caliber, illegal machine guns. And Koresh shot his way into the leadership of the cult.

So there's a lot of historical revision going on here to take people's attention off Oklahoma City.

Mr. King. We'll be right back to discuss some domestic issues, politics, too, and then take your phone calls. Don't go away.

[*The network took a commercial break.*]

Media Violence

Mr. King. People often ask, what do you talk about during breaks? We were talking about movies. Now, normally, that would be considered inconsequential, except movies are suddenly political.

Okay, what do you make of Bob Dole and the charges that—well, I'll tell you something he said yesterday. He said, ''Mr. Clinton will not criticize the movies like I do because if he needs a million dollars, he has to go to Hollywood.'' And he said, ''If he needs 2 million dollars, he has to go see Barbra Streisand, and she has to put on a concert.'' She'll be here tomorrow night, so I mentioned that. Your thoughts on Mr. Dole.

The President. Well, first of all, if I had any criticism it would be that the whole thing has been politicized, like in those comments you made.

The truth is, I was talking about violence and—in rap music and movies in 1992, in 1993. I went to Hollywood and met with a bunch of the people in production and challenged them to reduce it. I met with people—the members of—the representatives of television networks and challenged them. And I talked about it—if you remember, I got a big standing ovation in the State of the Union Address, talking about it.

Mr. King. So you agree with Senator Dole?

The President. So I think it's an absolutely legitimate point for discussion. Tipper Gore, years ago, long before there was any politics in it, was talking about how we needed to take——

Mr. King. Labeling records.

The President. Yes, and to take—and to just—so that people could know whether these things were consistent with what you'd want young children to see and here.

I don't believe in censorship, and I don't believe in singling Hollywood out. What I believe we need to do is to say to ourselves, what has happened to our ability to have an American community that raises good citizens, with good values, who are—who grow up into good people? That these kids—how do we reduce the teen violence? How do we reduce——

Mr. King. They're saying that Hollywood contributes to it.

The President. Well, I think—and I think that's—I think excessive exposure to mind-numbing violence or crass abuse of people in sexual and other ways, has a bad impact on young children, especially if they don't have the kind of structure and other leadership in their life that they need.

But what I would say is that we need to ask ourselves, what does the entertainment community need to do? What does the media need to do? What does the business community need to do? What does the religious community need to do? What do the politicians need to do? What's our contribution to all this? That is, my only quarrel with all this is I don't want to see it politicized. I agree with a lot of what Senator Dole said. I don't know about the specific movies; I hadn't seen most of the ones he mentioned. But I think that we need to do this in a spirit not of dividing each other but of asking everybody to come forward and be accountable.

Mr. King. Is the rap on Time Warner fair?

The Vice President. Well, I think that they have put out a lot of material that they shouldn't have. And it's not true that this administration hasn't talked about it. In fact, there was a public back-and-forth when one of their properties had some inappropriate material on President Reagan's Alzheimer's disease, and we said, ''Hey, wait a minute.'' And they pulled it back. And I give them credit for that. And there have been other examples.

And let me say this: My wife, Tipper, began working on this and talking about this 18 years ago. And a few years after that, she began to get criticized from all parts. Before they were in the White House, Bill and Hillary Clinton were among the few who stood up and said, ''We support what Tipper Gore is saying about this.'' And it took some doing, but she succeeded in getting the voluntary system of labeling for records. But she's continued talking about it. And she and I have appreciated the fact that this is the first President to talk about this in the State of the Union Address, to go to Hollywood and make a speech about it, and to take on this phenomenon in a responsible way, not in a partisan way.

Mr. King. Are you also against violent movies that Mr. Dole didn't mention, like ''True Lies,'' let's say, a Schwarzenegger movie that had a lot of violence?

The President. Well, let me say—I don't want to get into critiquing every movie. There have been about 3,000 studies of the impact of constant exposure to violence on children through television and through the movies. Almost all of them, not all, but almost all of them, conclude that what is really bad is the aggregate impact of it, the total volume of it, plus the treatment of violence as something casual and crass.

Mr. King. Everyday——

The President. Like you and I were talking about ''Braveheart.'' That's a violent movie, but it doesn't glorify violence. It's ugly, and it's awful.

Now, I feel that we ought to go after this in a responsible way. I was not upset when Senator Dole raised this issue. I just don't think any of us ought to be doing it as a way of sort of dividing the American people.

You know, we ought to get on this—a friend of mine said today, we need to get on the solution side of these problems. We need to challenge Hollywood. Most of these people, they're good people out there. They want to do the right thing. And we're not talking about censorship; we're talking about responsible, honest debate. We all have to say, what contribution are we making to creating an America that is too divided, that doesn't raise good children with strong values who are good, law-abiding citizens when they grow up?

Mr. King. We'll be back. We'll include some phone calls for the President and Vice President of the United States right after this.

[*The network took a commercial break.*]

Mr. King. Timeth flieth. We're moving along. Let's take a call. Jameson, Pennsylvania, for President Clinton and Vice President Gore. Hello.

Q. Hello. Good evening. Thank you, Larry, for the opportunity.

Mr. King. You're welcome.

Negative Criticism

Q. Good evening, President Clinton and Vice President Gore. This is indeed an honor. Like you, President Clinton, I saw President Kennedy when I was younger, and it has sparked my interest in studying the Presidency.

Mr. King. Ma'am, I wish you would get right to the question. I don't mean to interrupt, but we have long——

Q. My question is, I respect the Presidency of the United States, and I think it's an important job. How frustrating is it for you to try to get your message out to the people when it seems like the opposing party is criticizing you constantly?

Mr. King. What do you make of the daily hate? There is a lot of hate in America.

The President. There is, and I would say to her, I don't mind the daily criticism. What I don't like and don't agree with is the sort of atmosphere of negativism and cynicism. That is, I should be criticized by people who disagree with me; we should have an honest debate. That's really the way you make progress in this country. But we have gotten to be entirely too negative and cynical and divisive, and that's one of our country's big problems. We need to get out of being quite so partisan and quite so personal and quite so interested in the destruction of our opponents.

This country, with all of its problems, no other country would trade places with us as we get ready to go into this new century, because our productivity, the strength of our people, the wealth of our resources, the diversity of our population in a global econ-

omy—if we can just figure out a way to restore middle class dreams and middle class values and pull this country together, there's no stopping the United States.

So I say to the lady, it bothers me not to be criticized, but it bothers me that there is an atmosphere that is more negative than positive. America should be more positive than negative.

1996 Election

Mr. King. A couple of political things. Do you think Senator Dole will be your opponent?

The Vice President. I don't know. I don't know.

Mr. King. Do you think so?

The Vice President. It looks that way now, but it's impossible to tell. It's so far off.

The President. I don't know. One thing I've learned watching this for 30 years, is you can't tell now who will be there then.

Mr. King. Mr. Gingrich will be in New Hampshire all weekend; so will you. You'll be there for Dartmouth on Sunday. Do you think he might enter the race? That's just a thought. You know, just three people talking.

The President. I don't know. You've got to ask him. I really don't know. I talk to him all the time, but not about this.

Mr. King. Would you regard it as a challenge if he did? Do you think he'll——

The President. Well, it would be interesting. Of course, he'd have to be nominated first. But it would be interesting.

Mr. King. Senator—Mr. Vice President? I'm so used to calling him——

The Vice President. I'm still in the——

Mr. King. I know, you're still in the Senate.

The Vice President. I'm still in the Senate. And you know, the experience of voting in the Senate's made me a more optimistic person, because I've noticed that every time I vote, we win. [*Laughter.*]

Mr. King. Good line.

The Vice President. But to answer your question, I don't know. It sounds——

Mr. King. Would it be formidable?

The Vice President. You know, we're not going to rank any potential opponents for the President. Anybody who got the nomination would be, by definition, the nominee of the other party and formidable. But it sounds to me like he kind of wants to, but maybe I have it wrong, and I have no idea.

Mr. King. Mr. Perot has called a meeting in Dallas with his large group. He says every Republican candidate has agreed to go. Will you go?

The Vice President. I'm inclined not to go, because I have a lot of respect for the "United We Stand" group, and I hope that they will review my record in terms of what they said they wanted done in 1992, because I have done, or advocated, a vast majority of what they did. But I don't believe—I think the President's in a little different category. I don't think the President should start the politicking too soon. I've got a job; I'm supposed to be working for the American people. I'm trying to work with this new Republican Congress, and I want to diminish partisan politics and my personal politics for as long as I can.

Q. Therefore, you'll ask the Vice President not to go, either?

The President. We haven't even discussed it. I'm telling you what my instinct is.

The Vice President. I don't plan to go. I think that the party chair has already expressed his intention to go.

Mr. King. He will go?

The Vice President. Yes.

Surgeon General-Designate Henry Foster

Mr. King. Foster—is he going to go through?

The President. I think he will. I think we're very close to having the votes to break filibuster, and I think a filibuster would be wrong. He's a good man; he cleared the committee; he was treated fairly, in a bipartisan way; he had all those kids from Tennessee from those housing projects come up and say, "Here's a guy that told us to abstain from premature sex, to stay off drugs, to be good people." That's the message we need going out to America's children.

Mr. King. Is Senator Dole going to bring it to the floor?

The Vice President. I hope he will. Nobody in America is better qualified to lead a crusade against this epidemic of teen pregnancy.

Mr. King. And you think they'll override a Gramm filibuster if it comes to the floor?

The President. I don't see how a majority of the Senate, even 60 percent of them, could say this man's not entitled to a vote, up or down.

Mr. King. Back with more after this on "Larry King Live." Barbra Streisand tomorrow night. Don't go away.

[*The network took a commercial break.*]

Balanced Budget

Mr. King. We're back. The Republican National Committee sent out a news release today—Haley Barbour talking about your appearance tonight on this program and saying, 3 years ago on this show you promised the American people you would offer a plan to balance the budget. Do you have such a plan?

The President. Well, as you know, I have said that I will work with the Republicans to balance the budget. And at the proper time, I will offer how I think the best way to do is.

But let's just point out, in 1994, the Republicans told the American people all I did was raise taxes. And they basically turned things upside down; they won the Congress. But what we did, in fact, was to use their 7-year number. We reduced the deficit by a trillion dollars 3 years in a row for the first time since Truman was President. They talked about how terrible it was, but it produced low interest rates, high growth, 6.3 million new jobs.

And I might say to the American people, the Republican plan does not repeal my plan, it builds on it. If they didn't take the deficit reduction we'd already achieved, they could never get to a balance in 7 years or any other figure.

Mr. King. So you say we're going to have something from you after——

The President. So I think—I'll be happy to work with them, but I want—I thought it was important after they won the election on a set of specific promises that they have a change to go and say how they thought it should be done.

Now, you know what I think is wrong with their budget. I think that it cuts Medicare and other health programs to the elderly way too much. It cuts education too much. It uses those cuts to finance a tax cut that is entirely too large and tilted to upper income individuals who are doing very well in the present economy and who basically just want us to get the deficit down.

So, we need to do this, but there's a right way and a wrong way to do it. And at the proper time, I will say what I think the right way is.

Mr. King. And the proper time is imminent or not imminent?

The President. I will do it when I think the proper time is.

Mr. King. Dana Point, California, with Vice President Gore and President Clinton—hello.

Q. Hi, Larry. I enjoy your show. My name is Michelle Denise. Also, I'd like you to know I enjoy Jerry Spence.

Mr. King. Everybody does. He's an international hero, Jerry Spence.

Q. He is quite a character.

The President. He looks good in those jackets.

Mr. King. Doesn't he? Boy. This trial is going forever, right?

Okay.

Defense Base Closures

Q. This question is both for Mr. Clinton and Gore. Are we going to continue our military base closures in consideration that we might possibly be spreading ourselves too thin——

Mr. King. Any chance of that?

The Vice President. Well, the base closure procedure is locked into law. It's bipartisan in nature. It has caused a lot of difficulty. The President has directed his Cabinet to address the problems that have been created. There have been some very imaginative plans to try to use some of these facilities for other purposes and bring back employment and new opportunities in the community. But this was put into place long before we got here, and according to the law, it's going to continue for a while.

The President. But let me answer the security concern the lady raised. Defense spending peaked in about 1987, and since then, has been cut about 40 percent. We have suggested that we add back a few billion

dollars so we can get our training and our readiness up and support a good quality of life so we can keep first-rate people in the military because it's the people that make it go.

The answer to your question, ma'am, is that we actually have more base capacity than the number of our men and women in uniform would justify. So we have to bring down the bases a little more so that they're basically in line with the size of our forces. The size of our forces now will enable to meet our security needs and meet our strategic objectives. But we can't cut it a lot more. We should stay about where we are.

Mr. King. Barbra Streisand is here tomorrow night. And are you both fans of hers? Do you like her speaking out on politics, by the way?

The President. I think she's—just as—if we have a right to speak out on entertainment, I think she has the right to speak out on politics. [*Laughter*] I think that she should do it.

Mr. King. David Letterman is here on Friday.

The Vice President. Tell him I said hello.

Mr. King. I will. Do you plan to return to that show?

The Vice President. I hope to sometime.

Mr. King. Would you recommend the President even appear with David?

The Vice President. I'm going to let him make that decision. [*Laughter*]

The President. But you know, since we got this procurement reform passed, there are no more of those $10 ashtrays and $500 hammers. So he's got no gig anymore. [*Laughter*]

Mr. King. Thanks guys. You don't want to do a Brando close, do you? [*Laughter*]

The Vice President. Just a handshake. [*Laughter*]

Mr. King. Just a handshake.

The President. We've enjoyed doing the show.

Mr. King. Oh, let me—here—President Clinton does Brando. Do it once.

The Vice President. You missed it.

The President. It's been great being on your show, Larry.

Mr. King. Thank you.

The President. You're a good man, you got a real future in this business. [*Laughter*]

Mr. King. Thank you. Thank you.

The President. Good night.

Mr. King. Good night.

The Vice President. Good night.

NOTE: The interview began at 9 p.m. in the Library at the White House.

Remarks to the National Governors' Association Summit on Young Children in Baltimore, Maryland

June 6, 1995

Thank you very much. To Governor Dean and Governor Leavitt and all of the Governors who are here, Governor Glendening and Mayor Schmoke and Congressman Cardin. I'm glad to be back in Baltimore. I'm going to have to register as a citizen and begin to pay taxes if I don't stay out of your State a little more, Governor.

I am delighted to be here in Baltimore because Baltimore was one of the six cities which won a highly contested race for the empowerment zones in our country. And I congratulate Mayor Schmoke on that, and I look forward to his work, along with the Governor and others, in making Baltimore an even stronger and greater city as a result of that.

Governor Dean, I want to thank you for your leadership of the Governors' Association. I don't think I ever enjoyed any job more than being chairman of the Governors' Association, although it was not always easy to please all the Governors. I think it's still not always easy to please all of the Governors. [*Laughter*]

I'm delighted to see so many representatives of State government, county government, local government here. My good friend, Representative Blute from North Carolina, it's nice to see you here. Representative Campbell and Commissioner Franke, thank you for your work, sir.

I thank all of you for coming here to meet about the fate of our children. This has been a concern of mine, as the Governor said, for a long time and, of course, a profound concern for my wife. When I met her, she was spending an extra year in law school to do

4 years instead of 3, so that she could devote a year to the study of the laws that affected our children. And I might say she then predicted a lot of the more disturbing trends which we've seen unfold in our country over the last 20 years.

Hillary is working on a book now about children's issues and the responsibilities we owe to them, and she picked the title of the old African proverb: "It takes a village to raise a child." I want to come back to that a little bit during my remarks because I think there is a great difference of opinion about that in the United States today. I began with the premise that the first responsibility for children lies with their parents, but that since all our futures are bound up in theirs, the rest of us share a responsibility in the United States and in our States and in our communities for their welfare. I do believe, in other words, that it takes a village to raise a child, especially when you consider the facts of life that children face today.

I ran for this job because I wanted to ensure a better future for our children, to ensure that instead of losing so many of our children and seeing so many of them grow up with the American dream beyond their grasp, that they could be rewarded for their work and that the values that we all share of work and family and community would be stronger, not weaker, when they came of age.

I realize that people my daughter's age were in danger of growing up to be the first generation of Americans to do worse economically than their parents but, perhaps even more important, to live in a country that was less supportive of the kind and quality of life that most people in my generation took for granted.

The recent report of the Carnegie Corporation tends to corroborate a lot of those disturbing trends with statistics you all know well. In the quiet crisis, they say, that still, after years of effort, compared to other industrialized countries, our infant mortality rates are higher, our low-birth-weight baby rates are higher, our teen pregnancy rates are much higher, our childhood immunization rates are lower, and of course, our children are subjected to far, far higher rates of violence in the United States than they would be in any other country in the world.

If we are going to rescue our children's future, we have to do a number of things. We have to grow the middle class and shrink the under class. We have to support policies that reinforce work and families and communities. We have to change the way the Government operates so that it promotes independence, not dependence, opportunity and not bureaucracy. We have to give our youngest children things that they can't guarantee for themselves.

If you believe it takes a whole village to raise a child, it means that the Government has a responsibility, working with people in the private sector, to guarantee children who can't get it for themselves health, safety, and education, and then when they get older, to empower them to make the most of their own lives. To do that, I believe, we need not another ideological war, but a passionate and practical commitment to what we know will work.

The whole issue of welfare is at the core of that. But let me just say for a moment, for the last 2½ years a great deal of what I have sought to do has been centered in that conviction, that we have to have a passionate and practical effort to go beyond ideological wars right to the heart of what will make life better for our children.

We've worked hard to strengthen families and to give children a better start. The earned-income credit will now provide a tax reduction for working families with children with incomes below $27,000 an average of $1,000 a year. That's a profamily policy. We should continue that, not reverse it. The family and medical leave law, more than anything I've done as President, has caused ordinary citizens to come up to me and say, "Thank you. I had a sick child. I had a sick spouse. My wife had a baby. We were able to continue to work and to provide for ourselves. We were able to be good parents and successful workers."

That, it seem to me, is the kind of thing that we ought to do. Secretary Shalala, who is here, has worked very hard to expand immunization so that all our children under the age of 2 will be properly immunized by the turn of the century. We have expanded Head Start dramatically. The Goals 2000 program in which many of you have participated—

most of you have—emphasizes grassroots reforms to achieve national, indeed, international standards of excellence.

When children are more independent, we have given them access to lower cost, better repayment terms for college loans with tougher requirements to repay them. We've worked with you for more apprenticeship programs for the young people who don't go to 4-year colleges and universities, through the school-to-work program. And of course, many of you have been very active in the national service program, AmericCorps, which gives our young people a chance to give something back to their communities and earn more funds to go on to school. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Senator Mikulski of Maryland for her work on national service.

The crime bill was an important part of this because it emphasized not simply more punishment and more prisons but also protecting children through 100,000 more police officers on the street and through prevention programs that give our young people something to say yes to as well as something to say no to.

We were able to do those things and still reduce the deficit. The new majority in Congress uses 7-year terms. We use—the deficit is going down by a trillion dollars over 7 years, thanks to the '93 and '94 budgets. More than 6.3 million new jobs came into our economy. But we did it while saying that it takes a whole village to raise a child; that children deserve education, health, and safety; that families should be strengthened and supported; that work should be exalted; and that parents have to be able to succeed in the world we are living in, both as parents and as workers.

One thing we did not do is to pass comprehensive welfare reform. And that is now what is before the Congress. And that, more than anything else in this debate, captures a lot of the philosophical arguments that are at the core of what is going on in our national discussion today.

I don't think there's any question that I believe we ought to reform the welfare system. I was proud to represent the Governors when the Family Support Act was written under President Reagan's administration with strong bipartisan support. I realize what the shortcomings of it are, especially since it was never properly funded. And therefore, I have now given, the Secretary and I have, 29 of the 50 States exemptions from Federal rules and regulations to pursue your own path to welfare reform to move people to work. Nothing like that has ever been done before.

In Missouri, Vermont, and Wisconsin, Governors Carnahan, Dean, and Thompson are using their waivers to impose time limits and to require work. In Ohio and Oregon, Governors Voinovich and Kitzhaber are moving people to work by using money now spent on welfare and food stamps to subsidize private sector jobs. Others are doing other things that are very important. Every Governor I've ever spoken with, without regard to party, understands that welfare reform is important and must, first and foremost, be about work.

Unfortunately, to my mind, the welfare reform bill in Congress—or the debate—has not focused as much as it should have about work. And I believe that in important respects the tenor of the debate not only in the House but also in the Senate, puts both children and States at risk. The House bill, clearly, was too tough on children and too weak on work. Finally, after a lot of efforts, the House did agree to be tough on deadbeat parents, something that everyone among the Governors agree it needed to be done. The Senate Finance Committee reported a bill out the other day that clearly is a step in the right direction in many areas but, I believe, still misses the point on work and on children.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the current Senate Finance Committee bill will not succeed in moving people from welfare to work. The Congressional Budget Office and the person who wrote the report was generally acknowledged to be one of the preeminent Republican experts on welfare reform, concluded that only six of our States would be able to fulfill the bill's work requirements in the year 2000 with the bill's funding provisions. Forty-four States will fail. Six out of 50 in baseball is a .120 batting average. You can't play for the Orioles with that batting average. You can't stay in the

minor leagues, and you sure won't elevate children or end welfare as we know it.

The reason the Senate bill failed on the standard of work seems to me is clear: It takes away the tools that States now use to move people from welfare to work, child care, job training, greater incentives for job placement.

I very much want to work across party lines to solve this problem. But if we're going to end welfare as we know it, Congress must pass a bill that meets some basic principles. First, we have to require people who can work to go to work and make sure that they have the child care to do it so that they don't have to hurt their children to do the right thing as citizens. It defies common sense to insist that people go to work when they have very young children if doing so will actually cost them money.

Second, the legislation should have real work requirements, but it ought to be backed up with the resources necessary to get people into jobs and keep them there.

According to the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, it would cost you, the States, $10 billion a year by the year 2000 to meet these requirements just in the Senate bill. And yet, this bill asks you to meet these requirements with less money than you have now.

Now, I was a Governor long enough to remember what an unfunded mandate is. A lot of you—Governor Voinovich was in the Rose Garden celebrating when we signed the unfunded mandates bill; I strongly supported it. Just because this doesn't say it's one doesn't mean it isn't by another term. So I think we have to look at this forthrightly.

The third thing that I think is important is that welfare reform should have real incentives to reward the States who do succeed in putting people to work, not for cutting them off. The current bill gives States an incentive instead to save money simply by throwing people off the welfare roles.

The House bill even gives States what the Catholic Church has called an illegitimacy bonus, an incentive for more people to have abortions. That is not welfare reform. If we're going to change the culture of welfare, we have got to reward success, we've got to depart from the status quo. I want a performance bonus but one that will force the welfare bureaucracy and the welfare recipients to focus on work.

The fourth thing I believe is that the legislation should protect States so they can continue to move people from welfare to work, even when there is an economic downturn, extraordinary population growth, or unpredictable emergencies. In their current forms, these bills could really hurt the high-population States, the growth States, like Florida and Utah and others, and could put every State at risk in the next recession or profound natural disaster.

Finally, let me say we ought to protect our children. If you believe it takes a whole village to raise a child, we should avoid mean-spirited restrictions on benefits to children. We should avoid cuts in child nutrition and adoption and child protective services. We should give States more flexibility, but we should also make sure States continue to fulfill their responsibilities. The proposed legislation contains no incentives or requirements for States to maintain their own funding for cash assistance or for child care or work supports.

Now, I know that if you believe in the pure theory of State experimentation—and you know that I believe a lot of that, because if you just look at what's in these 29 waivers, I have pretty much gone along with anything the States wanted to do to move people from welfare to work. So you might argue that, in theory, if we believe that States ought to have great flexibility, why don't we just give them a block grant without any requirement for local maintenance or anything of that kind? But the serious danger there is that this will become a race to the bottom. It's always cheaper to cut people off welfare than to move them to work. It will always be cheaper to lower benefits than to figure out how to reduce the caseload by moving them to work.

We already do less for young children than most of our major competitors—perhaps all of our major competitors—throughout the world. And I just believe that we cannot allow welfare reform to be a race to the bottom.

Let me say again, I know in theory it's right, but let me remind all of you, I served for 12 years as a Governor. I served in good

times and bad times. I know that the last 2 years, this is the second year in a row when in all probability all 50 States will have economic growth. That is a highly unusual circumstance over the last two decades.

And I'm just telling you, I've been in enough State legislatures in my life, not just in my State but all around this country, to know what's going to happen. If you put this welfare reform block grant with less money and no local maintenance requirement up against the Medicaid cuts and the education cuts and the other things that are in this budget, you tell me how the poor children of your State are going to fare when they have to deal with the nursing home lobby. And I'm not complaining about the nursing home lobby; you just tell me how they're going to fare.

You know, everybody wants to cut Medicaid to shreds, because they say that's just a poor person's health care. You know as well as I do almost 70 percent of that money goes to the elderly and the disabled. And they're all coming to see you and your State legislators.

Now, how are they going to do? How are these poor children going to do? How are they going to do against some of my favorite lobbies—the education lobbies? How are they going to do? Not very well. How are they going to do against a lobby that no one can say no to, the prison lobby? The crime rate goes up and your legislature stiffens sentences, and people don't want you paroling folks that have no business on the street. And the only way you can get this Federal money for prisons is if you promise to leave people in longer and ignore your own parole laws. When you have to match that money or build prisons on your own, how are you going to stand up and say, ''Well, somehow we're going to keep doing what we used to do for poor children?'' And you can walk away and say, ''Well, what we used to do doesn't work, so maybe we shouldn't do anything.'' But the truth is we do less—I will say it again—we do less for children than the countries with which we compete.

And this is not a partisan issue, at least it never has been before. Everything that happened in the last 2 years on Head Start, on every education initiative we did, on the family and medical leave, every single thing was a bipartisan issue, everything.

Now, I think there are two big debates that are undergirding this welfare debate, and I'd like to just put it out on the table today. One is the debate about what causes people to be on welfare. Is it economic and politics, or is it culture? That's really what's behind all this debate about what's in the movies and in the rap lyrics and all.

And by the way, I think it's a positive thing. You know, Mrs. Gore was talking 18 years ago about the dangers of destructive entertainment forces on children. I've been challenging Hollywood and the television networks to reduce violence for years. I don't mind this debate. I think this is a good debate.

But the truth is, it's not either/or. You see, there was one young girl interviewed in a movie line last week—asked her, what do you think about this debate in Washington about whether movies were causing the breakdown of families. And she said, ''Well, my father's working three jobs. I'll tell you, that's not good for our family. I wish he'd just come home and spend some time with me.''

On the other hand, people who deny that culture is a force are wrong. The States in this country with the lowest incarceration rates also have the highest high school graduation rates and they often don't spend the most money. There are almost no poor children in families with two parents in the home. So if I could just wave a magic wand and make this problem go away, I would never have another kid in a home where there weren't two parents until the child reached a certain age so that then the child could take care of himself or herself. That would be a wonderful thing if that could be done. And in that sense, there is a cultural component to all this.

So the people that are out there exhorting parents to be more responsible, and especially male parents to be more responsible, people like this Promisekeepers Group, they deserve our support. They deserve our support. There is a cultural element in all this. But to say that there is no national responsibility on the economic and political side, I think is just plain wrong and defies the experience of every, single, solitary country in

the world. And I might add, that all the people that are out there working in the private charities, go interview them and ask them if they think that we can just walk away from this.

So I would say, this cultural debate is a very good thing, and we ought to have it. But there is plainly a political and economic root to this. If you look at rising poverty and stagnating middle class incomes in this country, it is clearly the result of international economic trends sweeping all advanced countries and national economic policies. And all those things are reinforced, one with another.

We are on the verge of having a 40-year low in the minimum wage. Why would somebody who was on welfare who had two kids, who at least had health care from Medicaid and they've got food stamps, go to work, if we won't even raise the minimum wage to keep it up to where it was 10 years ago, in fact, we're going to let it go to a 40-year low.

So I implore you, Governors are supposed to be the places where people look at the real world and they get away from all this theory and look at the practice. There's a political and an economic element to this problem, and there is a cultural element to the problem. That is one big deal. I think there is a public responsibility and there is a private responsibility, both, not either/or.

There's another debate going on here which is: What is the most important thing we can do to help grow the economy and stabilize the society? And on one side of that debate there are those who say the most important thing we can do is to reduce the deficit and shrink the Government. And nothing else really matters because the Federal Government would mess up a one-car parade. And on the other side of that debate are not people who say we need a Government; we need an expanded bureaucracy. That debate is not existent in Washington.

You look at the record. We have reduced already, with the two budgets already adopted, the size of the Federal Government by 270,000. Congressman Cardin's already voted to do that, to bring the Federal Government to its smallest size since President Kennedy was President. We've had dramatic changes in regulation. The 29 States with the waivers from Federal rules on welfare is just one example. The deficit has been brought down three times in a row for the first time since Mr. Truman was here. Nobody is for a higher deficit. That is not the issue.

The issue is: Are there any other responsibilities of the National Government? I believe there are some. I think we have to help people who cannot help themselves through no fault of their own, not because they're irresponsible, but through no fault of their own, like little children who are poor. And I think we have to empower people to make the most of their own lives, because that way we'll all be better off. That's what I believe. Therefore, I don't think that you can sacrifice our responsibility to educate people and our responsibility for basic health and safety, security issues, on the alter of deficit reduction.

You know, sometimes I think my big problem is that I was for some of these things before they were popular, like deficit reduction. Everybody's for it now. That doesn't mean we didn't do a lot of it in the last 2 years.

So we have to decide that. Now, don't kid yourself—from the point of view of the Congress, welfare reform has stopped being welfare reform primarily. Primarily welfare reform is a way to cut spending on the poor so that we don't have to worry about it and we can balance the budget in 7 years and give a big tax cut, largely benefiting upper income people who have done pretty well in the 1980's. That's what this is about.

It is true that a lot of people genuinely believe the States ought to have more say over this. So do I. It is true that a lot of people believe the prior system didn't do much good for people who were permanently dependent on welfare. So do I. And I have for 15 years. But we should not confuse—if we really say it's more important to cut spending so that we can balance the budget in 7 years and still give a tax increase to upper income people, even if we're going to hurt poor children, people ought to just say that flat out because that's what's really underneath this.

So I ask you to think about it. What's it going to be like the next time the coasts are growing and the Middle West is in a depression, when the farmland goes to pieces?

What's it going to be like the next time there's a high-tech collapse and the coasts are in trouble and only the Heartland is doing well? What's it going to be like the next time we have a serious national recession if there is not even a maintenance of effort requirement? If there is not real effort to have work? You know what it's going to be like. You'll have less people moving from welfare to work, more people getting less money, and the most important thing is our children, our future, will be in more difficult circumstances.

You could not design a program that would be too tough on work for me. You could not design a program that would give the States any more flexibility than I want to give them as long as we recognize that we, our American village, have a responsibility to our children and that in the end, our political and economic policies must reinforce the culture we're trying to create. They ought to be profamily and prowork. But if we get in the fix in this country where people cannot succeed as parents without being derelict at work or they cannot succeed at work without being derelict to their children, which is exactly what exists for too many people in America today or that is their deep worry, then we are going to suffer. We are going to suffer economically, and we are going to suffer culturally.

Now, I think this is a huge opportunity. We can save some money and reduce the deficit in this welfare area. I have proposed that. I think we can. I don't believe every penny we're spending is sacrosanct, but I just would say to you we must not walk away, and you should not walk away. And you shouldn't want us to put you in a position to walk away from our fundamental responsibilities. Just imagine all the debates that are going to occur here. Children are not very well organized. Poor children are very poorly organized. They will not do well on balance in all the State legislatures of the country the next time things are really bad and, especially, after all the other budget cuts come down to all the other people who will also be on your doorstep.

We can have welfare reform. We can balance the budget. We can shrink the Government and still be faithful to our fundamental responsibilities to our children and our future. Let's don't make it either/or. Let's do it all, do it right, and take this country to the next century in good shape.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:38 p.m. at the Stouffer Renaissance Harbor Place. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Howard Dean of Vermont; Gov. Mike Leavitt of Utah; Gov. Parris N. Glendening of Maryland; Mayor Kurt Schmoke of Baltimore; Gov. Mel Carnahan of Missouri; Gov. Tommy G. Thompson of Wisconsin; Gov. George V. Voinovich of Ohio; and Gov. John A. Kitzhaber of Oregon.

Remarks at the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Recognition Program

June 7, 1995

Jaime, I think I can speak for every adult in this audience today and say that there's not a person here who wouldn't be proud to be your parent when you graduate from high school tomorrow. Thank you, and God bless you for everything you've done. Thank you, Marilyn, for being here. Thank you, Director Brown. And thank you, Secretary Riley.

Ladies and gentlemen, the statement you just heard from this fine young women, about to begin her life after high school, is as clear an example as I could ever think of, of what I think we ought to be doing as a country. You hear all these debates up here in Washington about whether the government should do this, that, or the other thing, whether our problems are fundamentally to be addressed by political action, or whether all of our problems are just cultural and if people would just simply take responsibility for themselves and do the right thing we wouldn't have any problems, and therefore, we should just ignore any spending call—nothing is really worth investing in, let's just make everybody do the right thing.

The truth is, in the real world we need to do both things. Parents have to set better examples; they have to teach their children. We need to tell young people at the earliest possible age, "There comes a time in life when you cannot blame other people for your own problems, and whatever your dif-

ficulties are, you have to behave and you have to take control of your own lives.'' But it's also true that, in the meanwhile, somebody has to pay to protect these children if they need protection, to be safe in school, and somebody has to make provision to bring people into the schools who can do the kinds of things that Jaime talked about, who can be the role models, who can talk about how to diffuse conflict, who can talk about how to avoid violence, who can talk about the imperative of staying off of drugs, which is still, I would remind you, at the root of more than half of the problems that we're dealing with in this country today.

So this is one more time a phony, overly politicized debate here. It's not either/or; it is both. And we have responsibilities here, those of us who work here, to make sure that every single child in America has a chance to get out of school safe and educated and be the kind of person that was reflected in what Jaime said here today. We have a partnership obligation to do that for America.

That is at the heart of a lot of arguments we're having here in Washington. Last night I received Congress's rescission bill. The rescission bill cuts spending from this year's budget. I believe we ought to do that and make another down payment on balancing our budget. I've done everything I could to cut this deficit. In 1993, unfortunately, with only Democrats voting for it, we voted for a deficit-reduction program and passed it and I signed it, which reduced the deficit over the 7 year period now popularly discussed by $1 trillion. I believe in cutting the deficit.

We froze discretionary spending completely, which means every time we gave more money to education, we had to cut something else. And we did it gladly. We cut waste and duplication and bureaucracy and committed to reduce the size of the Federal Government by 270,000 people. But we increased investment in Head Start. We made college loans more available, more affordable. We supported schools with the Goals 2000 programs, which were not mandates from the Federal Government, but were programs like the safe and drug free school program, where we give money to local school districts and they decide how you can make the school safest, how you can make the schools the most drug free, just the approach the leadership of this new Congress says they favor, let people at the local level make more of their decisions. But we thought we ought to be partners because not every local school district had the money to guarantee safety and the best possible efforts to make children safe, to make them learn how to avoid violence and to stay drug free.

Now, after all this, I can tell you that the budget today would be in balance—today—but for the interest we'll have to pay this year on the debt that was run in the 12 years before I became President. That is the problem. We took leave of our collective financial senses about a dozen years ago and began to put this country in the ditch. And we've got to take it out. But we cannot do it overnight. And we must recognize that the only deficit in this country is not the budget deficit, there's a deficit in this country in the number of drug-free children. There's a deficit in this country in the number of safe schools. There's an education deficit in this country. And we dare not ignore those problems. We can do both. That's the right way to approach this problem.

I worked in good faith with Members of the Congress to craft a rescission bill that would cut spending by a set amount and do it in the right way. I actually agreed with the spending cuts passed by the United States Senate with a bipartisan majority, an overwhelming bipartisan majority, because it protected programs like the drug-free school program, the national service program, the education programs that we're working so hard on. Unfortunately, what happened is after the Senate passed the bill, they went into a closed-door conference with Members of the House who had passed a bill that did cut all these things, and instead of cutting more spending, they took out a lot of education investment. They took out half the drug-free school money and substituted courthouses, highways, and city streets in selected States and congressional districts. In other words, they decided to cut school safety to increase pork.

The bill cuts, as Secretary Riley says, half of the safe and drug-free schools money this year in anticipation of eliminating it altogether next year. Now, I'm sure that all the

people that voted to do it will tell you we favor these efforts, we just think people ought to do the right thing. Well, I think people ought to do the right thing, too. But if Jaime knows what she's talking about, and the chances are she knows a lot more about this than most people who live in Washington, DC, and work for the Federal Government and the Congress of the Executive Branch, in order to do that, we need a partnership. We need public action and personal responsibility.

I cannot in good conscience sign a bill that cuts education to save pet congressional projects. That is old politics; it is wrong. It wasn't a good policy when we were increasing spending on everything. It is a terrible policy if you're going to cut education to put pork back in. If we're going to cut spending to balance the budget, we must be even more careful about how we spend the money we do have. And we have to put education and our children and their future first.

So in just a few moments, I'm going to go over there and veto that bill. But I want to say this: I lived and worked here for 2 years with a crowd that had the "just say no" philosophy, and unfortunately, it wasn't about drugs. Just say no, and then go out and tell the American people nothing is happening, even when it is. And a lot of people in our party think, "Well, that policy benefited them so much at the polls last November, why don't we do it? Why don't we just say no now? That seems to be what's popular." It may be popular in the short run, but it is wrong for America.

I do not want to just say no. I have not said no to this. I agreed to the spending cuts passed by the Senate by Republicans and Democrats. And so what I'm going to do when I veto this, is to say yes. I'm going to send this bill right back. And this bill says, "Take out the pork; put back the education; send it on over. Let's cut spending and protect education and protect safe and drug-free schools."

I want to say one other thing, too. In this so-called spending cut bill, at the last moment there was also, I think, a very bad environmental provision added, which says that no environmental laws will apply for the next 3 years to any cutting of so-called salvaged timber in our forests, and we'll just have the taxpayers pay for whatever damage occurs to the environment. Well, ladies and gentlemen, we're here on education, but the most proenvironment people in America are the children of America. And they know they've got the biggest dog in that hunt, as we say back home, because they're going to be around here longer and their children will be around here longer. Nobody has worked any harder than I have to start logging again in our country's forests in an appropriate way. Suspending all the environmental laws of the country for 3 years is not the appropriate way.

So what I want to do is to say to the Congress, "Look, just put the education back in; take the pork out." I'm for, actually, slightly more spending cuts than they are—that's their wind blowing, not mine. [*Laughter*] The nice thing is—now you'll all look at the chart. [*Laughter*] You can see I'm actually for slightly bigger spending cuts than they are. I just don't think we ought to use this spending bill to do something bad to the environment, and I certainly don't think we ought to use it to cut out half the safe and drug-free schools money to build courthouses and city streets and pet highway projects. That is not good judgment. We need a partnership here. This is the right thing we should be doing.

Let me just say one other thing about this cutting spending. I have now seen two separate news reports in which the majority in Congress, according to some of their members, say that they have decided not to pass the line-item veto after all, after campaigning on it for a dozen years now. This line-item veto is a tool that would permit the President to single out special pork projects, veto them, send them back to Congress, and Congress would be able to override the veto. But they would have to vote on these projects separately instead of burying them in big bills that a President cannot in good conscience veto.

Now, that line-item veto was part of their Contract With America and a part that I embraced. President Reagan was for it. President Bush was for it. The House passed it on President Reagan's birthday. They talked about what an urgent thing it was. Now they say they don't think they ought to give it to

me this year because I might use it. [*Laughter*]

Well, today I am sending a letter to the Speaker of the House and the Senate Majority Leader, asking them once again to send me the line-item veto. They have said they were for it for a dozen years. They have portrayed it as the salvation of all of our problems. It's not the salvation, but it's an important part of it. And they say they're worried that I might line-item veto special tax breaks instead of special spending increases. It's six of one and half dozen of the other. But I'll make them a deal: If they'll send me the line-item veto this year, I will not line-item any tax cuts they sign. If they pass all these big tax cuts and wreck education and Medicare to cut taxes, I'll veto the whole thing. But I've already said that. But I will not—if they'll send it to me this year, I won't use it on any tax legislation. I will only use it on spending.

So I ask them again: Send me the bill. Send me the bill. Send me the line-item veto, and I will see whether America agrees that what we ought to do is to protect education, to protect things designed to enhance our security like safe and drug-free schools, to protect the welfare and the future of our children, and I will show you, once again, that there is nobody who wants to reduce the deficit and to balance the budget more than I do. I just want our incomes to go up and our future to be stronger and our kids to be healthier and better educated when we do it. Send it back here, let me sign it, and let's get to work and prove we're serious.

I want to say again that the primary purpose of this event is to honor all of you who have worked to make the safe and drug-free schools program work. I don't think I have had any more moving experiences than going into schools in this country over the last several years—and I began to do it not only when I was Governor in my own State but in other schools—see people succeeding against all the odds because their schools are safe and drug free. I have been into schools in very high crime areas, where the children come to school every day and there are no weapons in the lockers and there are no drugs in use and children do not fight in the schools. I know this can be done.

I also know that this requires good management, good discipline, but also special skills and sometimes extra resources in the poorer school districts of our country. And I know that we can't afford to be satisfied even with the stories that are here, the wonderful good stories that we honor today. What we want is, next year, to have every school do as well as you have done. That's what you want, too, isn't it? And that's why we have to support programs like this.

As I said, we let the school districts decide how to spend the money, whether it's on metal detectors and increased security or drug education and gang prevention and violence prevention techniques.

Our children do need a constant drum beat to remind them that drugs are wrong, illegal, not safe, will put you in jail, and can cost you your life. I know that. I have had this scourge in my own family, and I know that no amount of help from anybody else will ever replace people taking responsibility for themselves and saying, "I will not be destroyed by my own behavior." But I also know that very few people make that decision once they're in trouble without a little help and support and discipline from people who understand how to deal with this problem. And I think you know that, as well.

I do not believe that our children are inherently violent, although violence is going up dramatically among young people even as the crime rate drops. And I do believe that there are some cultural reasons for it. I think we do get deadened to violence if we're overexposed to it as children, collectively in show after show on television and movie after movie. I believe all that. But that's not an excuse to leave assault weapons on the street or keep police officers out of the school or not do what we can and we must to change that. So it's not either/or, it is both.

I am very pleased with the work that Secretary Riley, that Director Brown, that Attorney General Reno have done. We're working hard now to try to find a way to comply with the Supreme Court's decision, saying that the present law making it illegal for anyone to have a gun within a thousand feet of a school is not constitutional and to try to find a way to make it constitutional so that all of our

States will have this protection and not just some.

I also am proud of the fact that we fought last year for a law requiring States to expel students for a year if they bring guns to school, no excuses, zero tolerance. That's something the Government ought to stand for. If we're not for zero tolerance for guns in the schools, what are we for? There should be zero tolerance for guns and for drugs in our schools.

So let me say in closing, perhaps the most meaningful things said here today were said by Jaime. I want you all to think about her tomorrow when she graduates from high school. Then I want you to think about all the kids in this country that are in the grip of drugs and gangs and guns and violence. I want you to think about all the teachers who wonder every year whether they should continue to teach because they are having to deal with these problems and they don't feel that their schools are either organized to deal with it, supporting them in dealing with it, or bringing in the other people and resources who can deal with it. And I want you to ask yourself, is there a courthouse in America, is there a city street in America, is there a single solitary special highway project in America worth the price, worth the risk that we will not have more children like her? The answer is clearly no, no, no, no.

Now, I would like to ask Jaime Chambron to come up and receive her award; Marilyn Green, a wonderful teacher, to come up and receive her award; and John Torres, a D.A.R.E. officer who represents people who are literally beloved by school children all over America, who changed their lives because of their role models, to come up here and receive his award.

Let me again say to all of you I am profoundly grateful to you. I am asking for an end to the word wars and the artificial divisions here. You are being honored because you are making a difference in people's lives. That's what we got hired to do. And if we could get every American on the solution side of the problems we'd be a lot better off. I hope this veto, plus this substitute, will be a good start in bringing all of us back to the solution side of the problems, beginning with education and safe and drug-free schools.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

[*At this point, the President presented the awards.*]

The President. Thank you for being here. Thank you, students, for being here. We're adjourned. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:49 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Jaime Chambron, Largo High School student, Largo, FL.

Statement on the Commission on Immigration Reform

June 7, 1995

Having met this morning with Chair Barbara Jordan, I want to congratulate the Commission on Immigration Reform for its recommendation on legal immigration. Consistent with my own views, the Commission's recommendations are pro-family, pro-work, pro-naturalization. As with the Commission's first report on illegal immigration, which we are now aggressively implementing, the Commission has again laid out a roadmap for the Congress to consider. It appears to reflect a balanced immigration policy that makes the most of our diversity while protecting the American workforce so that we can better compete in the emerging global economy. The administration looks forward to working with Congress on this issue.

Statement on Senate Passage of Antiterrorism Legislation

June 7, 1995

I am gratified that the Senate has passed a sweeping, bipartisan antiterrorism bill, as I called for in the wake of the bombing in Oklahoma City. This legislation will give law enforcement the tools it needs to do everything possible to prevent this kind of tragedy from happening again. It will also help us prosecute and punish terrorists more effectively. I urge the House to do its part and get a bill on my desk without delay.

Message to the House of Representatives Returning Without Approval Legislation for Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions for Fiscal Year 1995

June 7, 1995

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 1158, a bill providing for emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions for fiscal year 1995.

This disagreement is about priorities, not deficit reduction. In fact, I want to increase the deficit reduction in this bill.

H.R. 1158 slashes needed investments for education, national service, and the environment, in order to avoid cutting wasteful projects and other unnecessary expenditures. There are billions of dollars in pork—unnecessary highway demonstration projects, courthouses, and other Federal buildings—that could have been cut instead of these critical investments. Indeed, the Senate bill made such cuts in order to maintain productive investments, but the House-Senate conference rejected those cuts.

For example, H.R. 1158 would deprive 15,000 young adults of the opportunity to serve their communities as AmeriCorps members.

It would deprive 2,000 schools in 47 States of funds to train teachers and devise comprehensive reforms to boost academic standards.

It would reduce or eliminate antiviolence and drug prevention programs serving nearly 20 million students.

It would prevent the creation and expansion of hundreds of community development banks and financial institutions that would spur job growth and leverage billions of dollars of capital in distressed communities across the country.

And it would seriously hamper the ability of States to maintain clean drinking water, thus jeopardizing the health of residents.

In the end, the Congress chose courthouses over education, pork barrel highway projects over national service, Government travel over clean water.

At my instruction, the Administration has provided alternatives to the Congress that would produce greater deficit reduction than H.R. 1158, cutting even more in fiscal year 1995 spending than is included in H.R 1158. But the spending reductions would come out of unnecessary projects and other spending, not investments in working families.

My position on this legislation has been made clear throughout the legislative process. The Administration strongly and consistently opposed the House version of the bill because it would have unnecessarily cut valuable, proven programs that educate our children, invest in our future, and protect the health and safety of the American people. We worked closely with the bipartisan leadership of the Senate to improve the bill, and I indicated my approval of those improvements. Regrettably, the conference went well beyond the spending reductions contained in the bipartisan compromise despite my Administration's consistent urging to adhere to the Senate bipartisan leadership amendment.

In addition, I continue to object to language that would override existing environmental laws in an effort to increase timber salvage. Increasing timber salvage and improving forest health are goals that my Administration shares with the Congress. Over the last 6 months, my Administration has put in motion administrative reforms that are speeding salvage timber sales in full compliance with existing environmental laws. It is not appropriate to use this legislation to overturn environmental laws. Therefore, I urge the Congress to delete this language and, separately, to work with my Administration on an initiative to increase timber salvage and improve forest health.

My Administration has provided the Congress with changes that would enable me to sign revised legislation. I urge the Congress to approve a bill that contains the supplemental funding included in H.R. 1158—for disaster relief activities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, for the Federal response to the bombing in Oklahoma City, for increased antiterrorism efforts, and for providing debt relief to Jordan in order to contribute to further progress toward a Middle East peace settlement—along with my Administration's alternative restorations and offsets.

I will sign legislation that provides these needed supplemental appropriations and that reduces the deficit by at least as much as this bill. However, the legislation must reflect the priorities of the American people. H.R. 1158, as passed, clearly does not.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 7, 1995.

Letter to Senator Bob Dole on Line-Item Veto Legislation

June 7, 1995

Dear Mr. Leader:

I am deeply alarmed by today's press report that some Republicans in the House and Senate want to continue to hold back the line-item veto so that I don't have it during this year's budget process. The line-item veto is a vital tool to cut pork from the budget. If this Congress is serious about deficit reduction, it must pass the strongest possible line-item veto immediately, and send it to my desk so I can sign it right away.

This is not a partisan issue. Presidents Reagan and Bush asked Congress for it time and again, and so have I. It was part of the Republican Contract with America. It has strong support from members of Congress in both parties and both houses. No matter what party the President belongs to or what party has a majority in Congress, the line-item veto would be good for America.

If Congress will send me the line-item veto immediately, I am willing to pledge that this year, I will use it only to cut spending, not on tax expenditures in this year's budget. I have already put you on notice that I will veto any budget that is loaded with excessive tax breaks for the wealthy. But I need the line-item veto now to hold the line against pork in every bill the Congress sends me.

The American people have waited long enough. Congress should give them and the Presidency the line-item veto without further delay.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: This letter was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary but was not issued as a White House press release.

Executive Order 12962—Recreational Fisheries

June 7, 1995

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in furtherance of the purposes of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742a–d, and e–j), the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661–666c), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), and the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801–1882), and other pertinent statutes, and in order to conserve, restore, and enhance aquatic systems to provide for increased recreational fishing opportunities nationwide, it is ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Federal Agency Duties.* Federal agencies shall, to the extent permitted by law and where practicable, and in cooperation with States and Tribes, improve the quantity, function, sustainable productivity, and distribution of U.S. aquatic resources for increased recreational fishing opportunities by:

(a) developing and encouraging partnerships between governments and the private sector to advance aquatic resource conservation and enhance recreational fishing opportunities;

(b) identifying recreational fishing opportunities that are limited by water quality and habitat degradation and promoting restoration to support viable, healthy, and, where feasible, self-sustaining recreational fisheries;

(c) fostering sound aquatic conservation and restoration endeavors to benefit recreational fisheries;

(d) providing access to and promoting awareness of opportunities for public participation and enjoyment of U.S. recreational fishery resources;

(e) supporting outreach programs designed to stimulate angler participation in the conservation and restoration of aquatic systems;

(f) implementing laws under their purview in a manner that will conserve, restore, and

enhance aquatic systems that support recreational fisheries;

(g) establishing cost-share programs, under existing authorities, that match or exceed Federal funds with nonfederal contributions;

(h) evaluating the effects of Federally funded, permitted, or authorized actions on aquatic systems and recreational fisheries and document those effects relative to the purpose of this order; and

(i) assisting private landowners to conserve and enhance aquatic resources on their lands.

Sec. 2. *National Recreational Fisheries Coordination Council.* A National Recreational Fisheries Coordination Council (''Coordination Council'') is hereby established. The Coordination Council shall consist of seven members, one member designated by each of the following Secretaries—Interior, Commerce, Agriculture, Energy, Transportation, and Defense—and one by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. The Coordination Council shall: (a) ensure that the social and economic values of healthy aquatic systems that support recreational fisheries are considered by Federal agencies in the course of their actions;

(b) reduce duplicative and cost-inefficient programs among Federal agencies involved in conserving or managing recreational fisheries;

(c) share the latest resource information and management technologies to assist in the conservation and management of recreational fisheries;

(d) assess the implementation of the Conservation Plan required under section 3 of this order; and

(e) develop a biennial report of accomplishments of the Conservation Plan.

The representatives designated by the Secretaries of Commerce and the Interior shall cochair the Coordination Council.

Sec. 3. *Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan.* (a) Within 12 months of the date of this order, the Coordination Council, in cooperation with Federal agencies, States, and Tribes, and after consulting with the Federally chartered Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council, shall develop a comprehensive Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan (''Conservation Plan'').

(b) The Conservation Plan will set forth a 5-year agenda for Federal agencies identified by the Coordination Council. In so doing, the Conservation Plan will establish, to the extent permitted by law and where practicable: (1) measurable objectives to conserve and restore aquatic systems that support viable and healthy recreational fishery resources, (2) actions to be taken by the identified Federal agencies, (3) a method of ensuring the accountability of such Federal agencies, and (4) a comprehensive mechanism to evaluate achievements. The Conservation Plan will, to the extent practicable, be integrated with existing plans and programs, reduce duplication, and will include recommended actions for cooperation with States, Tribes, conservation groups, and the recreational fisheries community.

Sec. 4. *Joint Policy for Administering the Endangered Species Act of 1973.* All Federal agencies will aggressively work to identify and minimize conflicts between recreational fisheries and their respective responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (''ESA'') (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*). Within 6 months of the date of this order, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service will promote compatibility and reduce conflicts between the administration of the ESA and recreational fisheries by developing a joint agency policy that will: (1) ensure consistency in the administration of the ESA between and within the two agencies, (2) promote collaboration with other Federal, State, and Tribal fisheries managers, and (3) improve and increase efforts to inform nonfederal entities of the requirements of the ESA.

Sec. 5. *Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council.* To assist in the implementation of this order, the Secretary of the Interior shall expand the role of the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council to: (a) monitor specific Federal activities affecting aquatic systems and the recreational fisheries they support;

(b) review and evaluate the relation of Federal policies and activities to the status and conditions of recreational fishery resources; and

(c) prepare an annual report of its activities, findings, and recommendations for submission to the Coordination Council.

Sec. 6. *Judicial Review.* This order is intended only to improve the internal management of the executive branch and it is not intended to create any right, benefit or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any other person.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 7, 1995.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:50 a.m., June 8, 1995]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 8, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on June 9.

Message on the Rescue of Captain Scott O'Grady

June 8, 1995

All Americans rejoice with me at the successful rescue of Captain Scott O'Grady tonight and join his parents in their relief after days of uncertainty and anguish. Captain O'Grady's bravery and skill are an inspiration. So are the bravery and skill of those who took part in the operation to rescue him. They are all American heroes. Please give them each—and all the men and women who supported them—our heartfelt thanks for a job done so very well. This is a moment that will long be remembered by a nation that is very proud of all her sons and daughters serving under your command.

NOTE: The message was sent to Gen. George Joulwan, Commander-in-Chief, U.S. European Command. An original was not available for verification of the content of this message.

Remarks at a Police Swearing-In Ceremony

June 8, 1995

Thank you, Attorney General Reno, for your outstanding work. Thank you, Mayor Rendell; Senator Biden, Senator Kennedy, Senator Kerry, Congressman Foglietta; ladies and gentlemen from all across our country who are here today.

These 263 new police officers are living proof that our crime bill will help to make your communities safer and help to make America safer. I want to thank the Attorney General for the work she has done to cut through the redtape and the bureaucracy to turn the crime bill into a reality. The Congress passed it, and I did push hard for it. But in no small measure because of the Attorney General and the dedicated people at the Justice Department, we have already awarded almost 17,000 new police officers to over half the police departments in the United States. We are under budget and ahead of schedule.

And most important, I want to thank all of you who are with us today who are dedicating your lives to law enforcement. I know I speak for all Americans when I say thank you.

I want to take a moment, if I might, to speak about another person to whom we all want to say thank you today, an American hero who risked his life and service to our country. I know all of you and all of our fellow citizens join me in rejoicing at the rescue of Captain Scott O'Grady late last night. We share the relief of his family, his friends, and his loved ones that he is now safe and sound. I can tell you that he's now on a United States aircraft carrier, and we're looking forward to having him back home on American soil. His bravery in the face of great danger and uncertainty is an inspiration to all of us. I can tell you, having followed this almost hour by hour for the last 6 days, when he gets back here and tells the whole story, it will be an astonishing story, indeed. He was well-trained and well-prepared, but he also rose to an extraordinary challenge. I also want to say how very proud I am of the skill of all of those who took part in the operation to rescue him and those who supported them.

Yesterday evening, when it became clear that Captain O'Grady had been located in general and that a rescue operation was possible and we began to get regular reports and then it became obvious that he could be res-

cued but that the group could not get in and out before daylight in Bosnia, there was no doubt in the minds of either the commanders or our people in uniform that even though that entailed some increased risk, they had to go and get him out, that he had survived for 6 days, and 6 days was long enough. And they did their job.

And last night, when I talked to Captain O'Grady's parents, after 1 o'clock in the morning, they and all of his siblings were full of joy and pride and gratitude. Let me tell you that they proved once again—all these people—that our country has the finest Armed Forces in the world. And we are very, very proud of them and ecstatically happy today.

I want to say to all of you here in uniform, you, too, are our country's heroes. Each and every one of you will make our streets a little safer, at more risk to yourselves. There is nothing more effective in the fight against crime than more police officers on the beat. This is not a partisan issue. This is an issue on which all Americans can be on the solution side.

We know that we owe it to our children to give them back the freedom to walk to school in safety. I have said this before, and I want to say it one more time: I intend to keep my promise to the American people to put 100,000 more of you on the streets. And I will fight and veto, if necessary, any attempt to stop us until there are 100,000 of you out there protecting the American people.

We need more police on the street. We need to get our children and our assault weapons off the streets. Our neighborhoods are not a place for military assault weapons, violent criminals, or gangs. In recent months, we have seen all too clearly that keeping our country safe and secure requires new efforts by both our Government and our people.

The crime bill provides law enforcement the tools they ask for. After the tragedy in Oklahoma City and what we endured in the World Trade Center, law enforcement needs additional tools to crack down on terrorists wherever they may come from, from within or beyond our borders.

I am very pleased that last night the Senate passed my antiterrorism legislation. I thank Senator Dole and the Republicans who voted for it. I thank Senator Daschle and the Democrats who voted for it. I thank them for working together. That's what America expects us to do, after all.

Now I want to urge the House of Representatives to act as quickly as possible. Some there have said maybe they ought to slow this up. Well, I assure you that the people who work in terrorism operate on their own timetable, and they will not pause for an extended debate in the United States Congress. So let this bill be reviewed. Let it be examined. That is the job of the legislative body. But let us act quickly. The safety and security of our people is not now and must never become a partisan issue.

Now, let me say one other thing. The budget passed in the House of Representatives, as distinct from the one passed in the Senate, reduces the crime bill by about $5 billion. We do need to cut spending further. We can move toward a balanced budget. But I don't think that is a good idea.

The crime bill was carefully balanced. It was worked on for 6 years. Senator Biden gave a major portion of his entire life's energy to it. And it was calibrated to fight crime in several ways: It had more police, more punishment, more prisons, and more prevention; and it had all those elements because the law enforcement community told us that we need to have those elements. I believe as strongly as I can say that we can continue to reduce the deficit. We can balance the budget without undermining the crime bill. And that is exactly what we ought to do.

In the next few months, as we get into this budget debate, and we argue about what to cut and where to spend, how soon we need to balance the budget, and what other objectives we need to pursue, I want to tell you that underneath all this, there will be a huge debate that you will see played out in a lot of ways. And it's a debate that I strongly believe is a false one. Those who argue that we can cut anything except national defense, anything else at all to balance the budget as quickly as possible, basically believe that most of the problems of this country are cultural in nature, that if people would simply behave themselves and take responsibility for their own lives and tend to their families and show up for work everyday, we wouldn't have

the problems we've got, and therefore it is not necessary to make these investments.

Others will argue that the first responsibility of Government is law and order, that another responsibility of our Government in this time, with this global economy just beating the living daylights out of working Americans so that they never get a pay raise, even though they work harder, there is a responsibility to help people make more of their own lives, to get the education and training they need to compete and win in a global economy.

There are others who will argue that there are people who through no fault of their own, because they're very young children or elderly or disabled, cannot take care of themselves and deserve some support from our Government. And so you'll see this big argument, the cultural side and the economic and political side. I personally believe it's a phony argument.

Now, I know from my own family's experience. I had a brother who was addicted to drugs and who did time because of that. I know that there is no program in the world that can make people do the right thing if they're not prepared to take responsibility for themselves. I am well aware of that. I know that.

But I also know that unless we take responsibility collectively for doing what we can, we will have people killed on the streets that don't need to be killed. We will have young people who lose their futures who don't need to lose them. We will have people whose incomes never get better because we don't invest in them and give them a chance to succeed. We will hurt the elderly and the defenseless because we don't recognize our common responsibilities. We have cultural problems and economic and political challenges in this country, and we should not permit Washington to be divided over what is essentially a phony choice. Keep in mind, often when we talk about cultural problems up here, we're looking for an excuse not to do our part and assume our responsibility.

So let's say there are both kinds of challenges in America. Let's get everybody on the solution side of dealing with them. And don't you let for a minute anybody try to push you into one camp or another. Life is all about personal responsibility and our actions together as families, communities and as a nation.

Captain O'Grady triumphed because he was personally responsible, personally able, personally courageous. He also got the finest military training in the world from the United States of America. You will do well as police officers if you are personally dedicated, not to abusing your authority but to using it to the maximum extent to protect people and to stop crimes from occurring and to punishing people when they do commit crimes. But it matters if you're well-trained. It matters if you're well-supported. It matters if you're properly funded.

Do not let America be divided over this debate. We have our responsibilities here in Washington. You have your responsibilities on the streets and in your own homes. If we all do our job, we can move America forward. If we get caught up in a bogus debate about whether our problems are cultural or economic and political, we will never get to the end of the road. They are both, and we must act that way.

Let me just say one thing in closing. The crime rate is going down all over America. In most major cities the crime rate has dropped substantially in the last couple of years. A lot of that is because of able and visionary mayors like the mayors that we honor here today, because of the reforms that have been undertaken in cities like those that I saw when Mayor Rendell and I walked in his neighborhood streets in 1992, and as I have done since then in the city of Philadelphia.

But let's don't forget one thing: The crime rate, especially random violence among very young people, is still going up, which means that the long-run battle to recover our children and to turn them away from mindless violence and to protect those who are not violent from that is still hanging in the balance.

So I honor you today for your contribution. I tell you that, for the next 10 years, you may be involved in the most important national security battle in the United States. And I ask you when you go home to ask every single citizen in your communities to help you win

this fight. It is truly the fight for America's future.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:07 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Edward Rendell of Philadelphia, PA.

Statement on House Action on Foreign Affairs Legislation

June 8, 1995

This bill (H.R. 1561) would take us in an isolationist direction at a time when America is ready to lead in the world. I am gratified that argument was persuasive to enough Members of the House to sustain a possible veto.

We are particularly concerned about the vote to lift unilaterally the arms embargo in Bosnia. As we have said, we believe this is counterproductive to our efforts to bring about a negotiated settlement.

Memorandum on the International Fund for Ireland

June 8, 1995

Presidential Determination No. 95–26

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Certification to Permit U.S. Contributions to the International Fund for Ireland for Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995

Pursuant to section 5(c) of the Anglo-Irish Agreement Support Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–415), I hereby certify that I am satisfied that: (1) the Board of the International Fund for Ireland as established pursuant to the Anglo-Irish Agreement of November 15, 1985, is, as a whole, broadly representative of the interests of the communities in Ireland and Northern Ireland; and (2) disbursements from the International Fund (a) will be distributed in accordance with the principle of equality of opportunity and nondiscrimination in employment, without regard to religious affiliation, and (b) will address the needs of both communities in Northern Ireland.

You are authorized and directed to transmit this determination and certification to the Congress, together with the Memorandum of Explanation, and to publish it in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

Remarks to the Friends of Art and Preservation in Embassies

June 8, 1995

One of these days we're going to have an event where I have to be introduced by the First Lady when we've had one of those other days. [*Laughter*] Lord only knows what will happen—[*laughter*]—but it will be another adventure.

I am delighted to see all of you here. I'm glad to be here with our friend Lee Annenberg and with Ann Gund and with all of you who support this important work.

Let me say that this has been an interesting day at the White House. We swore in 263 police officers earlier today. We've had all kinds of people in here from all over America. But mostly we have been celebrating the liberation of that fine young Air Force Captain from Bosnia.

Sometimes I read even in the American press from time to time that we don't seem to be doing anything in Bosnia, and we don't seem to have exerted ourselves. You should know that we have over 1,000 American troops on the border of Bosnia in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to make sure that conflict doesn't spread. We have 200 Americans in the hospital unit in Croatia. And we have flown the longest humanitarian airlift and the largest one in history, larger than the Berlin airlift, to guarantee food and medicine to people in the besieged areas of Bosnia. And perhaps most importantly of all, people like that fine young Captain have been flying for a couple of years now to keep the war out of the air. And for all of our frustrations and feelings of anxiety and anger, in 1992 there were about 130,000 civilians killed, a staggering number, in that troubled land. Last year there were under 3,000.

So I ask you to remember as we celebrate this liberation that a lot of people stick their neck out everyday and the results have been

important. If you look at Northern Ireland or South Africa or the Middle East, the lesson of this time is that it's very difficult to enforce peace on people that want to keep fighting with one another, but what you try to do is to keep it within some bounds of humanity, keep working on diplomacy until they spend their destructive energies and start trying to build again.

And once in a while the risk becomes apparent, as it was in the case of this brave pilot. And for 6 days he held out against a lot of attempts to find him and to shoot him and capture him. And he represented the best in our country. He told me today when we visited on the phone—I talked to his parents last night at 1:30 a.m., and they asked me if I was going to call him. I said, ''No, you call him. I'm going to bed. I just wanted—[*laughter*]—I wanted you to know he was home safe.''

But he told me today that he was on the ground between three and five minutes before armed people made it to his parachute. He had three to five minutes to find a place to hide and begin this incredible odyssey that I'm sure some day will be a very great movie that all of us will think is suitable for everyone to see. [*Laughter*]

Let me say on behalf of all of our administration, and especially the people who work in America's diplomatic efforts, we are profoundly grateful for what you do. By putting American art in our embassies around the world, you are part of our public diplomacy, you expose an important part of the essence of America to people all around the world. And it couldn't happen without you.

I also want to thank you because you have put, I think now, over 2,200 works of American art in more than 170 countries, raised over $7 million to fund projects at Embassy residencies in Beijing and Cairo and Rome and London, Singapore, Tokyo, and Warsaw. And I've been to a lot of those places, so I am one of the chief beneficiaries of your efforts. And I thank you for that.

You couldn't do it alone. The State Department couldn't do it alone. This represents one of those remarkable partnerships between the public and the private sector in America that almost nobody knows about, but everyone takes for granted when they benefit from it.

We're having such a raging debate in this country today about whether public is bad and private is good, whether all of our efforts should be directed at correcting personal conduct or at changing economic or political direction. I think these debates make for very interesting print and maybe news coverage at night, but they don't conform to the real-world experience of most people.

Most of us, I think, all of our lives, have felt that when people get together in some sort of constructive partnership, that's what works best. And I think one of the most frustrating things to me about going to work every day, in this otherwise exhilarating environment, is knowing that what comes across to the American people are these polarized choices and conflicts and rhetorical battles which don't reflect the way any sensible person would run his or her family or business or charitable organization or hospital or church or you name it.

You have done what I think is best about America. You have taken the world as you find it, worked together in a real spirit of partnership, recognized that there is a personal responsibility and opportunity and also a public responsibility in this area. I wish we had more of it, and I'm glad we've got you.

Thank you very much.

I have a lot to be grateful to Lee Annenberg and her fine husband, Walter, for, but not so long ago we were here to announce that the Annenbergs had decided to donate a staggering sum for the purpose of trying to improve public education in this country. I think there is no more noble cause. And because of what they have done, all across America people are doing things differently, striving for global standards of excellence in grassroots community schools. And for that and for this and for so much else, the country owes a great debt of gratitude to Lee Annenberg, and I am very pleased to introduce her now.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:17 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Leonore Annenberg, chairperson, and Ann Gund, vice chairperson, Friends of Art and Preservation in Embassies.

Remarks on the National Performance Review

June 9, 1995

We brought Paul Condit up here as a part of the Vice President and my continuing cultural education of Secretary Rubin. We found out that even though he's very brilliant, there are serious gaps in his knowledge. [*Laughter*] When I met him, he didn't know who Aretha Franklin, B.B. King, or Rod Stewart was. And he had never met a redneck in his life. [*Laughter*] We are correcting that—part of our reinventing Government. [*Laughter*]

Do you know what Paul Condit was saying to me when the Vice President was talking? He said, "Mr. President, this stuff is great. But you need to reinvent communications; it ain't getting out." He said, "Nobody knows anything about this." I said, "Well, you'd have to be here a while for me to explain it to you." [*Laughter*]

The greatest compliment I have received since I have been President was when we were in Montana the other day and—I didn't get it directly—you may have seen the—I went out to a farm to talk about agriculture because we have to rewrite the farm bill as we're trying to reduce spending. And I insisted that we go to a Republican farmer's farm and that we have equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats in the crowd. One of my staff members was standing next to one of these farmers, and we were talking about all this, you know, all this agriculture. And he asked the farmer—he said, "Well, what do you think about this?" And the farmer looked at him and said, "He ain't nothing like they make him out to be, is he?" [*Laughter*]

You learn to speak maybe in a way that people can understand if you spend more time on a John Deere tractor. And Paul Condit has, and we thank him for being here. I also thank the Vice President for the incredible job he has done on all these projects. And I thank Secretary Rubin and Commissioner Chater, Commissioner Richardson, Deputy Secretary Glynn, and all the people who have worked on this.

We do have an obligation to communicate what we're doing, but we also have an obligation to do the right things and to stop doing the wrong things. And our SBA Director, Phil Lader, is going to—we're going to have this White House Conference on Small Business next week. I'm very excited about it. I hope it is an opportunity to talk to the American people and to talk to the small business community about what we're trying to do. But I hope it's also a chance for us to continue to do more of the right things and to keep changing.

The truth is that—as the Vice President said, I could have listened to that story all day, analogizing what if the Federal Government was running a John Deere dealership. I wish I had thought of that myself. [*Laughter*] The truth is that one of our big problems is that almost everybody who works for the Federal Government is honest, hard-working, well-meaning, and really wants to serve. But we are trapped inside a system that there are some things we can't change, and one is we basically have guaranteed revenues and guaranteed customers, and that means that we change less quickly than the private sector that has neither. But if we don't change, then the voters eventually will try to find a way to get through the elected officials to the permanent Government. And in a way, people's perceptions are not all that specific even if they're generally accurate. We might wind up going from one extreme to the other.

So what we tried to do when we got here was to prove that it was actually possible for the institutional Government to change, something that most people simply didn't believe. Most people believed that politicians would come and go, but the Government would go on forever. And interestingly enough, in the last several years I have noticed politicians beginning to adopt the same rhetoric in an attempt to be popular with the people, so that people would be in control here for 7 or 8 years and still be cussing the Government as if, "What do you expect me to do, I'm just the President," or "I'm just the Secretary of the Treasury" or, you know," "What do you expect me to do?"

In the course of that I think that we have been less sensitive than we should have been, as I have said repeatedly—and I'm a guilty party—to treating Federal employees like people. And we must never contribute to this

atmosphere of resentment of the people who work for the Federal Government, because most people who work for the Federal Government are like most people anywhere. Given the choice between productive or unproductive, most people would choose to be productive. Given the choice between being relevant or irrelevant, most people would gladly choose to be relevant. Given the choice between building and tearing down, most people would choose to build.

And what we have tried to do with this national performance review, which the Vice President has doggedly pursued—what we have tried to do, even though we couldn't get it out and we knew there was probably never any way to make it a popular, big headline-grabbing issue, is day by day, week by week, department by department, agency by agency, employee by employee, to chip away at the habits and institutional conduct of the Federal Government that is not good for America and not going to take us into the 21st century in good shape and to flip it around so that our public institutions could do the public's business in a way that maintained the trust of the people who are paying the bill.

And all of you who have been a part of that deserve a lot of credit for what you've done. And I just want to urge you to keep doing it. We'll keep trying to figure out how to get it out, to use Paul's expression. But the main thing we need to do is to keep doing what has been done.

Some of this involves changing laws. You know, I recently signed the Paperwork Reduction Act. Last Congress, we passed the procurement reform which the Vice President was able to popularize on the David Letterman show by trying—by breaking the ashtray. But that broken ashtray was a way of getting out the idea that we were wasting, at a minimum, hundreds of millions of dollars a year with antiquated procurement practices.

The Paperwork Reduction Act, when Paul waves that around, it's a way of illustrating the burden that is on us to make sure that we are not asking people to spend their time, their money, and their resources on fooling with us if they don't have to and if there is no public purpose served by it.

Now, that is one of the things, it seems to me that if you talk to anybody about what they really resent about our Government, if they have any kind of success in life, they'll normally talk about regulation and paperwork, even before taxes. And we are trying to do something about that. Small businesses and big businesses, too, have been screaming at us for years to do something about it, and we are trying to do it.

Now, the Department of Treasury has taken the lead by spearheading the Simplified Tax and Wage Reporting System. Because of that, today we are announcing a plan that should lead to the elimination of the need to file W–2 forms in multiple places. You will only need to file once, and you will have a single point of contact for customer service. This will save time and hassle and about a billion dollars a year, which is real money, even up here, Paul—a billion dollars a year. When we free people from the burden of paperwork so that they can create jobs, opportunity, services, and products for the American people, we have saved much more than that.

In addition, I am going to send legislation to Congress that will remove the legal barriers that keep Federal and State agencies from working together in commonsense ways to ease the paperwork burden on all taxpayers.

Most taxpayers currently have to fill out both a State and Federal income tax form. Depending on where you live and work, you might also have to do a local income tax form. Most of the information on the State and city forms is simply a repeat of what's on the Federal form. So with some teamwork and some modernization of the tax system, the Federal Government is now going to create partnerships with State and city governments to eliminate the need for duplicate filing.

Since we came into office, we have permitted 29 States to have systems in which taxpayers can satisfy both their Federal and State personal income tax filing requirements with a single electronic transmission. More than a million and a half returns were filed this way this year. Next year, 32 States are going to participate. You can imagine what will happen to the paperwork burden as more and more people file electronically, one

time, both State and Federal. The IRS handles 2 billion pieces of paperwork a year.

So we are going to reduce regulation. We are going to speed transmission. We're going to make it easier for the taxpayers. And as an extra added bonus to the Vice President, we're going to save 14 to 15 more forests by the turn of the century by reducing this level of paperwork. This is a big deal. Now, what we have to do is make sure people know they can do it and more and more people do it.

We're going to clear away the barriers to full partnerships with State and local governments for employment as well as for personal tax information. We estimate that with a partnership with 20 percent of the States by the year 2000, we can reduce the burden to taxpayers just on this item alone by $1.5 billion and save the Government millions and millions of dollars in the process.

I invite Governors and mayors all across this country to join us in having businesses and taxpayers file their information just one time. This is the right way to fix the Government. There is no need for two or more filings. We are prepared to do our part in a technical way and in a legal way to make it possible for taxpayers all across America to have fewer piles like this.

This is the kind of service the American people are entitled to expect from a modernized tax system, and frankly, this is the kind of thing we're going to have to do to get the inordinate compliance costs with taxation systems in America down. This is what reinventing Government is all about.

I want to again say to all of you who worked on this project, I appreciate it very much. We now have to sign a memorandum of understanding which requires all these various agencies to work together. And we're going to sign that, and then I'm going to ask Paul Condit to sign it as a witness to make sure that he'll have something to get out when he goes home to Seminole, Texas. [*Laughter*]

So Secretary Rubin, Deputy Labor Secretary Glynn, Commissioner Chater, Commissioner Richardson, please come up here and sign the memorandum of understanding.

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:25 p.m. in the Cash Room at the Treasury Department. In his remarks, he referred to Paul Condit, president and general manager, Texas Equipment Co., Inc.; and entertainers Aretha Franklin, B.B. King, and Rod Stewart.

Remarks at the Faces of Hope Reunion Luncheon

June 9, 1995

Thank you very much. Congratulations, Leslie, that's a—[*laughter*]—Mr. Vice President, that may be your most memorable example of reinventing Government there. [*Laughter*] I promised you a personal service administration, and there's a living example of it.

Let me say, it is wonderful to be here with all of you today. I want to thank the people who have worked so hard to keep this group together and in contact with us. I appreciate Sue Hazzard and Ann Walker and all the rest of you who worked on this. Let me thank you, because these are really very disparate people, living very different lives all over the country, and getting even further and further apart. One of you has since moved to Alaska since we've started—came back. I thank you for being here.

Before we start, I'd like to just say that four of the people who were our Faces of Hope in 1992 have since passed away. Josh Cox, who was mentioned earlier; Sheri Kohlenberg, who came to see me with her husband and her son, Sammy—they're here. And Sammy left me something I thought was a dinosaur. He said it just looks like one, but anyway it's still in the White House over there. Sarah Weber, whose mother and sister are here; and Michael Quercio, whose partner is here. And Michael and I jogged together right before I became President, and I got to see him when I dedicated the new Kennedy Library. I miss them all very much; I know all of you do. And I'd like to ask if we could just have a moment of silence for them.

[*At this point, a moment of silence was observed.*]

Amen.

You know, all of you, in various ways, inspired us in this—when we ran for President, but you have very different stories: Some of you struggle to overcome great personal adversity; some of you still struggle with it; some of you struggle with your children; some of you were people who led what looked on the outside to be ordinary lives, but performed extraordinary service for others; some of you achieved very great things in your own lives, but took time to do things for others. There are a lot of different kinds of stories here. But the one thing that struck me about all of you was that you fundamentally decided that you would take an affirmative view of your life and life in general, that you decided that you would try to look for what could be done tomorrow to make it better, instead of just wallowing in what didn't happen yesterday or things that were beyond your control. You decided that you would make a constructive contribution to your own life and to the lives of others. You lived with hope. And that is a very important thing. You had a lot of influence on this administration, as the Vice President said. I think of all of you every time when I go someplace out of the country and our national service AmeriCorps people are there because that's what they do.

I was in Texas the other day with people who are in the AmeriCorps program, all doing national service, earning money to go to college. One of them was a woman who retired from the military, said she never had a chance to go to college. She had the GI bill, but she wanted to do this service in her community before she went back to college—with two young people who had babies out of wedlock, as teenagers were on welfare, got themselves off welfare, got high school diplomas and were then contributing to AmeriCorps before going to college so they could help other people avoid the kind of problems they've had. And with one young girl who was a college graduate who was raised the child of a mother on welfare who decided after getting out of college she still ought to do the national service program because she ought to help other people.

Now, everything—and I kept asking myself today, you know, what has all this got—how does it tie together? And I think, for me, all of you represent people who try to make something good happen. You didn't just talk; you acted. You tried to get on the solution side of—what I call being on the solution side of whatever your problems or challenges were, whether it was in your own family or in your community.

And one of the biggest problems we have in Washington and one of the reasons politics is such a turn-off to people today is that it comes across to the American people over the air waves as being nothing but rhetoric and conflict and not being on the solution side. No one would run a family, a business, a charitable enterprise the way it appears that things here are run often. It would just run right off the tracks. You know that. You remind me here every day of what we should be doing.

And you had another influence that hasn't been mentioned yet that you ought to know. When I became President, I put a lot of time and effort into making sure we had good people who were well organized in our casework division, when we get letters from people just like you all over America just asking for help with a problem or advice. About once a week, I get letters that I personally sign from ordinary American citizens who wrote the White House and asked for some problem. Everything—they have a sick child, they don't qualify for Government help, to, my father was supposed to get a medal in World War II, and he never got it, and all kinds of things in between. And I organized this because I made up my kind that I did not want to forget about people like you and the work that we do here.

Because of a lot of folks like you, we have managed so far, even in these difficult budgetary times when we have reduced the size of the Government by 100,000, and we have shrunk the deficit, and we're going to have more cuts, we have increased our investment in education, medical research, and particularly, we have emphasized research and treatment for AIDS. And I'm not sure we would have been able to fight off all of those budget cuts if I hadn't actually met a lot of you and gotten to know you. Because of some of you here, when we passed the crime bill, we were able to say, "Okay, you put more police on the street and have more punishment, but

put some money into giving these kinds something to say yes to.''

There were two former gang members here from L.A. who spend their lives trying to keep peace on the streets of Los Angeles. Better we should support them; also cheaper for you.

These are the kinds of things that we have tried to do. Because of you, we fought for the family leave law, and we've tried to fight for programs that would not only protect the environment but would also help to provide for economic transition where people are dislocated. When we had to cut back on defense, we provided for economic transition so we wouldn't forget about the people who lost their jobs because we won the cold war and we had to cut back on defense—because of you and people like you. And that's very, very important.

We're having two big debates here in Washington today, and you put the lie to both of them. And so I want to talk about it. You'll hear it when we talk about what we're going to do to the budget. Debate, you know, number one is, whether all of our problems are primarily personal and cultural, that is, if we'd all just behave and do the right thing, there wouldn't be any problems, which is, at one level, plainly true, right; or, whether our problems are political and economic, that is, we have an obligation to help each other make the most of our own lives and overcome our problems.

You put the lie to that debate. That is a bogus debate. Nothing I can do here in Washington will really solve your problems if you're not doing your part. On the other hand, if we don't do our part here, a lot of you still won't be able to do what you can do to make the most of your lives and the people you're trying to help. So I hope that when people look at you and think about people like you, they will say, the answer to that is both. I'll do my part, but you guys do yours.

The second big debate is whether, even though we have to do things together, the Government is so clumsy, inefficient, and inept, we ought to throw it away and just tell everybody to behave right in their private charities, ''Do good. Go forth and do good.''

My answer to that is, that is also a bogus debate. It's interesting to me that all of the people who work in charitable work say they'd like the Government to be a partner, that we need more charitable contributions, we want people to give more, but we need to have a partnership.

We have other debates like that. Is it more important to balance the budget or to invest money in the education of our people so they raise their incomes and generate more tax revenues because we've got more people in higher efforts? My answer is, we have to find a way to do both. And what you do in your private lives is you balance—a lot of your balance all these conflicts all the time, these kinds of conflicts, and you go on and live your life. That's what we have to do here. And that's what you inspire me to do.

You know, I was so moved, for example, after the horrible tragedy in Oklahoma City by how much work the private charities were also doing there, and how they did things that we could not have done, but we did things that they needed us to do.

A lot of you, I have seen you in your literacy centers or your work to help kids, older kids. And you get funds from the private sector, but you also need us to do our part.

And you know, when we showed up here, we really tried to shrink the size of Government, to reduce bureaucracy, to bring the deficit down, and we've done that. But we also tried to invest more in helping people make the most of their own lives. And it seems to me, that is the fundamental responsibility of we have, and that is what we're trying to do here.

There are 90 million Americans who volunteer. And some of you are some of them, and God bless them. We need more of it. But the main thing we need to do is to make practical decisions here that work right, not have a lot of theoretical debates that drive a stake through the heart of America's citizenry.

And you know, a lot of things are going on here I don't really understand. But I'm doing my best to remember you. And every time I come up to one of these decisions to say, what is best for the American people? What is best for the American people?

And it's sometimes very hard and very frustrating because we just came from an event where the Vice President had a John

Deere dealer from West Texas talking about what we were going to do to reduce reporting requirements on the income tax system and how we'd reinvented Government. And the John Deere dealer whispered to me, he said, "You know, Mr. President, this all sounds real good, but you need to reinvent what you're saying to the people because it ain't getting out out there." It was funny.

The reason is, the way we talk up here doesn't really often square with the way you live out there. But let me just give you an example on what's going on. We have people here in Washington in important positions who say that we should drastically cut the amount of money we're investing in poor folks because we're just corrupting them and making them dependent. I haven't noticed anybody who really likes poverty very much, but that's what they're saying.

My belief is we have had some programs that made people dependent, and I want to change them. I want to change the welfare system and support people who are putting people to work. I don't think anybody wants to be on welfare, and if they do, they shouldn't. So I have no problem with tough requirements to get people into training programs, require them to work. I think that's good. But to say you can do it for free, I think, is wrong.

Then we have people, some of the same people who say we should cut back on the Government's investment in these kind of public endeavor, they say, "Well, the charities should do more. We should just give more money to charitable contributions." But now I wonder whether they really mean that.

I just want you to understand the difference between where you live and what's going on here. For example, last week I heard about this letter—listen to this—a letter that was sent to the chief executive officers of 82 of the biggest companies in this country. And it warned these chief executive officers that they were in serious danger of giving money—the letter implied that they were sure these poor men were ignorant, maybe there were some women on the list, I haven't seen the whole list—maybe they were ignorant, but they were in serious danger of giving money to private organizations that were promoting the welfare state, undermining the free enterprise system, eroding the fabric of our country. I quote, the letter said, "You are giving charitable contributions which support the expansion of the welfare state."

Now these are people that want to give the Government less, right? So I was surprised to find out this letter was not for some fringe group. Now, this was a letter signed by the majority leader of the House of Representatives on very official looking stationery. So I couldn't wait to get my hands on a list of these subversive groups that were getting money from big American companies. Here are some of the groups that were on the list: The American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association—what do they have in common—the League of Women Voters, a dangerous outfit—[*laughter*]—the B'nai B'rith, the NAACP, the Nature Conservancy—they help States buy lands so people will be able to enjoy it forever, with enormous business support.

Now, I asked myself when I read about this, and I saw this letter, how can we have the Government give less money and then have a major leader of the Congress tell people that they ought to give less—big corporations ought to give less to groups dedicated to reducing disease, fighting racism, protecting the environment, and promoting jobs and encouraging Americans to vote? Why? Because there's probably some segment of the political base there that really likes that stuff and pumps a bunch of money into it, and because maybe these people are advocating things that some of the big organized power groups here don't like.

But don't you see what I'm trying to say is, this doesn't have anything to do with the way you live. And we have got to get Washington, DC, back on the solution side of America's challenges to help people make the most of their own lives, to help people who, through no fault of their own, cannot care for themselves, to really support work and family and community instead of talking about it and then just keep trying to drive stake after stake after stake through the American people to divide us and dissolution

us and convince each other that we're enemies.

At the end of the Civil War, just shortly before he was assassinated, Abraham Lincoln gave a speech in which he said—and we had had a pretty good fight then; we really were divided—he said, "We cannot be enemies. We must be friends." Now, that's the way you live, and you are entitled to a political system that reflects the hope that you gave to the four of us. That's what we're trying to give you.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:15 p.m. on the State Floor at the White House.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Belgium-United States Extradition Treaty

June 9, 1995

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Extradition Treaty Between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Belgium signed at Brussels on April 27, 1987. Also transmitted for the information of the Senate is the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

This Treaty is designed to update and standardize the conditions and procedures for extradition between the United States and Belgium. Most significantly, it substitutes a dual-criminality clause for the current list of extraditable offenses, thereby expanding the number of crimes for which extradition can be granted. The Treaty also provides a legal basis for temporarily surrendering prisoners to stand trial for crimes against the laws of the Requesting State.

The provisions in this Treaty follow generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by the United States. Upon entry into force, it will supersede the Treaty for the Mutual Extradition of Fugitives from Justice Between the United States and the Kingdom of Belgium, signed at Washington on October 26, 1901, and the Supplementary Extradition Conventions to the Extradition Convention of October 26, 1901, signed at Washington on June 20, 1935, and at Brussels on November 14, 1963.

This Treaty will make a significant contribution to international cooperation in law enforcement. I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and give its advice and consent to ratification.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 9, 1995.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Belgium-United States Supplementary Extradition Treaty

June 9, 1995

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Supplementary Treaty on Extradition Between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Belgium to Promote the Repression of Terrorism, signed at Brussels on April 27, 1987 (the "Supplementary Treaty"). Also transmitted for the information of the Senate is the report of the Department of State with respect to the Supplementary Treaty.

This Supplementary Treaty is designed to facilitate the extradition of terrorists, and is similar to the protocols to extradition treaties currently in force with other countries, including Australia, Canada, Spain, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the United Kingdom. Upon entry into force, the Supplementary Treaty will amend the Treaty for the Mutual Extradition of Fugitives from Justice, signed at Washington on October 26, 1901, as amended by the Supplementary Conventions, signed at Washington on June 20, 1935, and at Brussels on November 14, 1963, if that Treaty is still in force, or the Extradition Treaty Between the United States and Belgium signed at Brussels on April 27, 1987.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Supple-

mentary Treaty and give its advice and consent to ratification.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 9, 1995.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Switzerland-United States Extradition Treaty

June 9, 1995

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Extradition Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Swiss Confederation, signed at Washington on November 14, 1990. Also transmitted for the information of the Senate is the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

The Treaty is designed to update and standardize the conditions and procedures for extradition between the United States and Switzerland. Most significantly, it substitutes a dual-criminality clause for a current list of extraditable offenses, so that the new Treaty will cover numerous offenses not now covered by our extradition treaty with Switzerland, including certain narcotics offenses, important forms of white collar crime, and parental child abduction. The Treaty also provides a legal basis for temporarily surrendering prisoners to stand trial for crimes against the laws of the Requesting State.

The Treaty further represents an important step in combatting terrorism by excluding from the scope of the political offense exception offenses typically committed by terrorists for which both the United States and Switzerland have an obligation under a multilateral international agreement to extradite or submit to their authorities for the purpose of prosecution. These offenses include aircraft hijacking, aircraft sabotage, crimes against internationally protected persons (including diplomats), and hostage-taking.

The provisions in this Treaty follow generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by the United States. Upon entry into force, it will supersede the Extradition Treaty of May 14, 1900, and the Supplementary Extradition Treaties of January 10, 1935, and January 31, 1940, Between the United States of America and the Swiss Confederation.

This Treaty will make a significant contribution to international cooperation in law enforcement. I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and give its advice and consent to ratification.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 9, 1995.

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.

June 5

The President announced his intention to nominate C. Richard Allen as a Managing Director of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

The President announced his intention to appoint Joyce A. Savocchio to the Board of Trustees of the Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation.

June 6

In the morning, the President met with Prime Minister Gyula Horn of Hungary.

In the afternoon, the President traveled to Baltimore, MD. He returned to Washington, DC, later in the afternoon.

The President named Stephen D. Harlan and Edward A. Singletary to the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority.

The President announced his intention to nominate Beth Susan Slavet to be Vice Chair and member of the Merit Systems Protection Board.

The White House announced that the President has appointed Jeremy Ben-Ami as

Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy.

June 7

The President named Betsy Myers as Deputy Assistant to the President and Director of Women's Initiatives.

The President named Frank Herrera and Mary Jo Waits as members of the Community Adjustment and Investment Program Advisory Committee for the North American Development Bank.

The President announced his intention to nominate John J. Callahan to be Assistant Secretary for Management and Budget at the Department of Health and Human Services.

June 8

In the afternoon, the President had a telephone conversation with Capt. Scott F. O'Grady, USAF, who was rescued after being shot down and stranded in western Bosnia.

The President selected the following individuals to serve as delegates to the White House Conference on Small Business: Pedro Alfonso; James Burke; Paula Calimafde; Sharon Casey; Judith A. Clark; John H. French; Gail S. Messerman; Mary Ann Mitchell; James W. Mozley; Santiago J. Negre; Edward M. Nigro; R. Donahue Peebles; William Petrocelli; Joan Y. Phillips; Carlos Portes; John C. Rennie; and Amy Zisook.

June 9

The President announced his intention to appoint Dr. Richard Garwin and Dr. Edwin Smith as members of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's Scientific and Policy Advisory Committee.

The President selected an additional seven individuals who will serve as delegates to the White House Conference on Small Business: Brenda Garrand, Wayne Granquist, James T. Hamilton, Richard C. Herring, Donna Jean Rainville, George Shanklin, and William Worley.

The President announced his intention to appoint the following individuals to the President's Committee on Mental Retardation: Joyce Keller, K. Charlie Lakin, and Jacquelyn B. Victorian.

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 June 5

Tracey D. Conwell,
of Texas, to be a member of the National Museum Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 1996, vice Fay S. Howell, term expired.

Albert James Dwoskin,
of Virginia, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for a term expiring December 31, 1998 (reappointment).

David L. Hobbs,
of California, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Cooperative Republic of Guyana.

William J. Hughes,
of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Panama.

Submitted June 6

C. Richard Allen,
of Maryland, to be a Managing Director of the Corporation for National and Community Service (new position).

Chris Evert,
of Florida, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term of 3 years (new position).

Christine Hernandez,
of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term of 2 years (new position).

Submitted June 7

John Joseph Callahan,
of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, vice Kenneth S. Apfel, resigned.

Stephen G. Kellison,
of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for a term of 4 years, vice David M. Walker, term expired.

Stephen G. Kellison,
of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for a term of 4 years, vice David M. Walker, term expired.

Marilyn Moon,
of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for a term of 4 years, vice Stanford G. Ross, term expired.

Marilyn Moon,
of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for a term of 4 years, vice Stanford G. Ross, term expired.

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 June 5

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's initiatives supporting peace in Northern Ireland

Released June 6

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's meeting with Hungarian Prime Minister Gyula Horn

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the appointment of the Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy

Released June 7

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on American overseas interests legislation (H.R. 1561)

Statement by Special Associate Counsel Mark Fabiani on the indictment of Gov. Jim Guy Tucker of Arkansas

Released June 8

Transcripts of press briefings by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Released June 9

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the capture of Cali drug kingpin Gilberto Rodriguez Orejuela

Transcript of a press briefing by Deputy National Security Adviser Sandy Berger, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs Dan Tarullo, and Under Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs Larry Summers on the upcoming G–7 summit in Halifax, Nova Scotia

White House announcement on initiatives to streamline wage and income reporting requirements for small business owners and individuals

Acts Approved by the President

Approved June 3

H.R. 1421 / Public Law 104–14
To provide that references in the statutes of the United States to any committee or officer

of the House of Representatives the name or jurisdiction of which was changed as part of the reorganization of the House of Representatives at the beginning of the One Hundred Fourth Congress shall be treated as referring to the currently applicable committee or officer of the House of Representatives