Weekly Compilation of

# Presidential Documents

Monday, June 26, 1995
Volume 31—Number 25
Pages 1067–1111

## Contents


**Addresses and Remarks**

*See also* Appointments and Nominations
Arkansas, Little Rock teleconference with Democratic Governors—1106
Canada, unveiling of a G–7 commemorative plaque in Halifax—1079
Congressional picnic—1089
New Jersey
Ford Motor Co. employees in Edison—1099
Fundraising dinner in Somerset—1102
Senate action on the nomination of the Surgeon General in Edison—1098
Presidential Scholars, awards presentation ceremony—1089
Radio address—1079
Surgeon General-Designate Henry Foster—1094, 1098
U.S. Conference of Mayors, teleconference—1082
Women in the Military Service Memorial, groundbreaking ceremony—1096

**Appointments and Nominations**

Peace Corps, Director—1090

**Communications to Congress**

Bipartisan commission on political reform, letter—1078
Drunk driving legislation, letter—1094
Latvia-U.S. fishery agreement, message transmitting—1089

**Communications to Federal Agencies**

Supporting the role of fathers in families, memorandum—1077

**Executive Orders**

Commission on United States-Pacific Trade and Investment Policy—1095

**Interviews With the News Media**

Exchange with reporters in Halifax, Canada—1081
News conferences
June 15 (No. 98) with Prime Minister Murayama of Japan in Halifax—1067
June 16 (No. 99) in Halifax—1071

**Meetings With Foreign Leaders**

Japan, Prime Minister Murayama—1067
Russia, President Yeltsin—1081

**Statements by the President**

Guestworker legislation—1109
House action to lift the moratorium on oil and gas drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf—1089

**Supplementary Materials**

Acts approved by the President—1111
Checklist of White House press releases—1110
Digest of other White House announcements—1109
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1110


**Editor's Note:** The President was in Little Rock, AR, on June 23, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.


WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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



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

## The President's News Conference With Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama of Japan in Halifax, Canada

*June 15, 1995*

***The President.*** Good afternoon. Before turning to my meeting with Prime Minister Murayama let me begin by thanking Prime Minister Chrétien and the people of Halifax for welcoming Hillary and me and our delegation to Canada. Even on our short boat ride across the harbor we could see why this city and, indeed, all of Nova Scotia are favorite sights for so many American tourists. I hope the important business we do here won't prevent us from enjoying a little of this very beautiful place.

Our business began today with the meeting with Prime Minister Murayama, the third in the constructive dialog we began last November. Our discussion focused on the strength of the U.S.-Japan relationship, and we are determined to make it stronger still. Never have the ties between our nations been more important, and never have they been closer.

Our two great democracies are also the world's largest economies. Together we make up more than 30 percent of the world's gross domestic product. And trade between our people is growing rapidly.

Our security ties have never been closer. Friends and foes alike know the Japanese-American relationship is the most important force for peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region. Every day our people work together on the vital challenges of our times, protecting the environment, responding to natural disasters, combating the deadly trade in illegal drugs, and fighting the terrorists who have threatened both our nations from abroad and from within.

No issue is more important to our nations than stopping the spread of nuclear weapons. Prime Minister Murayama and I, along with our South Korean allies, have worked tirelessly on our strategy to stop the development of North Korea's nuclear program. We pledged to push forward with this week's important agreement to implement that strategy. Japan has agreed to make a significant contribution to the light-water reactors that will supply energy to the North Koreans without producing weapons-grade materials. And I thank the Prime Minister for Japan's ongoing commitment to the fight against weapons of mass destruction.

The Prime Minister briefed me on plans for the upcoming meeting of the Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum. APEC, as all of you know, has become an essential part of America's strategy for regional prosperity. Japan and the United States will work together so that November's meeting in Osaka sustains the momentum toward free and open trade in the Asia-Pacific region, achieved in Seattle and Indonesia last year.

We also discussed our progress and our disagreements on trade. Fifteen times, since the beginning of my administration, the United States and Japan have concluded agreements to open markets and increase trade across a wide variety of products and services. The latest, reached just this week, offers tax and financial incentives to Americans who want to establish on-the-ground operations in Japan. The Prime Minister and I also agreed to extend the 1993 framework on trade negotiations, and I am optimistic that that will advance both our interests in free and open trade. Once again, this proves that our countries can and do work together to solve our disputes and enable American companies to better compete in the Japanese market.

But we also, as all of you know, have real differences. The Prime Minister and I discussed the problem of access for U.S. airline cargo carriers to the Japanese market, for example. I again expressed to the Prime Minister my concern that Japan honor rights that

our carriers now have guaranteed under existing civil aviation agreements.

On the difficult issue of autos and auto parts, we had a frank and open exchange of our views. We agreed that our negotiators should redouble their efforts to seek a solution to those differences when they meet in Geneva next week. But I made it clear that I am determined to carry through on my effort to open Japan's auto markets. Billions of dollars in American exports and thousands of American jobs are at stake. They depend upon our success.

Opening these markets, as I have said repeatedly, will benefit not only the United States but Japanese consumers as well. I have instructed our negotiators to pursue every possible avenue of resolution before the June 28 deadline, and I remain hopeful that an acceptable, meaningful agreement can be reached. But if a solution cannot be found by the deadline, I will impose sanctions, and the United States will also pursue a case before the World Trade Organization.

At times like these, it is tempting to focus only on the differences that bring our two nations to the negotiating table. But I ask you again not to lose sight of the broader truths of our relationship. Only decades after the end of the terrible war that pitted our people against each other, the United States and Japan are allies and share a profound commitment to democracy, security, and prosperity. Our common agenda embraces everything from the fight to preserve our global environment to the global fight against AIDS, promoting the cause of women in developing countries, now to working together on natural disasters like earthquakes, and dealing with our common concerns after Oklahoma City and the terrible incident in the Japanese subway with terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

In any relationship as broad and deep as ours, there will always be differences. But the United States and Japan agree, no one issue, no one difference, will allow us to undermine our alliance or stop us from pursuing our shared goal and our common interests. Our two great democracies will never rest in our pursuit of a better, a safer, and a more prosperous future for all of our people.

Mr. Prime Minister.

***Prime Minister Murayama.*** In my meeting with President Clinton for a couple of hours, until a while ago, I engaged in a candid exchange of views on the present and future of Japan-U.S. relations and the stance that we'll take as we go to the G–7 summit meeting. And I think the meeting was very meaningful.

The Japan-U.S. relations have grown over the past 50 years, since the end of the Second World War, and are connected by a strong bond of cooperation and collaboration.

President Clinton and I confirmed that security dialog is progressing smoothly. Thanks to the President's cooperation, the issue of U.S. military bases in Okinawa has seen important progress. And the response to North Korea's nuclear development issue, which seemed to test our bilateral collaboration, has produced important results, thanks to the solidarity of our two countries and the Republic of Korea, and it is a matter that we expressed appreciation for.

Common agenda—that is to say our cooperation from global perspectives—is a symbol of creative partnership between our two countries. We today received a joint report containing new areas of cooperation. And the President and I are of the view that such cooperation should be promoted further.

As was mentioned earlier by the President, we also discussed the auto issue as well as the civil aviation issue. While the two countries remain apart on these issues, the President and I see eye to eye that we both will do our utmost to settle the issue as early as possible through the consultations slated for next week in Geneva. By the way, since the President has alluded to this matter, I should like to say that I asked for expeditious removal of the unilateral measures since they violate the rules and spirit of the World Trade Organization.

Now, in connection with that, including the civil aviation issue, we both agree that Japan-U.S. relations are a bilateral relationship of vital importance, so much so that the auto issue and aviation issue should not be allowed to adversely affect the overall Japan-U.S. relations.

We'll welcome President and Mrs. Clinton as state guests in November. Today's meeting with the President took place at a midpoint between my visit to Washington, DC, earlier, in January, and his visit to Japan in November. I am determined to further strengthen our bilateral partnership in the run up to the President's visit and beyond, into the future.

Lastly, I proposed to the President to hold a bilateral symposium of seismologists on earthquakes, in order to enable the peoples of our two countries who have experienced the great Hanshin earthquake and the Northridge earthquake, respectively, make the most of their experiences and the lessons. And the President has agreed to the proposal.

Thank you.

### *Japan-U.S. Trade*

***Q.*** Did you hear anything new today from Mr. Murayama to indicate a willingness to open Japan's auto markets, or was he inflexible? And also, was there anything that you heard from him that might lead you to extend the June 28th deadline?

***The President.*** The answer to the second question is, no. The answer to the first question is, we did not negotiate here, and we should not have. We had many other matters to discuss. We are both very ably represented by Ambassador Kantor and Minister Hashimoto and others on our behalf, and we have scheduled resumption of talks on the 22d and 23d in Geneva. So we did not discuss the details. But I did not and I will not agree to extend the deadline.

### *North Korea*

***Q.*** On the North Korean issue, up to the U.S.-North Korean agreement in Malaysia, I think there was some awkwardness in relations amongst Japan, Korea, and the United States. I wonder how the collaborative relationship will be kept up in the future? And how will Japan cooperate with this issue, including Japan's financial cooperation and if a substantial payout is made, when will that be?

***Prime Minister Murayama.*** Well, on that question of North Korean nuclear development issue, as was mentioned, in fact, we did discuss a lot of things. The talks in Malaysia were a very difficult one, and the United States continued to negotiate tenaciously. And as a result, the U.S. and North Korea finally arrived at a joint press conference. And we very much—highly appreciate all those efforts and the result.

Now, there may have been some misunderstanding amongst the parties in the process, but after overcoming those misunderstandings, we have had very close contacts between Japan and the United States as well, and we arrived at this agreement. So we would like to actively promote the outcome.

What sort of burden shall we take? When will we come up with a conclusion? Those are matters that we'll have to work on and finalize in the days ahead. At any rate, on this matter, Japan and the United States at the end of the day will continue to maintain close cooperation and act in concert. There is an agreement on that.

### *Japan-U.S. Trade*

***Q.*** Mr. President, what if the June 28th action, the imposition of tariffs, were to ignite a trade war with Japan? Won't that do more to adversely impact the jobs and the exports that you're trying to protect in the first place, sir?

***The President.*** Well, of course, we hope that won't happen. But we've already considered the alternatives, and I believe we're on the right course.

***Q.*** Did you get any assurance from the Prime Minister as to what the Japanese response might be?

***The President.*** We did not discuss the details of the trade issue, other than to talk about the firmness of the June 28th deadline and our common hope and our common pledge that we could have a satisfactory resolution on the 22d and the 23d when our negotiators meet. And of course, the Prime Minister very ably restated his position, as he did here.

***Prime Minister Murayama.*** With regard to June 28th, we did hear remarks from the President, and so, in response, I said that the 28th of June, we understand, is a deadline set by Section 301, but that is a matter of U.S. domestic law. As far as Japan is concerned, the auto talks are not talks conducted

under Section 301. That is the Japanese understanding, and I stated that clearly.

What is important is that we do not engage in talks with both of our fists raised but rather talk to each other in good faith and try to resolve the problem through talks and let us work on that. And fortunately, on the 22d and 23d of June, there will be some Cabinet level talks in Geneva. And through those talks we hope that we'll be able to come up with a solution that will be convincing to the international public opinion as well. And so let us do our utmost.

***Q.*** I'd like to ask the same question to both of you on the auto issue. Does that mean that each side will step one head ahead of the positions that you've stuck to so far? I wonder if you've engaged in discussions with that sort of feeling or intention to make a step forward.

***Prime Minister Murayama.*** Well, these are talks, consultations. So if both sides remain stuck into their principles, there will be no talks. We certainly have to keep our eye on overall flows or developments and try to walk closer to each other. Otherwise, there will be no solution. So where we can yield, we should yield to each other, so that we should find out the ways that will lead us at the end of the day to a solution. And let us find a way to do that. That is something that we've agreed on.

***The President.*** I have nothing to add to what the Prime Minister said. As you know, the objective of the United States is to open the market, to be free to compete. But it would have been inappropriate for us to engage in the details of the discussion. As I said before, we have both been very ably represented by people who have dealt with this issue for a long time. And so we reasserted the framework from which we are both proceeding, which I have stated and which he has stated. We did not negotiate the details of the agreement.

***Q.*** Mr. President, you said in your opening statement that the security relationship between the United States and Japan has never been stronger. But administration officials have said that frictions on trade could eventually lead to a deterioration of that relationship. What is your read of that? If this isn't solved——

***President Clinton.*** That is exactly why both the Prime Minister and I today said that we have made a common commitment not to allow our entire relationship to be defined by a trade difference. Even in the area of trade, we've made 15 agreements in 2½ years. That's pretty impressive. Even though the autos and auto parts are a bigger part of our economy, a bigger part of their economy, and a bigger part of the trade imbalance than all these other things combined, they are still significant.

And in other areas—what Japan and South Korea and the United States are doing with the North Korean nuclear problem is a matter of profound importance to every Japanese citizen, every American citizen, and all the people who live in North Asia. The things that we can do together to deal with problems like biological and chemical weapons being used in terrorists attacks—we are both more vulnerable to that as we open our societies to the 21st century—to organized forces of destruction.

The responsibilities we both have to the rest of the world to try to lead in environmental protection, in the fight against AIDS, and many other areas, these matters make it imperative that we maintain the closeness of our relationship. And we have pledged to each other today that however difficult our differences get in one area or the other of this relationship, we will not let it destroy the bonds of friendship and common values that are imperative for not only the American and the Japanese people but for the entire world.

***Prime Minister Murayama.*** The President has said it all, so I really don't have anything to add. But this cooperation based on Japan-U.S. relationship will contribute not only to the Asian economy but contributes very importantly to the world economy as well. So that is our common understanding. It is from that vantage point that we engage in cooperation on issues of global scale, which we have referred to. So we both have reaffirmed that we will continue cooperation in those areas as well.

***Q.*** Once again, on the auto issue, in the series of Japan-U.S. auto issues, you are far apart on one single issue, and that is whether the volunteer purchases should be increased

or not. I wonder if the Clinton administration plans to continue to stick on that position, and would the Murayama administration continue to refuse. If so, I think agreement or compromise will be very difficult. I wonder how you intend to settle the problem with emphasis on this one point of auto purchase plan.

***Prime Minister Murayama.*** As the President mentioned earlier, in our talks today we did not go into details of those talks because, as the President mentioned, we have outstanding negotiators, and on the 22d and 23d, there will be further talks in Geneva on that issue. And including that aspect, I hope that there will be in-depth discussions in Geneva and somehow we'll be able to come up with a force that will lead us to the settlement of the issue through talks. So let us both make efforts to that end.

***The President.*** You have identified by your question one of the very key issues in the negotiations. Any answer that we give will undermine the possibility that a successful negotiation can occur.

Thank you very much.

[*At this point, the President was presented with a plaque from the children of the Kobe area in Japan to show their appreciation for help received from the United States after the Hanshin earthquake.*]

***The President.*** We'll hang this in the White House as a constant reminder about this.

NOTE: The President's 98th news conference began at 4:40 p.m. at Dalhousie University. Prime Minister Murayama spoke in Japanese, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. In his remarks, the President referred to Minister of International Trade and Industry Ryutaro Hashimoto of Japan. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

## The President's News Conference in Halifax

*June 16, 1995*

***The President.*** I'd like to begin my statement with an American issue. I want to congratulate Salt Lake City on their successful pursuit of the Olympics in 2002. This will be an historic event for Salt Lake City—[*applause*]—there was good applause there, maybe a native or two back there. It's a great event for Salt Lake City. They sought the Olympics many times over the last several years, and I congratulate them. It's a great thing for the Western part of the United States and, indeed, for our whole country.

I want to particularly congratulate Governor Mike Leavitt; the Mayor of Utah—of Salt Lake City, Dee Dee Corradini; and Tom Welsh, the president of the Salt Lake City Bid Committee for their efforts and a job well done.

From the beginning of our administration I've worked hard to make the global economy work for the American people. We live and work in a global market. Our living standards depend upon our ability to compete and to keep one step ahead of economic change.

In the past 2½ years, we have fought at home for a comprehensive economic strategy that would create jobs and lift the incomes of our people, focusing on reducing the deficit but investing in our people, in their education and their future. My new budget proposal continues to reflect these priorities.

At the same time, we have worked to open more markets around the world to our products in free and fair competition from others, through NAFTA, GATT, our work with the Asian-Pacific countries and with the countries of the Americas. We've also worked hard to encourage the global trend toward market democracy in the former Communist countries.

I am pursuing this strategy, above all, for one reason: to renew the promise of America in the 21st century. But I also want to preserve the leadership of America as a force for peace and freedom, for democracy and prosperity.

This G–7 meeting has moved us a step closer to these goals. We've taken concrete steps to strengthen the international financial system, something we promised to do last year in Naples. And let me give you one, and perhaps the most important, example.

Earlier this year, we in the United States were confronted with a serious financial crisis in Mexico. It posed a risk to markets throughout the world, and it certainly threatened our own economic health, as well as our long-

term relationships with Mexico, involving a number of other issues. We led the effort to stabilize Mexico, and from all signs, it seems to be working. President Zedillo and his team have worked hard to live within the discipline the markets have imposed and to move Mexico to a brighter and better future.

But we learned two important lessons in dealing with the Mexican crisis. First, the world clearly needs better tools to identify problems like this so that they can be prevented, and second, the international system must have a stronger way of resolving these crises once they do occur.

We were fortunate in the Mexican instance that the United States had access to a fund which could permit us to make some guarantees and move to put together an international approach to this problem. But the U.S. will not be able to be the lender of last resort in other crises of this kind. So here in Halifax, we have begun to forge the tools to deal with these kinds of problems in the future.

We agreed to create an early warning system that will sound the alarm when nations begin to encounter real problems, before the severity of the Mexican crisis develops. We call for early and full disclosure of critical monetary and financial information. We'll establish tougher reporting standards for nations so that markets will react more quickly and nations will be pressed to implement sound policies in a timely manner. This may be the best discipline for preventing future crises.

When these problems do occur, we must respond decisively. And leaders of the G–7 have taken crucial steps toward that end. We've called upon the International Monetary Fund to establish a new mechanism to ensure that we can act swiftly when one nation's economic crisis threatens the world economy. We propose to double the funds available for this purpose to more than $50 billion from those nations with a stake in a stable international financial system. That will require loans from the United States which must be authorized by Congress. I know a lot of you are thinking about that, but they are scored as cost-free to the American taxpayers because they're viewed as risk-free because they go to the international institutions.

The G–7 leaders have also agreed that the international financial institutions, the World Bank, the IMF, and the agencies of the United Nations, must continue on a path of reform. These institutions have served us well for half a century; we will continue to support them, but they must adapt for a new era. We put forward new principles that will focus their work on addressing vital human needs: the alleviation of poverty, supporting private sector development, promoting sustainable development, environmental protection along side economic growth. The resulting economic growth will bolster democracy and stability in developing nations and, of course, create future markets for American exports.

The leaders at Halifax are also discussing new security threats that no nation should face alone. And we'll have more to say about that tomorrow. But let me say we have agreed that the G–7 must work together far more energetically and comprehensively to counter the growing dangers posed by terrorists, international criminals, nuclear smugglers, and drug traffickers. We must cooperate more closely to counter terrorism and criminal activities sponsored by states, groups, and individuals. These are among the foremost challenges of the post-cold-war world.

These are issues which affect the lives of the American people in a very direct way. How we deal with them, whether and how we strengthen the international financial system and reform its institutions and how we fight challenges like terrorism will in no small way determine our citizens' future prosperity and security, how they feel about themselves and the future their children will enjoy.

To create new high-wage jobs, to raise incomes, to expand economic opportunity, the United States must continue to lead, even as we work hard on these matters at home. We cannot—I will say again—we cannot walk away from our global leadership responsibilities. In Halifax we've taken another solid step along that road. It will make the economy work better for the American people, and I believe it will help us to prevent future Mexicos and to deal with those crises in a

much more effective way when they do occur.

### *Bosnia*

***Q.*** Mr. President, the United States has told the United Nations that for budgetary reasons it could not be counted on to pay the lion's share for a rapid response force in Bosnia. My question is, can a rapid response force in Bosnia be effective without the major backing—the major financial backing of the United States?

***The President.*** Yes. I'd like to review for a moment how that decision was made, however. I want to begin by saying I strongly support the rapid reaction force. It will give some muscle, some support, some security to the United Nations troops there. It will be staffed primarily by the British and French, with contributions from other countries that are on the ground there. It will have the mission of preserving the integrity of the U.N. force, being able to rush in and help to redeploy them when necessary, to support them in fulfilling their mission, and to take the necessary action if they are under threat. This offers the promise of making the U.N. mission more effective. I strongly support it.

Because the financing of this would have to be, obviously, approved by the Congress, I consulted with the Senate majority leader and with the Speaker of the House. And because President Chirac was in Washington, he went by to see them as well. They sent me a letter saying that they supported the concept of the rapid reaction force, and they understood why President Chirac wanted a vote in the United Nations right now, because things are pretty tense in Bosnia and because he was coming here and that they would certainly understand if I voted for the resolution in the United Nations but that, in the absence of appropriate and thorough congressional consultations, they could not agree to pay for it through an assessment.

So Ambassador Albright last night was able to get a modification of the resolution, which simply leaves open the method by which the rapid reaction force will be funded, either through assessments or through voluntary contributions. We and others have made several voluntary contributions to the United Nations in the past for other important missions.

I believe the United States should pay a share of this. I will support that, and I will do my dead-level best to argue that case in Congress. This rapid reaction force gives these countries the power that they have lacked to protect their troops and to preserve the honor of their country and to pursue the U.N. mission in a way they have not been able to since they have become more vulnerable to being taken as hostages.

Yes.

***Q.*** Mr. President, how much are you hamstrung in the discussions on Bosnia here at the summit by the fact that you can't make a firm commitment on U.S. support for the rapid reaction force and the fact that the United States does not have troops on the ground in Bosnia?

***The President.*** Well, I have made some firm commitments for support. We have promised some equipment. We have promised some strategic lifts. We have promised the kind of air cover which we have given to other U.N. missions.

The United States has spent a lot of money and provided a lot of support to the United Nations mission in Bosnia, through NATO, through participating in the humanitarian airlifts, which are now by far the largest humanitarian airlifts in history. I urge you to remember that not only has the death rate gone way, way down in the last 2 years, but there are now about 2.8 million Bosnians dependent upon the humanitarian aspect of this mission. Just because it hasn't succeeded in ending the war does not mean it has been a total failure in keeping people alive while we search for a political solution.

So I was able to make those commitments based on the resources we have now. And I have made it clear from the beginning that we would not be involved with ground troops in this U.N. mission. I have made it clear the circumstances under which we would help our NATO partners and our U.N. partners to withdraw or to help them if they were in a terrible emergency. And I think that everyone understands that and is more or less not only reconciled to it but supportive of it.

This is something that the Europeans wanted to take the lead on and decided to take the lead on before I became President. And we have taken, I think, a very vigorous and aggressive position through NATO. But I do not believe the United States should send ground forces into the U.N. mission as it is constituted, and I certainly don't believe we should send our ground forces into some sort of combat situation in Bosnia.

Our vital interests, I will reiterate, are in keeping the conflict from spreading. That's why we do have forces in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. That's why we have worked very hard to see that Bosnia and Croatia have an agreement which has shut down a big part of the war. In minimizing the human loss, in supporting our NATO allies, and preserving the integrity of this operation, we have done everything we could to those ends. I do not believe that this is a situation which warrants the introduction of America's ground forces.

### *Federal Budget*

***Q.*** You mentioned your budget, and it has been out for a little while now. It seems to be garnering more support from Ross Perot than some of your fellow Democrats. What is going on?

***The President.*** First of all, I think that—I think there are two things going on. First, I think the Democrats are still in the position where the Democrats in Congress do not have to offer an alternative. And a lot of them could not possibly have had the opportunity to study this budget resolution in any detail. And frankly, there are some political feelings among some of our Democrats which are entirely understandable. I mean, they're—so what some of them are saying is, "Look, the Republicans won the Congress with a "just say no" position. They refused to participate in deficit reduction. They put forward a health care plan and then walked away from their own plan. And they were rewarded somehow as the party that was responsible on the economy and health care and other things with a "just say no," organized, heavily financed attack, attack, attack, attack position. Why shouldn't we do the same thing?"

My answer to them is we may have failed to communicate to the American people that what we did was good for the United States in the last 2 years, that we would have a balanced budget today were it not for the interest we have to pay on the debt run up in the 12 years before I showed up, but our job is to do what's right for America. And the President, particularly, is in a different position.

I thought that I owed it to the country and to the Republicans to give them the opportunity to make their budget proposal first. I always said to the American people that we could not balance the budget without reducing the rate of growth of health care expenditures, but we ought not to be cutting services to elderly people who needed it. What we ought to be doing is reforming health care. My proposal reflects that. I think I have done the responsible thing. And I hope, as time goes on, I'll be able to persuade more and more Democrats and Republicans that I did the right thing. And I thank Mr. Perot for his support.

Yes.

### *Bosnia*

***Q.*** Mr. President, back on Bosnia for a moment, sir. Despite your support for the peacekeeping forces, the U.N. peacekeeping forces in Bosnia, are you at all moved by the appeal made at the White House the other day by Bosnian President Haris Silajdzic, who called the arms embargo an instrument of genocide. How do you answer him when he asks, "Why won't the U.S. let the Bosnian Muslims defend themselves?"

***The President.*** First of all, the arms embargo would be an instrument of genocide if the U.N. mission weren't keeping more people alive. In 1992, 130,000 civilians, more or less, died in Bosnia. In 1994, the best figures we have indicate that fewer than 3,000 people died.

When NATO was working with the U.N., we were able to create some safe areas around Sarajevo and the eastern enclaves which have since been eroded by the taking of U.N. hostages. But that's why the rapid reaction force is so important, to put some real steel back into the U.N. mission.

On principle, you know that the sympathies of the United States are with the Bosnian Government, and more strongly

than some of our allies feel. But the question is, will this thing ever be settled on the battlefield? I think the answer to that is, no. If that's true, shouldn't we support the Bosnian Government's position that it has accepted the Contact Group proposal, do everything we can to strengthen the U.N., keep as many people alive as possible, not allow an erosion of their territorial position insofar as we can prevent it, and keep pushing for a diplomatic settlement? That's what I believe is the best thing to do.

Lifting the arms embargo cannot be seen in an isolated circumstance. And I want you all to consider this. This is not an example where you can just kick the can down the road; this is the most complex problem in foreign policy today. If the United States—first of all, our European allies simply disagree with lifting the arms embargo. If we were to lift the arms embargo unilaterally, what would happen? The U.N. mission would immediately collapse and withdraw. We would have immediate responsibilities to send our people in to help them withdraw if they asked for it and needed it.

After that happened, then what happens? There are a lot of people in the United States, including many in Congress in both parties, who say, ''That is no concern of ours; all they have asked us for is to lift the arms embargo and let the arms flow in there.''

But I ask you: If the United States—if the United States cratered the U.N. mission by a unilateral lift of the arms embargo and then the lift of the arms embargo did not produce the military results on the ground that the Bosnian government hoped and if, instead, they began to lose more territory and more and more people started to die because of our unilateral action ending the U.N. mission, what would we do then? The chances that we would be drawn in are far greater than if the United States could walk away from an even greater mess that we had created all by ourselves with our European allies pleading with us not to do it.

Therefore, I will say again, if the U.N. mission does fail, if our allies decide to leave, I would strongly support lifting the arms embargo. It's the best alternative at that moment. But I cannot in good conscience support a unilateral lift of the arms embargo when the British and the French and the others are willing to say, ''We'll send more troops there; we'll stiffen our capacity to keep the peace and to work for the peace.'' I cannot do that.

Yes.

***Q.*** Mr. President, how can you push for a diplomatic settlement if every proposal that's been made, including the U.S.-backed proposal to give half the country to the Serbs, is rejected by the Serbs? What ideas are out there? There's nothing going on; there's no diplomatic initiative in the air right now. So what do you mean when you say push for a diplomatic settlement?

***The President.*** There's nothing—there will never—they will not make peace, sir, until they get tired of fighting each other. I agree with that. Now, that is also true of Northern Ireland. How long has this war been underway? Four years. How long has this peacekeeping initiative been underway? A little less time than that. How long did they fight in Northern Ireland before they began to do what they're doing now? Twenty-five years. How long have they been fighting in the Middle East? Over four decades before we made the progress we're making now. You cannot simply say, given—how deeply rooted are the conflicts between the Bosnians of—that are Serbian, Croatian, and Muslim? At least, at least going back to the 11th century.

So I say to you, there is nothing great going on right now. What is the answer? To do something else that might make it worse or to try to minimize human life, ensure that it doesn't—the loss of human life—ensure that it doesn't spread, and keep working for what I think is, based on the historical evidence, the only way fights of this kind ever get settled, which is when they—people decide that's it's better for them to make a deal than to keep killing each other.

Yes.

***Q.*** Mr. President, it is the President of France who has pushed the hardest on the rapid reaction force, and he has described it in terms of, ''we can't be humiliated''. These terms sort of harken back to the Vietnam quagmire, if you'll forgive that word, and I was hoping that you could outline exactly what you think the mission is—would

be of this force? Could you give it in the most specific terms possible, because as many people have said, unless we know exactly what the mission is, there could be a disaster.

***The President.*** Well, in fairness to the President of France, I thought that Americans might hear that in his rhetoric. But keep in mind, when the argument was made in Vietnam that we couldn't be humiliated, the argument there was there that we had to do more to Americanize the war, that is, we were involved in Vietnam supporting the side of the South Vietnamese government in a conflict with the Vietcong and North Vietnam on the other side.

In this case, the French President is taking the position that the honor of the country is eroded when U.N. personnel in blue helmets can be taken prisoner at will and they have no capacity to defend themselves. So he is not suggesting that they should get involved in this conflict in a military way on one side or the other. He is suggesting, however, that they ought to be able to move on the roads at will, that they ought to be able to do what they're supposed to do under the U.N. mandate without being taken prisoner, being shot at, being victimized; and that the rapid reaction force is supposed to be able to get them out of tights if they get in it and to support them when they need the support. He is not suggesting that the rapid reaction force would increase the level of military conflict or that there would be any military initiative taken by that force.

Yes.

***Q.*** The British have said that you here at this summit have committed the U.S. to paying its fair share of that rapid reaction force. Since the Republican leadership has said that they don't want Congress to pony up the money, just what options are available to you to come up with that money? And secondly, by the Republican leadership doing what they did in advance of the U.N. vote, does it unnecessarily tie your hands in the conduct of foreign policy?

***The President.*** No, in this case, I think, what they did was to make it possible for me to vote for an initiative that they agreed with in principle but weren't prepared to say they would pay for. That is—let me back up and say—there are two issues here. One is, under our law, the President is plainly required to consult with the Congress before agreeing to a course of action that would require the expenditure of money. You don't have to agree with the Congress, but at least you have to consult with them.

President Chirac came in and said, "Look, timing is of the essence, and we need a vote on this, and we need it now." So I called Senator Dole and Speaker Gingrich, and I have no—we had a good conversation, and I have no quarrel with the letter they sent, because I said, "I don't have time to do the consultations if he is right and we need the vote now."

So the letter they sent to me said two things. But the most important thing, apropos of your point is, "You can do this, but our committee chairmen have very serious reservations about this mission, what its role is going to be, what it's function will be, and whether we should pay for it. So if you do it, you have to know that we are not committing in advance to appropriate the money.

Now, what I told the British was, and what I told all my colleagues last night was, that I would make my best efforts to secure funding for it because it's the right thing to do.

Now, the second issue I want to say is, as you know, the leadership of the Republican Party disagrees with our policy. They favor a unilateral lift which would collapse the U.N. mission. That's what they think the right thing to do is. But they know that the President has to make foreign policy and that I have no intention of pursuing that for the reasons I have already explained.

***Q.*** ——and funding——

***Q.*** Mr. President——

***The President.*** We're working on that.

***Q.*** Since UNPROFOR is now unable to carry out its mission to deliver humanitarian relief to Sarajevo or to maintain the weapons exclusion zone around the city and Sarajevo is once again being strangled, why have you urged the Bosnian government not to use force to defend itself?

***The President.*** Well, first of all, my sympathies are with them. I agreed to the statement that we all signed off on last night because the French and the British are doing their best to get more troops there through

the rapid reaction force, which would permit the U.N. to fulfill its mandate which includes opening Sarajevo, and because I believe that has the best chance of opening Sarajevo without other adverse consequences to the Bosnians.

In other words, I tried to make sure that resolution was carefully worded to say, right now don't increase hostilities, because I don't believe this is a good time to do that when we are trying to strengthen the rapid reaction force and when, if we are successful, they will be better able to guarantee the openness of Sarajevo.

My sympathies with them are complete. They have a right to want their city to be open. And the Serbs have been shelling it on and off for 4 years whenever they could get away with it. So I don't agree with what's going on. But if the rapid reaction force works and the U.N. mission can work again and Sarajevo can be protected again, then I believe we're better off, and I believe, more importantly, they're better off if it can be done that way. I think there will be fewer casualties, and I think their political position will be stronger. That's why I agreed to support the settlement.

***Q.*** Lift the siege——

***The President.*** I'm saying, no, that's not their job. Their job is to back up and protect the U.N. mission. But I think it will show that the U.N. mission will have a greater capacity to do what the U.N. has authorized it to do, which is to be able to get in and out of Sarajevo.

Now, that is not the same thing as saying they will take a unilateral military action to lift the siege, but then the Serbs and everybody else, for that matter, will have to think about the Blue Helmets in a little different way before they just say, "I'm sorry, you can't cross this road; I'm sorry, we're going to take you a prisoner; I'm sorry, we're going to treat you like dirt; I'm sorry, we're going to ignore the U.N."

That is what President Chirac and Prime Minister Major want to avoid having happen to their troops again. And if it is seen in that light, then I think at least we have to give them a chance to try to make the U.N. mandate work again.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 99th news conference began at 4:20 p.m. at Dalhousie University. In his remarks, he referred to President Jacques Chirac of France and U.S. Representative to the United Nations Madeleine K. Albright. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

## Memorandum on Supporting the Role of Fathers in Families

*June 16, 1995*

*Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies*

*Subject:* Supporting the Role of Fathers in Families

I am firm in my belief that the future of our Republic depends on strong families and that committed fathers are essential to those families. I am also aware that strengthening fathers' involvement with their children cannot be accomplished by the Federal Government alone; the solutions lie in the hearts and consciences of individual fathers and the support of the families and communities in which they live. However, there are ways for a flexible, responsive Government to help support men in their roles as fathers.

Therefore, today I am asking the Federal agencies to assist me in this effort. I direct all executive departments and agencies to review every program, policy, and initiative (hereinafter referred to collectively as "programs") that pertains to families to:

- ensure, where appropriate, and consistent with program objectives, that they seek to engage and meaningfully include fathers;
- proactively modify those programs that were designed to serve primarily mothers and children, where appropriate and consistent with program objectives, to explicitly include fathers and strengthen their involvement with their children;
- include evidence of father involvement and participation, where appropriate, in measuring the success of the programs; and
- incorporate fathers, where appropriate, in government-initiated research regarding children and their families.

I ask the departments and agencies to provide an initial report on the results of the review to the Vice President through the National Performance Review within 90 days of the date of this memorandum.

The information gained from this review will be combined with information gathered through the Vice President's ''Father to Father'' initiative and other father involvement programs to determine the direction of those programs for the future. The National Performance Review, together with the Domestic Policy Council, will recommend further action based on the results of this review.

**William J. Clinton**

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

## Letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on a Bipartisan Commission on Political Reform

*June 16, 1995*

*Dear Mr. Speaker:*

I was delighted when you and I agreed to the suggestion of a citizen in New Hampshire that we create a bipartisan commission to address the issues of political reform. As you stated at the time, this proposal offers the best chance in a generation to break through the stalemate between the parties that has blocked progress for reform. As you know, the citizen stated that this commission should be modeled after the base closing commission; I agree. This is an idea with wide appeal: in addition to our agreement, this proposal has previously been endorsed by Senate Majority Leader Dole, and a similar proposal has been introduced by Representatives Maloney, Meehan, Johnson, and others. I am writing to set forth my views on the best way to write into legislation the agreement we reached in New Hampshire.

As you know, to succeed, such a panel must be distinguished and truly bipartisan; it must have a firm deadline for action; and it must have a mechanism for presenting its proposals to the President and the Congress in such a way that we will be forced to act on them in a timely and comprehensive manner. Several times in recent years, particularly thorny issues, including base closings and congressional and judicial pay, have been addressed in this fashion.

First, the commission should be bipartisan in nature. Under this model, it would be comprised of eight members, appointed by the President in consultation with the leaders of the Congress. The President would make two appointments; two would be made in consultation with the Speaker of the House; two would be made in consultation with the Majority Leader of the Senate; one each would be made in consultation with the minority leaders of the House and Senate. No more than four commissioners could be members of any one political party. To ensure that the commissioners are independent, receive the trust of the people, and can take a fresh look at these issues, they should not be current Federal officials or Members of Congress, or officers of or counsel to the political parties. In this fashion, we have an opportunity to achieve consensus and balance that will produce a national consensus on reform.

Second, the commission should be given a firm deadline in which to act—by February 1, 1996. These issues, while difficult, are not new, and can be fruitfully addressed in that time. The American people want to know that we will act during this Congress, and I believe the best chance of that is before the electoral season begins in the summer of 1996. The commission would be charged with considering all the issues of political reform, including campaign finance reform and lobby reform. Let me be clear: I do not believe that this proposal for establishing a commission should deter or detract from the previously scheduled Senate action on political reform (S. 101), a measure I strongly support. That would be contrary to the purpose of the entire enterprise—making progress on reforms that are stalled, not to delay action on measure that are moving forward. If the Congress has taken final action on any of these matters before the commission meets, the panel could choose not to address them altogether.

Third, its recommendations must be dealt with in an expedited and comprehensive manner, in the same fashion as the proposals of the base closing commission. They would

be sent to the President, who would reject them or send them on to the Congress in their entirety. They should then be considered on the "fast track"—an up or down vote, with no amendments, within 30 days of the submission by the President. Only in this way can the American people be assured that narrow interests do not pick apart the coherent and comprehensive recommendations of the bipartisan commission. (As you know, the recommendations of the base closing commission take effect unless they are rejected by the Congress, but in this instance I believe it is more appropriate to give the Congress the opportunity to vote up or down.)

Working together to follow up on our New Hampshire agreement, we have a rare opportunity for truly bipartisan cooperation on a matter of urgent concern to the American people. We have a chance to put aside partisan interests to work toward the national interest. I look forward to working with you toward this end, and to hearing your views on this proposal or others you might have for moving ahead, and I have directed my staff to meet with your staff on this matter. If we take these steps, we will set in motion a process that could truly transform American politics for the better.

Sincerely,

**William J. Clinton**

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

## Remarks on the Unveiling of a Group of Seven Commemorative Plaque in Halifax

*June 17, 1995*

Ladies and gentlemen, I just wanted to say a few words—I'm sure I speak on behalf of all of us here—to thank the people of Halifax and Nova Scotia and the leaders for making us feel so welcome, and to say a special word of appreciation for the leadership Prime Minister Chrétien has given to this conference. The people of Canada can be very, very proud of the direction and leadership that he gave this G–7 conference. It has been more businesslike, more informal, and more specific in its suggestions for what we can do to improve the lives of our people than many of our previous meetings. And I think it is due to the leadership of the Prime Minister. And all of us wanted to express that to the people of Canada. We are very, very grateful for it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:05 a.m. at the Halifax Waterfront. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

## The President's Radio Address

*June 17, 1995*

Good morning. I'm speaking to you from Halifax, Canada, where I've been meeting with the leaders of the world's largest industrial democracies. We've taken concrete steps to strengthen the world economy. We've agreed on measures to anticipate and prevent future financial crises, like the one that happened earlier this year in Mexico, and to promote economic growth in countries that will provide markets of tomorrow for our American exports.

The work we're doing here is part of my administration's strategy to create jobs and raise incomes and living standards for the American people. Our responsibility is to restore the American dream, to give our children the chance that we've had to make America work well for all people who work hard.

To do that, one of the things we have to do is to reduce the deficit and balance the budget. Earlier this week, I outlined my plan to balance the budget in 10 years. This plan proves we can balance the budget while we continue to invest in the things that will keep America strong, things like education, health care, medical research, and technology. My plan will keep our economy strong as we eliminate the deficit. And unlike other plans, my plan protects the people in our country who have so much to give and who have given so much.

For example, my plan would avoid a number of cuts proposed by the Congress that would seriously hurt hundreds of thousands of American veterans. The House budget plan has proposed quadrupling the amount veterans pay for the prescription drugs they

need, while cutting taxes a lot for upper income Americans who don't really need a tax cut.

Under my plan that wouldn't happen. We can balance the budget in 10 years without harming the people who protected our Nation and who now have to get by without much to live on.

The Senate budget plan has similar flaws. For example, it proposes to deny veterans benefits to anyone in the military who is injured unless that injury is directly connected to the performance of his or her duties. Now, think about what that means. A young Army sergeant stationed overseas is on his way home from the movie theater one night when he's off duty. He gets hit by a drunk driver, and he's paralyzed. The Senate budget says, "Tough luck, no veterans benefits to help you with the injury."

I think we've got a duty to help our veterans when they're sick or injured. But we also have a duty to balance the budget. What I want you to know is that we can do both. My plan cuts Federal spending by $1.1 trillion. It does not raise taxes. It is disciplined, comprehensive, and serious. It won't be easy, but we need to do it, and we can.

Let's keep in mind the purpose. The purpose is to renew the American dream, to grow the middle class in terms of jobs and incomes, and to give poor people the chance to work themselves into the middle class.

With that purpose in mind, my balanced budget has five basic priorities: First, help people make the most of their own lives. That means that while we cut the deficit, we have to increase investment in education, not cut education.

Second, we have to control health care costs, but do it by strengthening Medicare, saving Medicaid, not by slashing services for the elderly. We can maintain benefits by cutting costs through genuine reform, like more home care for the elderly so they can stay out of more expensive institutions, preventive mammograms, and respite care for people with Alzheimer's, and cracking down on fraud and abuse and giving people more incentives to go into managed care.

Third, cut taxes, but do it for the middle class, not the wealthy. We shouldn't cut education or Medicare just to give people money who don't really need it. Instead, let's help middle class Americans pay for college, like the GI bill did for veterans after World War II.

Fourth, save money by cutting welfare, but do it in a way that saves enough for investment to move people to work. Don't save money just by throwing people off the rolls or hurting their children, who are vulnerable through no fault of their own. The congressional proposals are tough on kids and weak on work. We need to be tough on work and supportive of children. The congressional approach will cost a lot more money down the road than it will ever save.

The fifth principle is, as I've said before, balance the budget in 10 years. We could do it in 7 years, as some in Congress want. But there's no reason to inflict the pain that would cause or to run the risk of a recession. Think about it like this: If you bought a home with a mortgage, you'd sure want to pay it off just as fast as you could without hurting your family. But if the choice was pay it off in 10 years and pay your medical bills and send your daughter to college, or pay it off in 7 and go without the best care and tell your daughter you're sorry but she'll have to fend for herself, I don't think you'd have a hard time making the right choice. We can have all the benefits of balancing the budget without a lot of the burdens if we'll do it in 10 instead of 7 years.

Now, don't let anybody fool you: balancing the budget is not going to be a walk in the park. It will require real cuts; it will cause real pain. But the difference between my plan and the congressional plans is the difference between necessary cuts and unacceptable pain. Remember the goals: Restore the American dream, promote jobs and higher incomes, reinforce families and communities.

This is a time when we must, more than ever before, join together to seize the opportunities before us, a moment of immense promise. We can renew the American dream, and we have to do it and do it right.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at approximately 5:30 p.m. on June 16 at the Chateau Halifax for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on June 17.

## Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Boris Yeltsin of Russia in Halifax

*June 17, 1995*

***Q.*** Mr. President, let me ask you a question. Are you now changing your mind as to the people against whom Mr. Yeltsin is waging a war when you learn what's going on in Budennovsk? That's Russian Television News question.

***President Yeltsin.*** In the first place, I would like to say that my friend, Bill, has never wavered in his opinion. He has always supported and is supporting Russia and President Yeltsin.

I would like to say that the storming of the hospital is continuing, that we have liberated 200 hostages, and the operation is going on. I am in contact, in constant contact with our commanders who command our special forces who stormed the hospital, and I am in full control of the situation.

Taking this example, you should judge for yourselves that Chechnya today is the center of world terrorism, of bribery and corruption and mafia. We couldn't act otherwise. We had to destroy those terrorists and bandits.

Well, not all in the world understood this situation correctly and perhaps not all of the mass media understood correctly. But I am very glad that my friend, Bill, understood me correctly and, nonetheless, always defended his position no matter what happened.

I just have to say that our state Dumas, as a matter of fact, today has made the decision to have the President go back, come back home and make a visit to Budennovsk. I think, therefore, that this is a bad mistake, a bad move on their part because now I, myself, become a hostage to these very same bandits by having to go back there.

And moreover, I have to say that after my discussion yesterday—and I once again reiterated that today to our partners in the G–7 and told them what kind of people we're dealing with, what kind of horrible criminals with black bands on their foreheads—they now much better understand that this is really the only way that we can deal with these criminal elements. They really now understand much more.

Dear journalists, Bill and I accumulated a whole host of very important issues—global issues, not some internal Russian disputes and issues or internal American problems. These are really serious, overwhelming global issues. And therefore, I say, we've got to go.

Thank you, and goodbye.

***Q.*** President Clinton, do you agree with what he said about your position?

***President Clinton.*** Well, let me tell you what my position is. First of all, it is true that the United States has always said that Chechnya was a part of Russia and was ultimately a problem that had to be resolved by the people of your nation, consistent with your constitutional laws.

It is also true that we believe that terrorism everywhere is wrong, that terrorism in the Middle East is wrong, that people blowing up our Federal building in Oklahoma City is wrong, and people taking over a hospital in your country and killing innocent civilians is wrong, and has to be resisted strong.

But I also subscribe to the position taken by the G–7 that sooner or later—better sooner than later—the cycle of violence has to be broken. And ultimately, in any democracy, there has to be a political solution to people's differences. And so that is what we have urged.

President Yeltsin and I have had several conversations about this. When I was in Moscow I said that I understood it was a terribly difficult situation for Russia but that the United States believed that, ultimately, in any democracy, all decisions were finally resolved in a political manner in a way that would permit the cycle of violence to be broken.

So that is our position. It is still our position. And we hope that it will become more possible now. But nothing—nothing—can justify this outrageous act at your hospital and innocent people being killed. It's just wrong.

I want to mention one other issue because it won't be in the headlines, but it's terribly important. When President Yeltsin and I were together in Moscow for the anniversary of the end of World War II, we talked about the problem of nuclear security. And I told him then I thought it was very important that we work closely together on the problem of

nuclear security, not just in Russia but in other countries where this is an issue, and on the problem of nuclear smuggling, because with so many terrorist groups around the world, we don't want small-scale nuclear weapons being added to their already impressive arsenals.

So when he came to this meeting, President Yeltsin suggested that we have a summit next year in Moscow dealing with these issues and involving many, many countries that have this problem. And I think we all agree. We think it's a very constructive suggestion. And we believe that, together, by next year we can make some real progress in making the world more secure for this problem in reducing the likelihood of nuclear smuggling and, ultimately, the likelihood of these small-scale weapons being used to further the cause of terrorism.

So that is one of the positive things that came out of this summit, from my point of view, along with the agreement we all made to work together more closely in fighting terrorism and the agreement we made to try to prevent further Mexican crisis and continued reform of the international financial institutions.

So from my point of view, this has been a very successful meeting. I know that the problem in Chechnya is occupying everyone's attention. The gripping scene at the hospital must have a hold on the imagination of the Russian people, very much like the explosion in Oklahoma City had on our people. And we join the Russian people in condemning terrorism in the strongest possible terms.

But we hope that in the end all the people of Russia, including the people in Chechnya, can be reconciled so that your democracy can flourish everywhere and the cycle of violence can be broken. And that is our prayer, and that is our policy.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The exchange began at 2:49 p.m. in the Cavalier Room at the Citadel Hotel. President Yeltsin spoke in Russian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

## Teleconference Remarks With the U.S. Conference of Mayors

*June 20, 1995*

***The President.*** Thank you. Thank you very much, Mayor Rice. And I want to begin by congratulating Mayor Ashe on a great year as president. I have enjoyed working with you very much. And I look forward to working with you, Norm, in the year ahead. I also want to say hello to some of my old friends in Miami. I see Mayor Daley and Mayor Clark are there. I understand that Secretary Brown and Secretary Cisneros are also both with you today.

Let me say before I go forward that I noticed in one of the previous sessions you had that it was suggested that we don't need the Department of Housing and Urban Development anymore. Let me say that I think Henry Cisneros and his whole team have done a magnificent job, and I don't think we want to send Andrew Cuomo to the beach just yet. I hope you agree.

I also want to thank all of you for giving me this chance to speak with you today. I'm very proud that our administration has worked in an unprecedented partnership with our cities, our communities, and especially our mayors. You make real budgets. You deal with real problems. You know the real concerns of our people as we try to restore the American dream. I'm looking forward to our continued cooperation. And I want to keep focused on the real problems our country faces.

You have heard in the previous speakers who have appeared before you strands of the great debates now going on in Washington and throughout our country. There are those who say that our primary problems are personal and cultural, not economic and political. There are those who say that the biggest problems we face are due to the fact that the Federal Government has too much authority and more ought to be given to the State and local level.

Well, I have to say to you that I'm glad to have these debates. I was making these arguments long before this Presidential election season, indeed, long before I became a candidate for President in 1992, when I was a Governor, working on the values prob-

lems we face, like teen pregnancy and youth violence and all kinds of personal irresponsibility in our society. You and I know that unless people do the right things themselves that we can't solve the problems of our society. And I was calling for a devolution of responsibility back to local and State governments long before I ever ran for President. So these are not just issues of a political season for me.

But let's keep our eyes on what we have to do in terms of the real problems that you deal with every day. We do have a values crisis in this country. We need to exalt responsibility and work and family and community. We need to be less violent, less irresponsible, and less divisive.

We do have an economic problem in this country. We've got years of stagnant wages and people who are working hard and being punished for it. We need to grow the middle class and shrink the under class and empower people to make the most of their own lives.

We've got a governmental problem in this country. We need a Government for the 21st century that is less bureaucratic and more entrepreneurial and more oriented toward partnerships where more is done at the grassroots level.

Now, I believe all that. But the question is, what are we going to do about it? And if we use a lot of rhetoric to divide the American people again and to divide the problems we face in terms of values as against economics and national as against local, instead of recognizing that what we need is to face these issues and all their aspects and we need a real hard-nosed partnership, then we'll be in trouble. After all, the problems that you face every day are the very reasons I ran for President. I believe we had to empower our people and our communities to meet the demands of change at the grassroots level where people live.

Now, there are some in Washington who believe we can make Government work just by juggling programs from the Federal bureaucracies to the State bureaucracies. You and I know that the right way is to give local governments, community organizations, and individual citizens and their neighborhoods the tools they need, the resources they need to improve their own lives.

In 1992, I laid out an agenda to send power, capital, and, most important of all, hope to the people who are working hard to make the most of their communities and their own lives. We still have a good ways to go, but I am proud that we have kept that commitment.

Look at what we have already achieved together: We created the empowerment zones and the enterprise communities, awarding tax incentives and grants to spur economic growth in 105 communities that also supports good values. We're creating a network of community development banks and financial institutions to lend, invest, provide basic banking services in places that need the most to the people who can do the most to change the social conditions we all want to change. We passed final regulations for the Community Reinvestment Act to help our banks and thrifts make good loans and investments, to help people rebuild our troubled communities. The SBA established one-shop—one-stop capital shops to distribute $3 billion in loans and investments for small and minority businesses over the next 5 years. We fought to save the community development block grants and our economic plan in the face of huge opposition.

Now, those are the things that we have done together—just some of the things we've done together. Now it's up to us to continue a partnership to create jobs, raise incomes, lift living standards, and improve the values and the strength of our communities. We can do that, and we have done that, working with the new Congress.

I have supported and signed into law, for example, the bill to minimize the unfunded mandates that tell you what to do without giving you the resources to do it. I was proud to do that. But I also want you to know that I vetoed the rescission bill in part because of the cuts that affect you directly. For example, the Congress in this rescission bill would cut grants to cities that have already been obligated to make our water safer. These grants were already committed; the letters had gone out. To cut them now would be worse than an unfunded mandate; it would be a defunded mandate. And I don't intend to let that happen.

Another reason I vetoed the rescission bill is because the Congress had cut the community development financial institutions and added language which made it almost impossible for them to operate. I am proud that we've already awarded one large bank in Los Angeles, and we've got more work to do on that front. We shouldn't turn back now from a proven commitment that will bring free enterprise to the most distressed areas of our country.

Now, we have to approach a new budget. And as we do it, I want to continue to work together with you to seize this opportunity to build a stronger future for all of our people, to do it in a way that supports our economic interests and our values and works to reform the Government and give you more responsibility.

For the first time in a long, long time, the leaders of both political parties now share the will to balance the Federal budget. That's an important issue, and I want to talk about it just a moment. We know that that requires some tough calls. But if we can balance the budget, it will mean in the years ahead there'll be more money to invest in our people, in our cities, and in our future, and less money that has to be spent just paying interest on yesterday's debt. The difficult task ahead is for us to have the will necessary to do it and to cast partisanship aside so that we can get the job done in a way that helps instead of hurts the long-term prospects of our people. We need a budget that balances debts and credits but also keeps our values in balance. That's what our responsibility as leaders demands.

We faced that challenge together in the first 2 years of our administration when we cut the deficit by $1 trillion in 7 years and still were able to invest in the tools that our communities and our people have to have to compete and win in the global economy. The work now has to go on.

Now, with that in mind, last week I outlined my plan to eliminate the deficit in 10 years. My plan cuts Federal spending by $1.1 trillion, on top of the $1 trillion in deficit reduction enacted in our '93 budget plan. This new budget does not raise taxes. It is disciplined, it is comprehensive, and it is serious. It won't be easy, but we need to do it, and we can. Our plan proves that you can balance the budget and still invest in things that will keep America strong and growing, like education, health care, research, and technology.

To accomplish these goals we have to focus on five basic priorities. First, we've got to help people make the most of their own lives. That means, while we cut the deficit, we should increase investment in education, not cut it.

Second, we have to control health care costs, but we should do it by strengthening Medicare, saving Medicaid, reforming them, not by slashing services for the elderly. We can maintain benefits by cutting costs through genuine reform, including cracking down on the substantial amount of Medicaid fraud and abuse and giving more incentives for more efficient and cost-effective ways of delivering care.

Third, we need to cut taxes but for the middle class, not for the wealthiest Americans who don't really need it.

Fourth, we can save money by cutting welfare, but we have to do it in a way that saves enough for investment to move people to work. The congressional proposals are too tough on children and too weak on work. We need to be tough on work and supportive of children.

And in that regard, I want to thank all of you there who, in the spirit of bipartisanship, have come out in support of our efforts to achieve real welfare reform that moves people from welfare to work. The bill that was recently introduced in the Senate by Senators Daschle and others achieves that objective, and those of you who are supporting it, I am very grateful for that. We can save funds, but we have to save enough to invest in people, to empower them to end welfare as we know it, not just to cut people off and not worry about the consequence to the children.

The fifth principle is to balance the budget in 10 years, not 7. Now, we could do it in 7 as some in Congress want, but there's no reason to inflict the amount of pain that would cause or to run the risk of recession. A highly respected economic group out of the Wharton Business School recently estimated that one of the Republican budgets

would actually cause a recession, driving unemployment to 8.6 percent and delaying balancing the budget by 2 years anyway.

Now in spite of all this, don't let anybody fool you. Balancing the budget in 10 years will require real cuts; it will cause real pain. We can and we should discuss where those savings should be found. We have to decide about whether the savings should come out of programs like the community development block grants, which I know are very important to you and which I have strongly supported. I still believe in them very strongly. But let me be straight with you. If we don't cut the community development block grant, then there will have to be some cuts in some other programs that you and I care about.

We have to do that if we're going to bring the budget into balance. But let me say again, we should do this. We should do this. We never had a huge structural deficit before the 12 years before I became President, before the years between 1981 and 1993. And I'll tell you how big the problem is. Right now, today, our budget would be in balance today if it were not for the interest we have to pay on the deficit run up between 1981 and 1993 in January. So we have got to turn this around. We cannot continue something that we only started 12 years ago.

But I want to remind you there is a big difference between my plan and the congressional plans. It's the difference between necessary cuts and unacceptable pain. It's the difference between a deficit reduction plan that goes to balance budgets and still invest in our future and one that cuts off our future. It's the difference between one that will reduce the deficit in ways that will promote long-term growth and one that will reduce the deficit in ways that risk a severe, near-term recession.

I am going to fight to avoid cutting education, hurting people on Medicare, undermining critical investments in our communities. It would be wrong to sacrifice those investments just to meet a 7-year deadline when we can get the job in 10 years. It would be wrong to cut in those areas that will help our people restore the American dream, raise our incomes, so that we can give a tax cut to people who don't really need it.

One of our most important challenges is to make sure that the American people feel more secure in their homes and neighborhoods as well. And therefore, I thank you again for joining me in the fight against crime and the fight for the crime bill last year. Without your support, we could not have possibly passed it, especially given the bitter opposition of some Members of Congress to the assault weapons ban and to giving cities the flexibility that you need in the prevention funds.

I know some of you had conflicting opinions and different needs when it came to our plan to provide 100,000 new police officers. But I believe we have a national crisis on crime because we don't have enough police officers on the street. Over 30 years we watched as the violent crime rate tripled and our police departments only increased by 10 percent. Now we've found the funds to pay for police in the right way. We cut unnecessary Government at the national level and sent the savings to our communities for more police officers. That is the kind of bargain the American people deserve. The philosophy behind that was to do what could be done to reduce crime.

But I would also remind you, under our plan, we gave localities enormous flexibility in spending the prevention funds because you know what works at the local level. It is ironic today that there are those who are trying to dismantle our national commitment to put 100,000 police on the street in the name of giving you more flexibility when less than a year ago they were saying that giving you more flexibility would lead to widespread abuse in the spending of Federal money.

The truth is that a lot of these programs to give you more flexibility, from welfare to crime, are really just ways to cut spending that invests in our future and our economy and our security. If we'll adopt my budget plan, we can give you more flexibility and still do those things and balance the budget. Behind all of these initiatives are not just shuffling from Federal to State bureaucracy, but trying to empower our people directly—is the philosophy that we are using to help our people meet the demands of the global economy in their own lives.

Some still say, as I said—let me just give you one example, finally—that we ought to trust the Federal Government to train our workers. We've got about 70 or 80 different training programs. Then there are some that say, ''No, let's give all these programs to State government.'' But I say, we shouldn't empower one bureaucracy over another.

In the future, in every one of your cities, the ability of the American people who live there to do well in the global economy will depend upon our ability to directly empower individual Americans, to directly empower them to make the most of their own lives, including having a lifetime right to constant reeducation and training.

So let me talk with you, finally, today about an effort that we're making now that would give people those most important tools they need to build better lives. It is central to the rebirth of your cities. If you have more people who can get good jobs and who can earn higher incomes, then so many of the problems that you face, so many of the problems you face will be lessened.

So here's how I want our people to get those jobs and to keep them in this global economy that is always demanding more and more of them. I want to do something that's modeled on the GI bill. Fifty years ago, as World War II was coming to an end, our country created the GI bill that gave a whole generation of Americans the education to create an unprecedented prosperity. What I have proposed today is a GI bill for America's workers—to help a whole new generation of Americans secure decent lives and decent incomes for themselves and their families.

The principle is simple: Education and training can no longer stop at high school. We've all got to keep on learning to keep pace with the dynamic global economy. And the best way to make it happen is to put the power directly in the hands of individual Americans who have to do the learning. Today there is a confusing maze of 70—at least 70—job-training programs sponsored by the Federal Government. What we want to do is to consolidate them into a single grant, and that grant will have but one purpose—to put money directly into the hands of people who need it.

Through our school-to-work initiative, we'll continue to help high school students or graduates who want further training get that in order to compete. Through our skilled grants, we'll help the worker who has lost a job, who is grossly underpaid and underemployed to take the responsibility to get a new leg up in the global economy. We also want to make it easier and cheaper for workers to get loans to build on their education. That means expanding, not cutting, Pell grants and direct student loans. And it means the right kind of tax cuts, not tax cuts for people who don't need them but tax cuts for middle income Americans who can use the money to invest in their training and their children's education. We propose a tax cut for the cost of all post-high-school education.

Now, these things will make opportunity real for more Americans and make opportunity real for more of your cities. The GI bill for America's workers will make it possible for more and better jobs for people who live in your communities and will help attract jobs and expand your economic base.

You think about it: If everyone considering investing in your communities knew that every person who wanted a job could get the job training in a direct voucher from the Federal Government, which could go to your community colleges, to get the kind of training they need, that would help us to do what you need to do. We want to make you a full partner in designing a system of adult education and job placement. That will mean that community colleges, which are the new lifeblood for so many of your citizens, will be even stronger and, more importantly, will mean that you will be able to use this as a tool to develop your own economies.

I believe this approach will play a major role in our goal, our common goal to restore the American dream. I'm pleased that this morning in the Los Angeles Times there was an article that I hope you've all had a chance to read, written by Al From, the president of the Democratic Leadership Council, a Democrat, and by Jack Kemp, the former Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, a Republican. Here's what they say about our GI bill. They say, quote, it ''offers an all-too-rare opportunity for Members of Congress of both parties to discard partisan

squabbling and cooperate on a measure that can help hard-working Americans acquire the skills they need to lift their incomes.'' ''The needs of this great country of ours demand that all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, ask ourselves the question: 'Can we make it work?' The correct answer is: We must.''

I could not have said it better. Al From and Jack Kemp, the Republicans and the Democratic mayors out there who are listening to me today, just remember, as we balance the Federal budget, as we help all Americans prepare for a bright future, we have got to seize this moment of great opportunity. We've got to put our national priorities above party politics and put the American people first. That's what I was trying to do when I had that conversation in New Hampshire with the Speaker of the House the other day.

This is a moment of immense promise. We can renew the American dream. But we have to work together, and we have to avoid trying to divide our people by false choices. Good economics, sound values, strong communities, a Government that works: that's what we really need, and I will work with you to achieve it.

Thank you very much.

[*At this point, Mayor Norman Rice of Seattle, WA, president, U.S. Conference of Mayors, thanked the President and asked about the prospects for welfare reform.*]

***The President.*** I think the prospects for real welfare reform really depend upon whether the Senate Republicans, or at least the block of moderate Republicans who understand these issues, will work with the Democrats on something like the Daschle bill.

You know, there is a hard core in the Senate who are demanding that there be no welfare reform bill unless all aid is cut off to unmarried mothers and their children born out of wedlock, even though the Catholic Church, the National Governors' Association, your group, everybody I know says that that would be unfair to children.

If the rest of the Republicans will leave that block and join with Senators Daschle and Breaux and Mikulski and the others who are on this bill, we could work out a bill that would make a real difference.

And let me say, one of the important things, I think, about the Daschle bill is that it really heavily emphasizes the importance of child care. As I look back over the time that has elapsed since, as a Governor, I worked on the welfare reform bill of 1988, if you ask me what its single biggest shortcoming was, I would say that we should have done more in child care.

And if we do what I have suggested here—and I think a lot of the Republicans want to do this—and we take all these various training programs and put them into a big block and let unemployed workers access them, then that could help to provide the training money for an awful lot of people on welfare who want to move to work, so that if the Daschle bill itself or any future amplification of it that could have bipartisan support in the Senate, could really focus on child care, I think we could get a welfare reform bill that is tough on work and good for children, instead of the other way around.

So I would urge all of you—especially the Republican mayors; you have a lot of allies in the Republican Party in the Senate—welfare reform ought to be a bipartisan issue. If we could get a good bill out of the Senate, I feel confident that we could have a bipartisan majority in the House that would vote for it as well if we could get it out of the conference committee.

So that is what I would implore you all to do. This is a huge deal for the United States. And the Daschle bill is an opening, an outreach for a genuine bipartisan compromise that doesn't just dump a lot of money back on the States and localities—excuse me, a lot less than you used to have in a way that would lead to people being cut off with nothing good happening.

[*Mayor Richard M. Daley of Chicago, IL, vice president, U.S. Conference of Mayors, thanked the President for his efforts to prevent crime and asked what the mayors could do to ensure continued funding for policing and other crime prevention efforts.*]

***The President.*** I think, Mayor, what you have to do is to, again, emphasize in the Senate where this is being debated and ulti-

mately in the conference committee that we need to have more flexibility for the cities but that it is unacceptable, at least for me and I hope for many of you, to come off of our commitment on 100,000 police.

I have watched many panels, and I've seen a lot of your mayors on C-Span. You know, I actually get to watch you as well as you watching me, and I know that some of the mayors believe that we've been too firm on the police requirements, because some cities have already increased their police forces and can't take maximum advantage of this. But I have to tell you, I think there is a national interest in increasing the police forces of this country by about 20 percent. And after all, this crime bill was funded by a reduction in the national employment of people in the Federal Government.

On the other hand, I have been strongly in favor of absolutely maximum flexibility for you in other aspects of the crime bill and would be in favor of even more flexibility in other aspects of the crime bill as long as we don't undermine our commitment to 100,000 police. If we can get more flexibility in the other areas of prevention and imprisonment, I would be in favor of it. I will work with you to do anything I can in that regard.

***Mayor Rice.*** Thank you, Mr. President. The next questioner is Paul Helmke, mayor of Fort Wayne.

***Mayor Helmke.*** It's good to have the opportunity to talk to you again, Mr. President.

***The President.*** Thank you.

[*Mayor Helmke, chair of the advisory board, U.S. Conference of Mayors, asked the President what could be done to ensure that Federal funds to cities remain flexible so mayors can meet the needs of their citizens.*]

***The President.*** First of all, Paul, let me say that I think that we have to do this. I didn't give you any specific numbers in my remarks, but let me tell you that even with a 10-year balanced budget plan, if you don't cut education and if you have a tax cut much smaller than the ones contemplated by either the Senate or the House, it would still require about a 20-percent overall cut in other discretionary spending because we're all at about the same place on where we think defense ought to be.

Now, that's over a 10-year period—for my budget at least. What I think we need to do here is, before this budget is actually passed in the fall or in late summer, but probably be in the fall, we need to know before the budget is passed what the new arrangements with our cities will be.

Let me just give you one example. I would like to preserve the community development block grant program, if we can. I have proposed it to be continued at the present level of funding in 1996. The Senate budget resolution proposes to cut it in half. What I think we ought to do—and I know—by the way, I wanted to compliment Secretary Cisneros. He has been waging a very strong fight within our administration to try to make sure that the cuts come in other areas and the community development block grant program is preserved at its present level. We could do that. You might argue that we could even increase it if some of the other categorical programs were folded into it so that if we are going to go forward here, maybe some new purposes should be added to it.

I am open to all that. I want to reduce regulation. I want to increase your flexibility, not just for the cities but for all local units. We just announced a 40-percent cut in the regulations of the Department of Education, for example. Most of you don't run your own school districts, but some of you do, and that will be important to you.

We are moving in the right direction here. But I think we have got to be willing, before this budget is passed, to sit down with the cities and, in fairness, also with the States and the counties, and try to design what the new agreement will be about this money and how it's going to be funded. And I think there are great opportunities for you to get some more flexibility and for you to determine how we ought to do it. And I am more than willing to go forward with you on that basis.

***Mayor Rice.*** Mr. President, we thank you very much for giving us this opportunity, and we will take the challenge to respond and open up a dialog that really moves this country forward in the interest of cities and the people that we represent.

***The President.*** Thank you. Mayor Rice, Mayor Daley, Mayor Helmke, thank you all. I appreciate your good work.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:15 a.m. from Room 459 of the Old Executive Office Building to the meeting in Miami, FL. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Victor Ashe of Knoxville, TN, immediate past president, U.S. Conference of Mayors, and Mayor Steve Clark of Miami, FL.

## Statement on House Action To Lift the Moratorium on Oil and Gas Drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf

*June 20, 1995*

Today's vote by a House subcommittee to lift the moratorium on oil and gas drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf would overturn a long-time bipartisan consensus on the need to protect the environment and economies of California, Florida, the Pacific Northwest, Alaska, and other coastal States.

This action is a mistake, and I will have no part of it. I will not allow oil and gas drilling off our Nation's most sensitive coastlines on my watch. America's coastlines are simply too important to our economy and our way of life.

This is yet another example of the zealous efforts of the Republican Congress to roll back environmental laws. Those laws serve the American people well, and I will fight to maintain them.

## Message to the Congress Transmitting the Latvia-United States Fishery Agreement

*June 20, 1995*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), I transmit herewith an Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Latvia Extending the Agreement of April 8, 1993, Concerning Fisheries Off the Coasts of the United States. The Agreement, which was effected by an exchange of notes at Riga on March 28, 1995, and April 4, 1995, extends the 1993 Agreement to December 31, 1997.

In light of the importance of our fisheries relationship with the Republic of Latvia, I urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this Agreement at an early date.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
June 20, 1995.

## Remarks at the Congressional Picnic

*June 20, 1995*

Let me welcome you to the back lawn of the White House. I believe this is the first time in 3 years we've done this when we have not had a tent. And thank goodness the weather cooperated. But as a result of that, we all have a lot more room to get up and walk around. And I think it's a little cooler and breezier than it normally is. We're delighted to have you all here.

I want to thank the Marine Free Country Band that was playing a little bit before we came up. They did a great job. And I want to say a special thanks to David Sanborne and the Manhattan School of Music Orchestra who are about to entertain us and who are quite wonderful.

We're going to listen to them play a few songs, and then I want—Hillary and I want to get up and kind of wander around and say hello to all of you. I want to thank you again for coming and echo the Vice President's words—we really look forward to this every year, a time when Members of Congress can come and bring their families and just relax and have a good time and enjoy this wonderful place that is America's home. I think it puts us all in a little better frame of mind. And I know it always energizes me to get up in the morning and go to work with a more positive outlook.

We're delighted to see you. We welcome you. And let's get on with the show. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:58 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

## Remarks at the Presidential Scholars Awards Presentation Ceremony

*June 21, 1995*

Thank you. That was one of the more unusual introductions I've ever had. [*Laughter*]

But I do have a lot more wrinkles inside and out than I had when I showed up here, grayer hair, and a few more scars, which are deeper wrinkles. But it has been a great joy, thanks in no small measure to people like those who have joined us here today.

I thank Secretary Riley and Secretary Kunin and all the fine people at the Education Department; the leaders of the education groups who are here; the members of the Commission for Presidential Scholars, Governor Sinner and others, who have served so well and who have selected all of you, so you know how wise they are. I thank them for their service to education which is really service to our future.

I want to make a brief announcement before I make the comments I have to make to you about education. Most of the people my age who were drawn into public service, as I hope each of you in your own way will become a public servant, even as a private citizen, were attracted by the example set by President Kennedy and the people who came into his administration. Many people now know that when I was about your age I met President Kennedy here in the Rose Garden 32 years ago next month. It inspired me and my entire generation to believe that we should ask not what our country could do for us, but what we could do for our country, how we could serve.

And when I became President I asked the American people to join me in a season of service. I asked the Congress to establish a national service corps, AmeriCorps, that would give our young people—and sometimes people who aren't so young—the opportunity to earn money for education but to do it by serving people here in our community, at the grassroots level, all across this country. That idea was inspired by the Peace Corps. And the Peace Corps continues the tradition of service that John Kennedy established to this day.

President Kennedy started the Peace Corps to help expand the circle of freedom and democracy when it was threatened by communism and by the cold war. But it has continued throughout all these years, in countries all across the globe, to help people solve real problems, to go beyond language and racial and ethnic and religious and the political differences to unite us at the most fundamental human level in fulfilling our potential. The Peace Corps is very, very important.

Just a few weeks ago, my Director of the Peace Corps, Carol Bellamy, had the great honor to be named the head of UNICEF on behalf of the United Nations. And now I have to replace her. And today I want to announce that the distinguished gentleman behind me, who has been my faithful friend and aide for many years and is now the White House Communications Director, Mark Gearan, will be the new Director of the Peace Corps.

Mark, please stand up. [*Applause*]

I think it would be fair to say that if we had a secret ballot for who the most popular person working in the White House is, Mark Gearan would probably win it in a walk. He has the understanding and the ability to build bridges and the tenacity to cross them. I am proud to nominate him to lead our Peace Corps into the 21st century, to keep the vision and the spirit of John Kennedy alive and the dream of America alive all over the world.

Thank you. Thank you very much.

I am very proud that all of you are here today, and I hope while you're here you'll have a chance to look around this magnificent city. I recently represented all of you in Kiev in the Ukraine, commemorating the end of World War II and the 50th anniversary of that. And the mayor of Kiev proudly told me that Kiev, of all the capital cities in the world, had the second largest percentage of its land in park land and forest, exceeded only by Washington, DC.

I think it is the most beautiful capital city in the world. It is also full of our common history. If you walk through the Capital or look at the White House or go over to the Lincoln Memorial or go up the hill leading to the eternal flame on President Kennedy's grave at Arlington, you have to imagine all that has taken place here. The White House just behind me has, after all, been here now for almost 200 years; it was opened in 1800. Every President but George Washington has lived here. And he, of course, was responsible for building it.

When you put your hand in the river of our history, you can't help being touched by

it and being changed by it. You have to be reminded of all this country has stood for and what it has accomplished. You also have to be sobered by the fact that not so far from here there live a lot of other young people your age who are among the poorest young people in our country, who live in some of the highest crime areas in our land, and have some of the most limited futures facing them.

I'm very proud of the fact that year before last my Secret Service detail gave to the First Lady and me, as a Christmas present, the adoption of one of those schools to try to help give those young people a better future as well.

Today, as every day, the fundamental purpose of America is to preserve our freedom, maintain our democracy, and do what is necessary to help the American people make the most of their own lives.

There is a great debate going on here in Washington today. Those who want to shrink our Government sometimes say that the real problems of America are not after all economic, political, or educational, they're just personal, moral, and if you will, cultural. Well, at one level they're obviously right. None of you was brought here today by a Government program. None of you was brought here today even by the teachers whom you brought with you. If you had not been willing to study, to work hard, to make the most of your own lives, you would not have won this award and you would not be going on to the rich and full lives that you will doubtless lead. But it is also true that none of us, none of us, from the President on down comes here to this tent alone. And to believe that is folly. We do have an obligation to make our country stronger so that we can make individual Americans stronger. And we do it together.

I ran for this job because I was really worried that your generation could become the first generation of Americans not to do as well as your parents. I ran for this job because I was worried that the diversity we have in our country, the incredible racial and ethnic diversity we have, could become more divisive than uniting, at a time when we're moving into a global society. And believe me, no country on the face of the Earth, no other great country has the asset America does in our diversity. Look around at you; look at each other.

This is something that any intelligent nation would kill for, because in the global economy of the 21st century, how we relate to people who live beyond our borders, how we trade with them, how we learn with them, how we avoid conflict with them, how we work through our differences in honorable ways, how we bridge those cultural barriers will determine in no small measure what your future will be like. And America, because we are home to so many different people—one of our counties, Los Angeles County, has over 150 different racial and ethnic groups within one county. That is our meal ticket to the future. It is in so many ways the American dream. It must not be allowed to divide us. So I wanted us to have a better future and a more united future.

Now today, we are facing some stark choices. I've worked hard for the last 2½ years to try to get this economy going and to give our country a strategy that would deal with the problems of the moment but always keep our eyes on the long run. It is our responsibility here to always be thinking of the next generation, even when we have to make unpopular decisions to do it.

So we had this huge Government deficit, something we never had to worry about before about 12 years before I became President. And I did my best to try to bring it down. And we have reduced it dramatically in 2 years, but we did it in a way that allowed us to still increase our investment in education, increase our investment in technology, increase our investment in medical research, increase our investment in the future.

Now, make no mistake about it, it's very important to get rid of the deficit. Let me just give you two examples of how important it is. Our budget would be in balance today, and your generation would not have to worry about that, but for the interest we pay on the debt run up in the 12 years before I became President—never mind the previous 200, just in that 12—we would be in balance.

Our interest payments on the debt are so large that next year they will exceed our defense budget. Every year if we have to pay more and more and more on interest on the

debt, it's less and less and less we can invest in education or technology or the care of poor young children or needy seniors. This is a big deal, and it matters.

But the question is, how can we do it in a way that is good for the long-run and the short-run futures of America? We're at an historic moment because for the first time leaders of both parties who conspired to increase the debt in the 1980's have now agreed that we should balance our budget. And that is a good thing.

We owe it to your generation to end the policy that is only—basically was 12 years old when I became President, that we should always, always run a deficit no matter what the condition of the economy is. But there is a very different approach, as the Secretary of Education has said, between what I think we ought to do and what the Congress believes we ought to do. And it will affect your future and the future of those who will be under this tent in the years ahead, when we are long gone from here.

Now we'll both, the Congress and I, have to agree that we have to make big budget cuts. And if we're going to reach an agreement, we're both going to have to agree to give up the chance to score small political points and instead score a big victory for all Americans. But there are real differences here. There's a big difference between necessary budget cuts and unnecessary pain. There's a real difference between creating a stronger economy with the right kind of balanced budget and actually driving the country into a recession with the wrong kind of balanced budget. And we have to recognize, as all of you know and you look out to the rest of the world, the budget deficit is not the only deficit we have. We still have some education deficits. We've still got a lot of poor children and some social deficits. We've still got some technology deficits we need to close. We have to make some investments even as we close the deficit.

Now, let me give you an idea of something you may already know but, just for example, so that nobody is under any illusion about what's going on, you probably all know that more than half the American people are working harder today for the same or lower incomes than they were making 15 years ago, when you take account of inflation. You may know that people my age, men between the ages of 45 and 55, after you adjust for inflation, are working harder and making on average 14 percent less than they were 10 years ago. Many of you may come from families with hard-working parents who have lost their jobs and been unemployed for protracted period of times or not been able to find new jobs that pay the same as their old jobs or have the same level of benefits.

More than anything else, this is because more and more people in America are working in a global economy where their income and their support is determined by their level of education. Earnings for high school dropouts have plummeted in the last 15 years; they've dropped by more than 25 percent. Earnings for people who just graduate from high school have dropped in the last 15 years. Earnings for people who get 2 or more years of college have gone up or at least held steady. Earnings for people who have a college degree have gone up. You may know young people who got out of college who are still having a hard time finding a job. I know there are some, and I'm very concerned about it. But still, playing the odds, education is more important to the economic future of individual Americans and our entire country than it has ever been.

Now, in this kind of circumstance, cutting education would be like cutting the defense budget at the height of the cold war. It will undermine our common security. And we can balance the budget without doing it, and that's exactly what we ought to do.

Let me just tell you, my proposal is to balance the budget in 10 years. We've taken—we've gotten rid of a third of the deficit in 2 years. So, over a 12 year period, we would go from a huge deficit to zero. This huge deficit was run up in 12 years; we can take it down in 12 years.

My proposal would not have big tax cuts for upper income people who are doing pretty well in our economy today and don't really need them. We would save that money and put it back into education and into medical care for the elderly and others who are in real need.

Those are the two principal differences. Those 3 years give you millions of dreams,

millions of American dreams. Let me tell you what a difference those 3 years and the size of the tax cuts can make. Specifically, I propose in my balanced budget to increase overall investment in education and training by $40 billion in 7 years. The Congress proposes to reduce our investment in education and training by $43 billion over the same period.

I propose to increase Head Start funding by $1.5 billion by 2002, to reach another 50,000 children, for a total of 800,000. The House budget would cut up to 200,000 people from this year's Head Start rolls.

In the Goals 2000 program, which is a local reform, national standards program that promotes all kinds of grassroots reform, we propose to reach another 44 million children in 85,000 schools with Goals 2000, to support reforms that include things that people in Congress say they're for, like character education and charter schools and more public school choice. That's what we propose to do—44 million children getting help. Congress would kill support for Goals 2000. We want our kids to be thinking about learning, not about their safety, so we want to keep funding for safe and drug-free schools. Congress would cut the program by 30 percent and just give it to the States to figure out what to do with it.

I bet most of you are going to college, and I hope you are. For you and millions of other Americans, here is what is at stake. We want to increase the phase-in of our Federal direct loan program. That means we'll have more college loans at lower cost and better repayment terms. That means $25 billion in loans to 6 million students a year at lower cost to everyone. The House budget proposal would eliminate the in-school interest exemption. That doesn't make a lot of sense to you. Let me tell you what it means.

It could mean that students who get college loans would have to pay $3,000 more for their loan than under our plan. We want more people going to college, not less. I just gave you the economic statistics—the more college graduates we have, the higher incomes you have, the more people are paying taxes, the faster you bring the budget down. Isn't it better to bring the budget down with educated citizens than by cutting our nose off to spite our face by cutting education and cutting the college loans? That is a big, big mistake.

We want to increase the Pell grants to reach almost a million more students and raise the maximum award because there are a lot of poor young people out there that deserve a chance to go to college and need those Pell grants. The congressional budget would freeze this proposal for 7 years at the present level.

We want to expand the national service program to give a million people a chance to serve their country and earn money for their education. The House of Representatives would eliminate it.

And we want to help adults as well. You know, when I was your age, over 80 percent of people who were laid off from their jobs were called back to the job they were laid off from. Now, over 80 percent of the people who are laid off from their jobs are not called back to the jobs from which they were laid off, and they have to try to find a new job. That is a stunning difference in a generation.

What does that mean? It means from the moment people are laid off they should be in a new training program if that's what they need. And we propose to collapse—the Department of Education, the Department of Labor are working on collapsing 70 different Government programs and adding more money into it to create a vast pool, kind of a scholarship pool for unemployed workers in America, so that they can apply and get a voucher or a chit worth $2,600 a year to take to their local community college for up to 2 years to get the training they need. Every unemployed person in America would have it from the day they were unemployed. It will make a big difference to the future of this country.

I am saying this to you because you are going to college in this time. Your lives will be lived in an environment created by the decisions we make today. We are not talking about luxuries; we are talking about the things that made this country great.

And I want to close by asking all of you—I know you were invited to bring a teacher with you, and I want to ask all the teachers to stand. But before I do, I want everybody to look at the teachers who stand up here and ask yourselves if we are really going to

build a better tomorrow by taking $40 billion away from their ability to create more students like you. I think the answer is clear.

Would all the teachers here please stand today. Give them a hand. [*Applause*]

Congratulations again on your magnificent award. Good luck with your future. I wish you well. Remember this: One thing only you owe your country, your devotion to making sure that every other young person in this country will always have the opportunities that brought you to this day.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:10 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

## Remarks on Surgeon General-Designate Henry Foster

*June 21, 1995*

***The President.*** Good afternoon. I'd like to begin by saying that I was quite pleased that 57 of the Members of the Senate today voted to allow a simple up or down, yes or no vote on the nomination of Dr. Foster. A strong majority, 57, voted to give him a fair chance and a full vote. But a small minority are using this nomination to dictate a litmus test to the rest of America.

That is wrong. And the American people are not going to understand it. The Senators who voted to deny Dr. Foster an up or down vote did a disservice to a good man. They also did a disservice to our whole system of democracy. And make no mistake about it, this was not a vote about the right of the President to choose a Surgeon General. This was really a vote about every American woman's right to choose.

Henry Foster is qualified to be our Surgeon General. He spent 38 years in medicine. He spent a lot of his time working to improve the health of women and children in poor and rural areas. He's delivered thousands of babies and trained hundreds of young doctors. His efforts to curb teen pregnancy have earned him high praise among Republicans and Democrats. He shares my view that abortion should be rare and safe and legal.

Don't you think it's interesting that we finally found a person in this country who's actually done something, actually done something to try to reduce teen pregnancy, actually done something to try to convince large numbers of young people that they should not have sex before they're married, who's actually done something to deal with this problem, but because he cannot pass the political litmus test that has a stranglehold on the other party, they cannot even allow a simple vote? Did the Democratic Senate deny a simple vote to their controversial nominees for the Supreme Court, a lifetime job? No.

This man got 57 votes—43 people say no because they are in the grip of people who don't question my right to choose him but question American women's right to choose. It is wrong. What's fair is fair, and he ought to get an up or down vote. He's actually done something about the problem they all claim to be concerned about, and he ought to be given a chance to do something about it for the whole country.

[*At this point, Dr. Foster made brief remarks.*]

***The President.*** Let me just say one other thing. Let me remind you that the committee approved Dr. Foster's nomination. This should be about whether the President has a right to make this decision if the person is qualified. The committee ruled that he was. The only other question worth asking and answering right now is, are we going to try for another vote? Yes, we are. Do I know what the outcome will be? No, I don't. But I'm not through yet, and we're going to do our best to win it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:36 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

## Letter to Senator Robert Byrd on Proposed Drunk Driving Legislation

*June 21, 1995*

*Dear Robert:*

Drinking and driving by young people is one of the nation's most serious threats to public health and public safety. I am deeply concerned about this ongoing tragedy that kills thousands of young people every year. It's against the law for young people to drink.

It should be against the law for young people to drink and drive.

As you know, earlier this month, I called on Congress to make Zero Tolerance the law of the land. I support your amendment to the National Highway System Designation Act, which would achieve this goal.

A decade ago, we decided as a nation that the minimum drinking age should be 21. In 1984, President Reagan signed bipartisan legislation to achieve this goal, and today all 50 states have enacted such laws. Our efforts are paying off—drunk driving deaths among people under 21 have been cut in half since 1984.

But we must do more. Twenty-four states and the nation's capital have enacted Zero Tolerance laws that consider a driver under age 21 to be ''driving while impaired'' after just one full drink of alcohol. These laws work—alcohol-related crashes involving teenage drivers are down as much as 10–20 percent in those states. If all states had such laws, hundreds more lives could be saved and thousands of injuries could be prevented.

I commend your efforts today, and I urge the Senate to pass your amendment.

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 12964—Commission on United States-Pacific Trade and Investment Policy

*June 21, 1995*

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.) (the ''Act''), and in order to establish a Commission on United States-Pacific Trade and Investment Policy, it is hereby ordered as follows:

***Section 1.*** *Establishment.* (a) There is established the Commission on United States-Pacific Trade and Investment Policy (''Commission''). The Commission shall be composed of 15 members to be appointed by the President. Members shall (1) be chosen from the private sector (businesses, unions, academic institutions, and nonprofit corporations); and (2) have substantial experience with selling agricultural products, manufactured goods, or high-value-added services to Asian and Pacific markets or be knowledgeable from their personal or professional experience about the trade barriers or their industry and government policies and practices, formal and informal, that have restricted access by U.S. business to Asian and Pacific markets.

(b) The President shall designate a Chairperson and Vice Chairperson from among the members of the Commission.

***Sec. 2.*** *Functions.* (a) On or before February 1, 1996, the Commission shall report to the President on the steps the United States should take to achieve a significant opening of Japan, China, and other Asian and Pacific markets to U.S. business. The report also shall identify trade and investment impediments to U.S. business in Asian and Pacific markets and provide recommendations for reducing the impediments. The report's recommendations shall reflect the goal of securing increased access for U.S. business to Asian and Pacific markets, by the turn of the century, in such a way that a maximum number of high-wage jobs are created and maintained in the United States. The Commission also shall recommend to the President (1) measures to strengthen, if necessary, ongoing programs for regular monitoring of progress toward this goal, including the periodic assessment of the nature and scope of trade and investment impediments; and (2) realistic measurements of trade and investment activity in Asia and the Pacific, which consider all relevant factors, including the composition of trade and intracompany trade and investment patterns.

(b) The Commission shall decide by a three-fifths vote which recommendations to include in the report. At the request of any Commission member, the report will include that Commission member's dissenting views or opinions.

(c) The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions, hold meetings at such times and places as the Commission may find advisable.

***Sec. 3.*** *Administration.* (a) To the extent permitted by law, the heads of executive departments, agencies, and independent instrumentalities shall provide the Commission, upon request, with such information as it may require for the purposes of carrying out its functions.

(b) Upon request of the Chairperson of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency or instrumentality shall, to the extent permitted by law and subject to the discretion of such head, (1) make any of the facilities and services of such agency or instrumentality available to the Commission; and (2) detail any of the personnel of such agency or instrumentality to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties.

(c) Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation for their work on the Commission. While engaged in the work of the Commission, members appointed from the private sector may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons serving intermittently in the Government service (5 U.S.C. 5701–5707) to the extent funds are available for such purposes.

(d) To the extent permitted by law and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Department of Commerce shall provide the Commission with administrative services, facilities, staff, and other support services necessary for performance of the Commission's functions.

(e) The United States Trade Representative shall perform the functions of the President under the Act, except that of reporting to the Congress, in accordance with the guidelines and procedures established by the Administrator of General Services.

(f) The Commission shall adhere to the requirements set forth in the Act. All executive branch officials assigned duties by the Act shall comply with its requirements with respect to the Commission.

***Sec. 4.*** *General Provision.* The Commission shall terminate 30 days after submitting its final report.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
June 21, 1995.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:39 p.m., June 22, 1995]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 22, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on June 26.

## Remarks at a Groundbreaking Ceremony for the Women in the Military Service Memorial

*June 22, 1995*

Thank you very much. Thank you, General Mutter. Thank you to all the fine active duty and veteran women, servicepeople who have just speaken—spoken. Speaken! I can't even talk, I'm so excited. [*Laughter*]

I'll tell you, when our wonderful World War I veteran got through talking, I thought there's no point in my saying a word. It has all been said. I thank all the members of our military, beginning with the Secretary of Defense, the Service Secretaries, General Shalikashvili, the Joint Chiefs, those who preceded them—I see General Powell and others here—for their support of this endeavor. I thank the Members of Congress who are here. General Vaught, I thank you for your determination. I don't believe that anyone in the United States could have said no to you on any important matter; I know I couldn't. And I congratulate you on this triumph of your vision and will.

To all the remarkable servicewomen who surround me here, out in the audience and on the podium, let me say to all of you: Thank you for your service to America. We are all proud to be here to break ground on a memorial that will recognize a contribution that you have made far beyond the call of duty.

Women have been in our service, as has been said, since George Washington's troops fought for independence, clothing and feeding our troops and binding their wounds. They were in the struggle to preserve the Union as cooks and tailors, couriers and scouts, even as spies and saboteurs. Some were so determined to fight for what they believed that they masqueraded as men and took up arms.

Women were there during the two World Wars, and slowly, our military establishment that for decades had sought to limit women's

roles brought them in to serve as WACS and WAVES, SPARS and WASPS and Women Marines. In our Nation's shipyards and factories, women helped to build democracy's arsenal. From the beaches of Normandy to the Pacific Islands, they endured bombs, torpedoes, disease, deprivation to support our fighting forces.

Despite this history of bravery and accomplishment, for very much too long women were treated as second class soldiers. They could give their lives for liberty, but they couldn't give orders to men. They could heal the wounded and hold the dying, but they could not dream of holding the highest ranks. They could take on the toughest assignments, but they could not take up arms. Still, they volunteered, fighting for freedom all around the world but also fighting for the right to serve to the fullest of their potential. And from conflict to conflict, from Korea to Vietnam to the Persian Gulf, slowly, women have overcome the barriers to their full service to America.

The past few decades have witnessed a remarkable series of firsts: the first woman company commander, the first female service academy graduate, the first woman skipper, the first female fighter pilot, the firsts that are here with us today. Twenty-five years ago this month, Anna Mae McCabe Hays became the first woman promoted to general. Hazel Johnson-Brown was the first minority woman to reach that rank. And 2 years ago, it was my honor to nominate the Secretary of the Air Force, Sheila Widnall, to become the first woman to head one of our service branches. I am honored to be with all of them today.

But just as important as these firsts are those who have followed them, proving that they were not an accident or an aberration, for women today are test pilots and drill sergeants, squadron commanders and admirals, academy instructors and service recruiters. I am very proud of the fact that during our administration almost 260,000 new positions in the military have been opened to women who wish to serve.

And I might say that this is a tribute not only to the women in the service, but to the men in leadership positions who had the wisdom and the understanding and the ability to proceed with this remarkable transformation and strengthening of our military in a climate of tolerance and teamwork and respect. I know of no other institution in our society which could have accomplished so much in such an incredibly efficient and humane and professional way. And so we should be proud of all who played a role in that.

And let me say, before I go further, our Nation, as you know, is involved now in a great debate over the subject of affirmative action. Before people rush to judgment, I would like to remind all Americans that the United States military is the strongest in the world because it has found a way to make the most of the talents of every American without regard to gender or race. And as a nation, we must continue to search for ways to make the most of the talents of every American without regard to gender or race.

There are so many individual stories, the stories that this memorial will tell. But in their detail and drama, they help us understand more of what has occurred than the speeches we can give. Some of these women are here today, and I would like to ask them to stand:

Women like June Wandrey Mann who volunteered for the Army Nurse Corps in the Second World War, who served 2½ years overseas from primitive field hospitals in Tunisia and Italy, to a center for concentration camp survivors outside of Munich. In her courage and caring, Lieutenant Wandrey represents the best of America. Would you please stand. [*Applause*] Thank you. And I might add, you still look terrific in your uniform.

Women like Charity Adams Earley, who was mentioned earlier, the Women Army Corps' first African-American officer. Along with thousands of other African-American veterans, both men and women, she helped our Nation act on a truth too long denied, that if people of different races could serve as brothers and sisters abroad, surely they could learn to live together as neighbors at home. Colonel, would you please stand. [*Applause.*] And I might add, she gives a resounding speech.

Women like U.S. Air Force Captain Teresa Allen Steith of the 60th Air Mobility Wing from Travis Air Force Base in Califor-

nia, who was among our first soldiers to set down in Haiti last year, and who, for 3 months, helped planes and troops and cargo move in and out of the Port-au-Prince airport. Because she and the rest of our troops did their job so well, the people of Haiti now remarkably have a second chance at democracy. And this Sunday—this Sunday—they will be going to the polls to exercise their newfound rights for the first time in 5 years. And this time, they won't be stolen from them, thanks to people like you, Captain. Thank you very much, and God bless you.

Women like Barbara Allen Rainey, the mother of two daughters, the Navy's first female aviator. Tragically, the victim of a training crash, her story reminds us that even in peacetime, those who wear the uniform face danger every day. Now she rests just behind me in the quiet of these sacred grounds.

This memorial will tell the stories of these women and hundreds of thousands more. It makes a long overdue downpayment on a debt that we will never fully repay, a debt we owe to generations of American women in uniform who gave and continue to give so much to our country and a debt we owe yet to future generations of women who will in the future dedicate their own lives to the defense of our freedom.

May this memorial say to each and every one of them: We cherish your devotion; we admire your courage; we thank you for your service.

God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:10 p.m. at Arlington Cemetery. In his remarks, he referred to Maj. Gen. Carol Mutter, USMC, Commander, Marine Corps Systems Command, and Brig. Gen. Wilma Vaught, USAF (ret.).

## Remarks on Senate Action on the Nomination of the Surgeon General in Edison, New Jersey

*June 22, 1995*

Good afternoon. Today 43 Republicans in the Senate failed the fundamental test of fairness. By choosing to side with extremists who would do anything to block a woman's right to choose, those Senators have done a disservice to a good man, done a disservice to the nominating process, and sent a chilling message to the rest of the country.

The American people are smart enough to see through what just happened. They know this is not about my right to choose a Surgeon General; this is about the right of every woman to choose. The committee recommended Dr. Foster to the Senate. A clear and substantial majority of Senators were prepared to vote for his nomination. But a determined minority succumbed to political pressure and abused the filibuster rule.

It's wrong for a man as qualified and committed as Dr. Foster to be denied this chance to serve our country. He has gone where too few of us have ever dared to go. He has ridden the rickety elevators in high-rise projects to talk to young people about the importance of abstinence and avoiding teen pregnancy. He has traveled the backroads of rural Alabama, bringing health care and hope to women and children who would otherwise have never seen a doctor. He has been a father figure to many children who do not see their own fathers.

He has actually done something, in short, about the problems a lot of people in Washington just talk about. He's done something about teen pregnancy. He's done something to convince young people to abstain from sex. He's done something about women's health and crime prevention and giving young people hope for the future. One of his former patients even talked about how he talked her out of having an abortion.

Now, you would think that those who deplore teen pregnancy, advocate abstinence, and oppose abortion would want to support a man who has actually done something to advance the aims they say they share, instead of just use them as political weapons. But no, in their brave new world, raw political power and political correctness—pure political correctness—are all that matter. They are determined to call the tune to which the Republican Party in Congress and in their Presidential process march.

Well, they won a victory today, but America lost. And all those young people who came up here from Tennessee, what about them? What about those young people that came here believing in the congressional process and told the Members of Congress

that Dr. Foster had encouraged them to avoid sex, to stay away from teen pregnancy, not to do drugs, to stay in school? They had a role model, and they saw their role model turned into a political football. In 1995, Henry Foster was denied even the right to vote.

A minority in the Senate may have denied him this job, but I am confident that he will go on to serve our country. I think more of Henry Foster today than the first day I met him. This is not a good day for the United States Senate. But it is a good day for Henry Foster. He didn't get what he deserved, but he is still deserving. Those who denied him the right to a vote, they may have pleased their political bosses, but they have shown a lack of leadership that will surely be remembered.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 3:45 p.m. at the landing area at the Ford Motor Plant.

## Remarks to Ford Motor Company Employees in Edison

*June 22, 1995*

***The President.*** Thank you very much. I like your spirit.

***Audience member.*** Give 'em hell, Bill!

***The President.*** You help, and I will. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Denton and Earl and Peter for being here with me today. I want to say a special word of thanks to Ford Motor Company for being a good partner with the United States of America to build our economy and to get a fair trade policy and to do a lot of things we need to do in this country. Ford has been a good citizen of this Nation and has helped immeasurably to further the aims of this administration. I thank you, Peter, and I thank all of you for the contribution you have made to that.

Some of you may know that my main claim to your affection is that I own a car that's older than some of the people who work here. I own a 1967 Mustang, and Mustangs were made here in this plant from '65 to '70, here and in San Jose, California. And I own one of them. And I enjoy having it.

I want to talk to you today very briefly about two things: one of them has already been discussed, trade; the other is what we can do here at home to build up our economy and strengthen our people.

I ran for the job that I now hold because I was really concerned that we were going to raise the first generation of Americans who wouldn't do as well as their parents. It bothered me that more than half of our people were working a longer workweek for the same or lower wages they were making 15 years earlier. It bothered me that we were coming apart with all of the social problems and tensions we had in this country when we need to be working together.

You've proved in this plant that if you work together you can compete and win and do well. And that's what America has to do. And I have done everything I could for 2½ years to try to restore the American dream—not only to create jobs, but to raise incomes and to give working families some security, that if they do work hard and play by the rules they're going to be all right and our children are going to be all right. That, it seems to me, is the most important thing we can do.

There are a lot of things we can talk about, but I just want to talk about two today that are very important. The first is, what do we do about the economy here at home. The second is, how do we relate to the rest of the world.

And let me talk a little about the economy here at home. When I became President, we had just finished 12 years in which we had quadrupled—increased by fourfold—the national debt—by fourfold. But we were reducing our commitment to the things that make us rich, to education, to technology, to building the skills and the technology and the kind of partnerships that really generate jobs and incomes in the world today. So what I tried to do was to flip that around. I tried to bring the deficit down but to increase our investment in education, technology, basic research, and to form a real partnership with the private sector to help to sell American products.

Now, we have reduced the deficit by about $1 trillion over a 7-year period. We have increased our investments in education, research, and technology. We are working

more closely with business than ever before. And we have to show for it a lower unemployment rate and over 6.7 million new jobs. I am proud of that. But we have to remember that we've been getting into the rut we've been in for 20 years. And I'll just give you two examples. We created 6.7 million new jobs, the unemployment rate went down, but the average income of the American people didn't go up. We have to keep working on that. People have to be rewarded for their work. We can't expect working people to make a profit for their companies unless they can also make a profit for themselves.

Now, you've got a unique situation in Washington where the leaders of Congress want to balance the budget, and that's a good thing. And I do, too, and that's a good thing. Why is that important? I'll tell you why it's important. Because if it were not for the interest we have to pay—I want you all to listen to this—if it weren't for the interest we have to pay on the debt this country ran up in just the 12 years before I became President—forget about the other 200 years—just those 12 years, our budget would be in balance today, and we would have more money to spend on your children's education; more money to spend on the health care of elderly people through Medicare and Medicaid; more money to spend on new technologies to guarantee Americans good jobs in the future. So we need to get rid of this deficit.

But the question is, how should we do it? Keep in mind, every day my objective is more jobs, higher income, more security for people who are working hard. That's what I go to work and try to guarantee. So there's a big difference between my budget and the one the leaders of Congress have proposed because I think mine will do more for jobs, incomes, and security of families.

Here's what the differences are. First, we cut spending, except for defense, Social Security, and medical costs, about 20 percent across the board, except for education; we increase spending on education. I think your children should be able to go to college. They should be able to get good training programs. They should be able to be in good pre-school programs. I think that's important.

Second, we want to slow the rate of growth in the medical costs the Federal Government pays; that's Medicare and Medicaid, which is mostly for elderly people and disabled people. But I don't want to charge middle and lower middle income elderly people on Medicare more money for the same health care, and I don't want to see them have to give up their health care. So we cut medical costs less than the Congress does because I think it's important to protect Medicare and to protect the people who are on it who have paid into it and who don't have enough money to live on as it is.

Third, we have a much smaller tax cut than they do, and ours is targeted not to upper income people but to middle class people and focused on education and child rearing. I think everybody ought to get a tax deduction for the cost of sending their kids to college. I am for that.

The fourth thing we do is to save money on welfare spending. But I want to be honest with you, we don't save as much money as the Congress does because I think we should hold some money back to give to the purpose of education and training and child care for people on welfare so you can actually get them to work. We don't want to cut these kids off and put them in the street. We want people to go to work and be good parents and good workers. So we ought to invest enough in child care and education to get that done. So we do that.

And the fifth thing that my plan does is to balance the budget over 10 years. They balance the budget over 7 years. If you go to 10 instead of 7, you can increase education, not cut it; you can protect elderly people on Medicare; you can invest enough in welfare to get real welfare reform to put people to work; and you don't have to risk a recession.

The Wharton Business School over in Philadelphia, not far from here, did an analysis of the congressional budget and estimated that they're cutting so much out of the economy so fast it would drive unemployment up and slow the economy down. We want to lower interest rates, free up money, balance the budget in ways that grow the economy.

So when you hear these debates—I want to work with the Congress. I don't want a partisan fight. I want to put America first. I want you to know, if somebody tells you

that we don't need to balance the budget, that's not true, because every year we don't balance the budget, we're spending more and more of your tax money on interest payments and less money on things that we all want. We do need to do it, but the aim is your jobs, your incomes, your family security. And the test of every decision we make should be, is it going to increase those. And I think my budget does that.

Now, the second point I want to make is we can't grow the American economy alone if we don't have the right kind of relationship with the rest of the world. We know—you sell these trucks here all over the world, don't you? And we know that your earnings are above the national average, aren't they? And we know generally that jobs related to trade in America pay better than jobs that have no relationship to the global economy. We also know that because of all the changes you and others have been through, millions of people like you in America in the last 15 years, we are the high quality, low cost producer of many, many, many products that can be sold all over the world.

So I have done my best to negotiate agreements that would open markets around the world and make everybody else's market as open as ours. We're opening markets to the south of us in Latin America, and you're selling some trucks down there. We're opening markets with Europe and other countries. We have had all kinds of new trade agreements.

Even with Japan, we have had 15 new trade agreements, so that we're selling rice and apples and cellular telephones over there for the first time. This movement toward open trade now that America is competitive is a good thing for us. Why? Because we have open markets. So we can't stop some people from being at risk from low cost competition if it's generally low cost and good quality. We can't stop that. But if we don't get a fair deal going the other way, then we get it coming and going. We don't have a chance to create the high-wage jobs from trade to replace the low-wage jobs that we lose. And we don't have the chance to give people the security they deserve if they are competitive in the world market. That is what is at stake.

Now, here's the problem. Our relationship with Japan has simply been different than that with everybody else. And their system of protecting their products and their markets is different from the things you can normally reach with a trade agreement. They're not necessarily tariffs; they're not necessarily quotas. It's a highly complicated system of doing business that works to freeze us out.

You know, your leader has said he didn't know the exact numbers. I'll tell you what the exact numbers are over the last 20 years. Twenty years ago we had less than one percent of the Japanese market in automobiles. You know what it is today: 1.5 percent. Big deal. Since we have been trading cars both ways, we have shipped a total, cars and trucks, of 400,000 vehicles to them. They have shipped a total of 40 million to us.

***Audience members.*** Boo-o-o!

***The President.*** Now, that's a hundred to one. Now, if all this were fair and they didn't want to buy anything we had produced and we were buying what they had to produce, it would be fine. In auto parts—forget about what you do here; let's just talk about auto parts—with the whole rest of the world, we have a $5.8 billion surplus. That's a huge number of jobs. Every billion dollars is about 17,000 more jobs; it's a lot of jobs. With them, we have a deficit in auto parts of over $12 billion a year.

Now, you say, well, if it were fair it would be all right. These luxury cars that are at issue here in our trade dispute, you can buy some of them for $9,000—they're made in Japan, right—you can buy some of them for $9,000 less here in America than they pay in Japan for them. A carburetor made in Japan costs 3 times as much there as it does here. I am for free trade, but I am for fair trade, and that's not fair. And you know it's not fair.

And guess what? It's not good for them. They're rolling in dough, but their economy is not growing. Their people look like they're making more money than you are, but they're paying 40 percent more for all of their consumer products. So the average working stiff in Japan is not doing much better than a lot of people in other countries, not doing as well as many American workers, and would be doing much better if they had free and open competition and it drove down the

prices that their consumers are paying, because as you well know, when you pay the bills every month, every worker is also a consumer.

What I am trying to do is not just good for us; it's good for them. They're a great democracy. We work together on a lot of things. But you know we had to change; all of us did. A lot of you went through gut-wrenching changes in the last 20 years to make sure this plant would be recognized for its low error rate and its high quality production. We all have to change. Their system is not fair. And that is what we are trying to get done. We're trying to open it so that you will have free access to their markets like they have to ours. And it's a fight worth making.

Now today and tomorrow, in Switzerland, the representatives of our Government and the Japanese are talking, and they're trying to avoid what's going to happen next week. But on the 28th, if we don't have an agreement that will take us toward opening their markets and fair treatment for American products and American workers, then I have ordered the U.S. Trade Representative to put tariffs of 100 percent on 13 of their luxury cars.

I want to say again, I think you can compete with anybody where you get a fair shot. If people don't want what we produce, that's a different story. But I think it is wrong for America to be leading the way in opening our markets and putting our workers at risk in competition and not have the same rights in every other major market, in countries that are as rich as we are. That is not right. You deserve a fair chance.

So I want you to think about this. Every time you wonder what we're doing up there or you see a fight going on in Washington, you just remember my test is: Will it create jobs; will it raise incomes; will it make working people more secure if they're doing their part? That's what I think about every day. If everybody in this country had a job, if every job paid enough to support children, we wouldn't have a lot of the problems we have today.

You know, there's a lot of talk about how angry voters are—or angry men are. Well, you know, one reason is that 60 percent of the hourly wage earners in this country are working a longer workweek for about 15 percent less than they were making 10 years ago. If that wouldn't make you mad, I don't know what would.

Now, you can lead the way. The auto companies now can lead the world. And they can lead America back toward a high-wage, high-growth economy. I don't want any special breaks, but I do want a fair deal. If you get a fair deal, if you have a Government that works for you, that invests in your education, that gets rid of this deficit, that looks toward the future, I think you can take care of your families and your communities and the future of our country. But I'm going to be in there plugging for you. You stay with us, and we'll get the job done together.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:19 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to Denton Grenke, plant manager, and Peter J. Pestillo, executive vice president, Ford Motor Co.; and Earl Nail, bargaining unit chairman, UAW Local 980.

## Remarks at a Fundraising Dinner in Somerset, New Jersey

*June 22, 1995*

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. Let me begin by joining with Al and Tipper and Hillary and thanking tonight's dinner chairs, Al Decotis, Lew Katz, Ray Lesniak, Jack Rosen, and Bob Raymar. They were terrific, and so were all of you. Thank you for your remarkable help.

I am also delighted to be here with two of my former colleagues, former Governor Brendan Byrne and former Governor Jim Florio. I thank them and their wonderful wives for coming tonight.

I want to say something selfish. I think New Jersey did a good thing for New Jersey by reelecting Frank Lautenberg. But we needed him back, and I saw it today on the floor of the Senate. And this country needs Bill Bradley, and you must—you must—send him back to the United States Senate and the United States.

I have always loved coming here. I have been, frankly, rather astonished from the beginning of my campaign that the State of

New Jersey was so good to me, beginning way back in 1991, when I was a stranger from a small southern State, as my former adversary, Mr. Bush, used to say. And every time I came here I always felt at home. I felt that I understood the people. I felt a certain kinship.

And when we began our general election campaign here with the bus tour, and then ended up in the Meadowlands and then New Jersey—I have heard it a thousand times—always closes Republican, but it didn't close enough to take the State away from the Clinton-Gore ticket. I was profoundly grateful.

And now I come to say to you, I thank you for this remarkably successful dinner. It will enable Terry McAuliffe and Laura Hartigan and all of our finance staff to continue on their goal of financing our campaign next year and this year so that I can devote my energies to being President and to running in a responsible way. And you have done a very great thing. But I also want to tell you that we need your help, beginning tomorrow morning, to talk to everyone you can about what is really at stake in this election.

I have to tell you that there are differences now in Washington more profound than the partisan differences even of the last 2 years and certainly of the last 50 years. There are also opportunities to work together. And which way we take in the next few months will be determined in part by what the American people say. And whether we keep going forward or take a huge lunge off center will be determined by how the American people vote in 1996.

I want to say to all of you that I never could have dreamed when I started this that our partnership, the one Hillary and I have enjoyed with Al and Tipper Gore, would have been as remarkable as it has been. I thank Tipper for her tireless advocacy for the interests of mental health and women and young girls and so many other things that she has fought for. And I have said this repeatedly, but I believe with all my heart that Al Gore will go down in American history as the most influential and productive Vice President in our country's history.

The other day we had the White House Conference on Small Business in Washington. There were 3,500 delegates there, and I think we had only appointed about 300; the rest were elected from their States, and well over half of them were Republican. And all they had been—a lot of them had just been fed this sort of propaganda, this steady stream of propaganda people put out. And the Vice President got up and introduced me, and we talked about our reinventing Government program.

We reminded them that we had increased their ability to write off their capital expenses by about 70 percent, that we had offered a capital gains tax for small businesses, and that we had reduced regulations dramatically, and we were about to reduce 16,000 more, and we brought them out, the 16,000 regulations, including half of the paperwork regulations of the Small Business Administration. And these people, a lot of them were literally dumbfounded. They didn't know whether to believe it, because that's not what the propagandizers had been telling them for 2 years. But it was true. They liked it. And we ought to be the candidate of small businesses in 1996, thanks in large measure to Al Gore. And I thank him for that.

Hillary and I began this day publicly at Arlington National Cemetery, doing something else that is a symbol of what the choices in 1996 will be all about. We dedicated a memorial, the groundbreaking of a memorial to the 1.8 million American women who have served in our Armed Forces but have never been recognized before. In our administration, we have not only promoted things like family and medical leave and child care for people to move from welfare to work but greater investment in medical research affecting women, greater access to mammograms, a greater commitment to the future of women's health. But I was able to announce today something I am very proud of: Since our administration has been in office we have opened 260,000 more positions and different roles for women in the United States military. I am proud of that, and I hope all of you are as well.

The Vice President gave you a summary of the record of our administration. It's led to lower inflation, lower unemployment, more jobs, and a better future. But this is still a troubled time for our country, and we are trying to decide which way to go, with

all the challenges we face in a confusing time, that I believe has far more hope than fear ahead for America. I ran for President because I wanted to restore the American dream of opportunity for those who would behave responsibly and because I wanted to bring this country together. I was sick and tired of seeing politicians exploit the differences of race and religion and region and income and background among Americans, to drive wedges between us for their own personal benefit. And I still believe that's what we ought to be doing in your Nation's Capital.

Today, because of the November elections, you can ask Senator Lautenberg and Senator Bradley, we are back to debating first principles. Things that we used to take for granted are no longer taken for granted in the United States Congress. There are a whole group of people in this Congress who believe that all of the problems of America are personal and cultural, and if people would just get up every day and behave themselves there would be nothing wrong in this country, and therefore, we don't even need a Government.

There are those of us who believe that some of these problems are economic and social and that, of course—they're personal and cultural; if people don't behave, there's nothing you can do for them—but that we are going up or down together, and we need a partnership in this country.

That is a fundamental debate. And if you want to know the difference between a Republican and Democrat in Washington today, it is largely around that issue. Are the problems just personal and cultural, or are they personal, cultural, and political and economic and social?

There are people today in Washington who believe that the Federal Government is absolutely worthless except for national security, and therefore, the most important thing to do is to balance the budget as quickly as possible. It doesn't matter what else you cut. Then there are those of us who honestly believe we should balance the budget but believe we have an education deficit as well and believe we have to do this in a way that will grow the economy, create jobs, raise incomes, and reinforce the partnership between business and Government that ought to exist.

There are people in Washington today who believe the environment is a nice thing and people who think right will protect it but that the Government should do nothing to protect it. You heard the Vice President say a committee of the House today voted to allow blanket offshore oil drilling all over the United States. You don't know the half of it. That is just scratching the surface. But they honestly believe the Government has no role in trying to protect our common natural resources. And then there are those of us who believe that we can find ways to protect the environment and grow the economy and that if we want this country to be around for our grandchildren and our grandchildren's grandchildren, we had better protect the environment while we are growing the economy.

There are people in Washington today who believe that the only answer to crime is to lock more people up for a longer period of time and that things like the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban are a ridiculous infringement on the right of everybody else to do whatever they want to do and that what we really should do is do nothing but take everybody we ever catch and lock them up, throw the key away, and forget about everything else. Then there are those of us who believe that fighting crime is a more complicated thing and that the best thing to do is to prevent it in the first place, like dealing with any other problem, and that we ought to listen to law enforcement and work with them.

And I'm telling you, folks, these are big, profound debates. And that's really what this election is all about. There are those of us who believe that you can be passionately in favor of life and still be for a woman's right to choose. And they don't believe that. So—and don't kid yourself, that's what this fight over Dr. Foster was all about. It was not about my right to choose a Surgeon General, it was about a woman's right to choose. It was not about whether he was capable of being a powerful role model for young people. He's one of the few people in America, one of the very few people in America who enjoyed a prominent social and economic po-

sition, who gave years and years and years of his life to reaching out to poor children and telling them they should not have sex when they weren't married, they should not become pregnant as teenagers, they should not get on drugs, they should not be violent, they should stay in school.

He went into poor tenements in Nashville; he rode dusty country roads in Alabama to bring health care to women and children who did not have and would never have seen a doctor. One of his patients said that he had personally talked her out of having an abortion. But because he had observed the constitutional right to choose, he wasn't pure enough, he wasn't politically correct enough for the people who are trying to create a "brave new world" in Washington with a stranglehold on the other party. And you better stand up against it and help us fight against it.

These are big choices. Now we both want to balance the budget. That's good. They want to do it in 7 years, with a huge tax increase. We say, if you do it in 10 years, have a smaller tax increase targeted to education, you can increase investment in education and medical research and technology and our economic partnerships; you don't have to cut Medicare so much that you really hurt older people who don't have enough to live on as it is. You can have a decent, humane budget and still balance it if you do it in the right way, not the wrong way. That's the difference between us.

They think the most important thing to do in the area of crime is to repeal the assault weapons ban. Jim Florio gave his governorship for it, and if I have to give the White House for it, I'll do it. It will be over my dead body if they do that. [*Applause*] Thank you.

Let me just say one thing in closing. We can do this one of two ways. We can fight, or we can work together in good faith. Something happened to our whole country when that bomb blew up in Oklahoma City. It was an awful, heartbreaking, wrenching event, and it shook this Nation to the core. And we lost some of the edge that we felt for those who were different from us and who disagreed with us. We were all a little less willing to demonize people with whom we simply disagree.

And then something good happened to this country when that brave young Air Force pilot, Scott O'Grady, survived for 6 lonely days in Bosnia and was rescued. And we saw what was best about America. And nobody cared if he had an Irish or a Polish name or if his skin was black, brown, or white. He had done something very brave and profoundly good that didn't have much to do with the kind of partisanship that covers so much of what is done in Washington.

And it was in that honest spirit that I offered the Republicans a balanced budget that the Democrats and the rest of the country, in my judgment, can in good conscience support; that will grow and not shrink the economy, and build up, not tear down, the middle class; that will help people to move from welfare to work, not just throw innocent children off of welfare. That is the spirit that I am trying to capture.

It was in that spirit that I agreed to have that conversation with the Speaker of the House up in New Hampshire a few days ago. I tell you, my friends, I did not sign on to be President just to say no, just to divide the country, just to try to prove I can be more clever than they are in these political debates. But I will not back down from my commitment that we have to grow the economy, build the middle class, reach out a helping hand to the poor, be fair to those who through no fault of their own need some help, preserve our environment, and bring this country together. I am telling you, that is the most important thing we have to do.

You know, one of the greatest honors of being President is being able to represent you when I go to other countries. I just was in the Ukraine and the beautiful city of Kiev, and I spoke outdoors at the university. There were tens of thousands of people there. And all along the road, four and five deep, people were there waving their American flags, cheering as Hillary and I rode by. And you know, I looked at her and I said what I always say, "They're not cheering for me. They're cheering for America, for what we are, for what we represent, for the hope that they feel."

Many of you have supported our administration's efforts in trying to make peace in the Middle East. They haven't asked "me" to do that, they have asked "us" to do that. Many of you have been involved in our efforts to try to help support the peace process in Northern Ireland. They didn't ask "me" to do that, they asked "us" to do that. America—that's what they think "we" are—bringing people together, bridging differences, moving forward.

There is no country in this world better positioned for the 21st century, better positioned to hand down our dreams to our children than the United States. But now we are back to debating first principles in Washington.

We thank you for your financial investment tonight, but we ask you for your voice. We ask you for your labors. We ask you for your passion. We ask you for your heart. We are going to have to fight and debate and struggle to make sure that in this season we make the right decisions.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:56 p.m. at the Garden State Convention Center. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

## Remarks in a Teleconference With Democratic Governors From Little Rock, Arkansas

*June 23, 1995*

***The President.*** Hello, Governor Romer.

***Gov. Roy Romer.*** Yes, Mr. President. I'm here, and also on the line are Howard Dean, Evan Bayh, and Bob Miller and Tom Carper.

***The President.*** It's nice to hear your voices.

***Governor Romer.*** Mel Carnahan would be here, but he's in Korea, Mr. President.

***The President.*** I'm sorry he can't be here, but I hope he does well on his trip to Korea. And I want to thank him for his support as well. And I want to thank all of you for your letter in support of the budget plan that I have presented.

I know that all of you have experience in balancing budgets, and you know that it takes a combination of discipline and compassion and hard choices. And I believe that my budget meets the test that you try to meet every year.

As you know, the Congress yesterday, both Houses of Congress, the Republican majorities, have agreed now to reconcile the differences between their two. I am glad that both the President and the majority in Congress are committed to a balanced budget, and I believe most of the Democrats in Congress are as well. But I still disagree fundamentally with the way in which they propose to balance the budget. And I think it will complicate your lives as Governors considerably.

I believe that their plan is still too extreme, runs a significant risk of putting the economy into a recession and raising unemployment. It cuts education at a time we should be increasing it. It cuts Medicare beneficiaries in order to pay for large tax cuts that disproportionately go to the most well-off people in our country who don't really need them. And because the cuts are so severe in some areas, I believe they'll be very difficult for you to manage.

Our plan balances the budget over 10 years instead of 7, increases education along with inflation, from Head Start to our investments in college loans and scholarships. It preserves—while slowing the growth of Medicare and Medicaid, it preserves the integrity of the incomes of people on Medicare, so that these middle and lower middle income elderly people, who many of whom don't have enough to live on as it is, are not going to have to pay more for their medical benefits or give up a lot of medical care. It is a much more sensible approach to welfare, and the tax cuts are much, much smaller and targeted toward individuals and toward education and childrearing. So I believe that it's a better plan.

But now that the Senate and House have resolved their differences, we can proceed to what I hope will be an honest, open, and civil discussion with the American people about the agreements and the differences in our two plans. And I hope in the end we'll wind up doing a balanced budget in the right way that will grow the economy and that will support you and what you're trying to do at the State level.

And I cannot tell you how much I appreciate your support. You may have some questions about what we're doing, and I'd like to hear from you now.

[*Governor Romer of Colorado stated that all of the Democratic Governors favored the President's 10-year plan for balancing the Federal budget and asked what the Governors could do to refocus the debate on the importance of investing in education.*

***The President.*** Well, I think that's one of the things the Governors have to do to help us on. And you have raised a point that has been almost completely absent from this debate in Washington because there's so much focus on the Federal investments and the Federal programs. The Republican alternative as compared to mine will have a bad effect on education in a direct way and in an indirect way. And I think most of the people covering this debate even have not thought about that.

Directly, it will obviously cut our ability to invest in everything from Head Start to the funds we give to you for Goals 2000 to help promote reforms, to the apprenticeship programs, to college loans.

But indirectly, you've made a very important point. Most of the funding for education in our country comes from the State and local level, and increasingly, States are playing a larger and larger role in school funding and in university funding. And if we cut Medicaid as severely as they propose to cut it—70 percent of that money goes to the elderly and the disabled—they will show up in the legislatures all across America. The pressures to avoid severe human hardship will be enormous, and therefore, the pressures on you to divert money that would otherwise go to education for the State level into nursing home care, into the care of the disabled, will be very, very great indeed. And there's been almost no discussion of this. So this could be a huge indirect cut in education as well.

And I think most Americans know we ought to be increasing our investment in education. In the global economy it's one thing we can do to ensure a good life with a secure income for our people. And I would urge the Governors to focus on the indirect impacts of this budget as well as the direct ones, because that's something our citizens will understand if it's explained to them. It's something the press corps will understand and report if it's explained to them. But it's been almost totally absent from the debate so far. And it's a huge factor that has to be considered.

[*Gov. Howard Dean of Vermont supported the President's plan for its approach dealing with Medicaid costs and asked the President to comment on the impact of the Republican budget plan on Medicaid.*]

***The President.*** Well, I would just make a couple of points. And Governor Miller may want to talk more about this in a moment because he comes from such a high-growth State, but I think two things are going to happen if the Medicare and Medicaid budgets that they advocate actually become law. One is that the reductions in spending are so significant that there's no way that the high-growth States won't be adversely affected. That is, you may be able to take account of inflation and the fact that people as they live longer will use more health services, but there won't be enough to guarantee that the States with fast-growing populations that depend upon Medicare and Medicaid will be taken care of. There just won't be enough.

The second thing is that the cuts are so significant that it will virtually end the ability of States to expand health care coverage to the working poor through the Medicaid program and through a lot of the self-initiated reforms at the State level.

You know, what we tried to do—Governor Dean just alluded to it—after the failure of the health care reform effort in Congress last year, we just tried to support States that were finding ways to expand coverage and increase health care security for their people. I think that it will be almost impossible for the States to do that if the Medicare and Medicaid funds are cut this much. In fact, I think you'll be in a position of either dramatically increasing the cost of health care beyond the ability of low-income people to pay it or cutting back on the services you provide to them. I think if you look at these numbers, it's very difficult to imagine how that won't happen in almost every State in the country.

[*Gov. Evan Bayh of Indiana endorsed the budget plan for avoiding the shift of health care costs from the Government to consumers and asked why Congress would not make this compromise.*]

***The President.*** Well, let me answer your question and then comment on what you said earlier. I think that what I'm hoping will happen is that now there will be a discussion out in the country and a lot of moderate Republicans as well as independents and Democrats will say that, in the interest of economic growth and in the interest of fairness and in the interest of the integrity of the operation of a lot of our common efforts like education and health care, we ought to move more toward the framework that I have outlined.

I think that—I'm very much hopeful that you'll be able to discuss this budget at some point with the Republican Governors, and they will at least be able to embrace part of it because we've got now a serious economic study which predicts that the Republican budget would cause a recession. We've got a lot of evidence that it will hurt the States. But on the other hand, they are trying to balance the budget and, I agree with you, that's a goal we all ought to embrace because—well, let me just give you—you've all seen how the Federal-State partnership has been eroded as we have to devote more and more of our resources to paying interest on the debt. The budget would be balanced today because of our previous deficit reduction efforts in the last 2 years but for the interest on the debt run up in the 12 years before I became President. That's how bad a problem it is recently. And next year we'll pay more interest on the debt than we will for defense.

So we've got to balance the budget. But I'm hoping what you can do is to help me reach responsible Republican State legislators, State office-holders, Governors, and thoughtful independents to say let's do it, but let's do it in the right way.

Let me make just one other comment. Roy Romer pointed out one of the possible indirect impacts of the Republican budget, which was to—if we cut health care too much here and you have to take up the slack at the State level, you'll invest less in education. So we'll be cutting education at the Federal and the State level because of this budget.

You have pointed out two other indirect impacts, which we have already seen over the last 10 years. On health care, if we don't cover the full cost of health care for those who are insured by the Government, then hospitals and doctors will simply shift that cost on to private citizens and on to their health insurance bills, which will put more and more pressure on more and more employers to either drop health insurance coverage altogether or to dramatically increase the cost of it. And if we cut taxes too much here in Washington and put you in a bind at the State level or people at the local level, there will be offsetting increases at the State and local level.

Now, we know what happened in the 1980's, the tax cuts in Washington mostly benefitted upper income people. The tax increases at the State and local level, because they were concentrated on sales taxes and property taxes, mostly taxed middle income people. So again, I think we ought to think about protecting the middle class. Most American wage earners are working harder for the same or lower wages than they were making 10 years ago. We don't need to lower their incomes by these budget decisions.

So I would say anything you can do to tell the Democrats and others who aren't for a balanced budget they ought to be for a balanced budget—I appreciate what you said, Evan, about the Beltway, as opposed to the heartland; I think most Democrats out there in the country are with us; that's positive. But anything you can do, to go back to Governor Romer's point and your point, to try to help the American people and the press, who communicates to the American people, understand the indirect consequences of this budget, for education, for health care, and for taxes, I think will be very, very helpful, because there will be significant indirect consequences that ought to be taken into account.

[*Gov. Tom Carper of Delaware endorsed the President's plan. Gov. Bob Miller of Nevada pointed out that the congressional plan failed to consider the impact on States which faced rapid growth and asked if the President's plan addressed that concern.*]

***The President.*** Yes. We maintain the present approach, for example, toward helping States fund welfare. And if you had a huge increase in the number of poor children, under our plan, there would be provisions for funneling more funds there in ways that would enable you to match them and go forward. Under their plan, they're going to cut it so much there's no way they can take account of growth. They try to on welfare for poor kids, but they just can't get there. There's no way, just because the size of the cut.

By the same token, with the medical programs, Medicare and Medicaid, with the size of the cuts that are coming in, they won't be able to take account of growth. And they will force States to either reduce medical coverage or try to get some cost out of people that we know are so poor they don't have the money in the first place.

Now, I would say those would be the two biggest areas where the high-growth States will be cut, in medical coverage and in the care for poor children.

[*Governor Romer thanked the President, said he found the conversation very helpful, and once again praised the President's budget plan.*]

***The President.*** Thank you. Let's just keep talking about it. And let's use this debate. Now there's one alternative and not two, and we can use the debate. And again, I would say, let's try to get—let's try to go beyond partisanship as much as possible, look at the direct and the indirect impacts of both budget proposals. And we'll get to the end of the road in the right place.

Thank you very, very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:15 a.m from the Excelsior Hotel in Little Rock.

## Statement on Guestworker Legislation

*June 23, 1995*

I oppose efforts in the Congress to institute a new guestworker or ''bracero'' program that seeks to bring thousands of foreign workers into the United States to provide temporary farm labor.

In its most recent report, the bipartisan Commission on Immigration Reform chaired by Barbara Jordan unanimously concluded that a large-scale guestworker program would be a ''grievous mistake.'' We have worked hard to reduce illegal immigration and have made great progress toward controlling this longstanding and serious problem. To allow so-called temporary workers to cross the border now would undermine all the success we have achieved.

A new guestworker program is unwarranted for several reasons:

- It would increase illegal immigration.
- It would reduce work opportunities for U.S. citizens and other legal residents.
- It would depress wages and work standards for American workers.

When these programs were tried in the past, many temporary guestworkers stayed permanently—and illegally—in this country. Hundreds of thousands of immigrants now residing in the U.S. first came as temporary workers, and their presence became a magnet for other illegal immigrants.

If our crackdown on illegal immigration contributes to labor shortages—especially for perishable crops that require large numbers of workers for short periods of time—I will direct the Departments of Labor and Agriculture to work cooperatively to improve and enhance existing programs to meet the labor requirements of our vital agricultural industry consistent with our obligations to American workers.

## 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 17***

In the morning, the President attended the plenary session of the Group of Seven summit at the Maritime Museum in Halifax, Nova Scotia. Later in the morning, he went

to Summit Place where he participated in a G–7 leaders meeting and a press conference.

In the afternoon, the President attended a farewell luncheon at the World Trade Club.

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton returned to Washington, DC.

***June 20***

The President announced his intention to nominate Derrick L. Forrister as Assistant Secretary for Congressional, Intergovernmental and Public Liaison at the Department of Energy.

The President announced his intention to nominate Alberto Mora as a member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for the International Bureau of Broadcasting.

The President announced that Theodore C. Sorensen, Harrison J. Goldin, and Jules B. Kroll have been named to serve on the Board of Directors of the Central Asian-American Enterprise Fund.

The President announced that James C. Rosapepe has been named to serve on the Board of Directors of the Albanian-American Enterprise Fund.

***June 21***

In the morning, the President met with Members of Congress in the Oval Office.

The President announced his intention to nominate John T. Conway as Chairman and member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The President announced his intention to appoint A. Huda Farouki to the Advisory Committee on the Arts of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

The President announced his intention to appoint Norman R. Augustine as Principal Officer of the Board of Governors of the American National Red Cross.

***June 22***

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Edison, NJ, where they toured the assembly line at the Ford Motor Co. plant. In the late afternoon, they traveled to Somerset, NJ.

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Little Rock, AR.

The President announced his intention to renominate Stephen D. Potts as Director of the Office of Government Ethics.

***June 23***

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary Clinton attended ''America's Hope, Arkansas' Pride Luncheon'' in the William J. Clinton Ballroom at the Excelsior Hotel.

The President announced his intention to nominate Jill L. Long as Under Secretary for Rural, Economic and Community Development at the Department of Agriculture.

The President announced his intention to appoint former Senator Birch Bayh to be a member of the J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board.

## 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 21***

John T. Conway,
of New York, to be a member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 1999 (reappointment).

## 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 16*** [1]

Transcript of a press briefing by Under Secretary of State for Economic and Agricultural Affairs Joan Spero, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs Daniel Tarullo, Under Secretary of the Treasury for International Economics Law-

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

rence Summers, and Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the Group of Seven summit

***Released June 19***

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

White House statement on fiscal year 1996 budget amendments for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Small Business Administration

***Released June 20***

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by National Economic Council Chair Laura D'Andrea Tyson on the President's plan to balance the budget

***Released June 21***

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by National Economic Council Chair Laura D'Andrea Tyson and Deputy Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs John Emerson on the Pacific Rim Economic Conference

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on Nigeria's arrest and detention of former President Gen. Olusegun Obasanjo

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the refusal of the regime in Rangoon to reach an acceptable arrangement on access for the International Committee of the Red Cross

Announcement of nomination for Peace Corps Director

***Released June 22***

Statement by Chief of Staff Leon Panetta on the President's plan to balance the budget

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry the U.S.-Russia Joint Commission on POW/MIA's

Fact sheet on the U.S.-Russia Joint Commission on POW/MIA's

Interim Report of the U.S.-Russia Joint Commission on POW/MIA's

Announcement of nomination for U.S. District Judge for the District of Utah

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the U.S. delegation to Haiti to observe the elections

Fact sheet on the Haitian elections

## Acts Approved by the President

***Approved June 21***

S. 349 / Public Law 104–15
To reauthorize appropriations for the Navajo-Hopi Relocation Housing Program

S. 441 / Public Law 104–16
To reauthorize appropriations for certain programs under the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act, and for other purposes