Weekly Compilation of

# Presidential Documents

Monday, July 17, 1995
Volume 31—Number 28
Pages 1209–1244

## Contents


**Addresses and Remarks**

Legislative agenda—1216
National Hockey League champion New Jersey Devils—1214
Radio address—1209
Tennessee, the Family and Media Conference in Nashville—1210, 1212, 1213
Vietnam, normalization of diplomatic relations—1217
Virginia
  Central Intelligence Agency in Langley—1237
  James Madison High School in Vienna—1220
Welfare reform—1233

**Appointments and Nominations**

Commission on the Roles and Capabilities of the U.S. Intelligence Community, Chairman, statement—1236

**Communications to Congress**

Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, letter transmitting report—1236
Corporation for Public Broadcasting, message transmitting report—1216
Georgia-U.S. investment treaty, message transmitting—1215
Latvia-U.S. investment treaty, message transmitting—1215

**Communications to Congress**—Continued

Libya, message reporting—1231
Romania, message transmitting report on trade—1219
Trinidad and Tobago-U.S. investment treaty, message transmitting—1219

**Communications to Federal Agencies**

Religious expression in public schools, memorandum—1227

**Interviews With the News Media**

Exchanges with reporters
  Cabinet Room—1216
  Rose Garden—1233
  State Dining Room—1217

**Statements by the President**

*See also* Appointments and Nominations
Budget rescission legislation—1215
Environmental program reforms to assist homeowners—1230
Older Americans Act—1241

**Supplementary Materials**

Acts approved by the President—1244
Checklist of White House press releases—1243
Digest of other White House announcements—1241
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1242



WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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



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

## Week Ending Friday, July 14, 1995

### The President's Radio Address

*July 8, 1995*

Good morning. Last week I spoke to you about the need for Congress to pass reforms to end welfare as we know it. I want Congress to send me a bill that requires work, demands responsibility, and provides the child care people need to move from welfare to work.

This issue is now before the U.S. Senate. The truth is, Republicans and Democrats alike know what's needed to get this job done. A majority of Senators in both parties agree with me that welfare reform must require everyone who can work to go to work. We agree on the need for the toughest possible child support enforcement. And we agree that no one who can work should be able to stay on welfare forever. So we are close.

Congress could put a bill on my desk, a good bill, within the next few weeks. After a generation of debate, we have a chance, finally, to do what's right for the taxpayers who pay for a failed welfare system and for the people who are trapped by it. But in recent days we've seen unsettling signs that progress could fall to gridlock. This week, Republican leaders said that a threat from the far right in their own party could keep them from passing a welfare reform bill this year. A handful of Senators are threatening to hold welfare reform hostage to their own political views. They're threatening to block a vote on any bill that doesn't cut off all help to children whose mothers are poor, young, and unmarried.

I believe their position is wrong. Republican and Democratic Governors also strongly oppose Washington telling them to throw children off the rolls simply because their parents are under 18 and unmarried. And the Catholic Church has taken a very strong position on this, fearing that to cut young people under 18 and their children off welfare would lead to more abortions. This approach also would punish the innocent children of unmarried teenagers for the mistakes of their parents. This might cut spending on welfare, but it wouldn't reform welfare to promote work and responsible parenting. That's why so many Republicans and Democrats oppose it.

The threat of the Senators to take this extreme position and block this welfare reform effort is just wrong. We've come a long way in the welfare reform debate in the last few years. Not so very long ago, many liberals opposed requiring all welfare recipients who can work to do so. And not so long ago, most conservatives thought the Government shouldn't spend money on child care to give welfare mothers a chance to go to work and still be good parents. Now we have a broad consensus for both. We should do both, and we shouldn't allow welfare reform to be held prisoner to ideological political debates.

I ran for President to bring new opportunity to the American people and demand more responsibility in return. That's what I call the New Covenant. And welfare reform is a crucial part of this effort. We are now at an historic moment. The failure to pass welfare reform this year would be a disservice to the American people. It shouldn't become another victim to the politics of gridlock. Republicans and Democrats alike have a real responsibility to bring real change to Washington, and a bipartisan majority in the Senate is prepared to vote for a welfare reform bill with time limits and real work requirements and without moralistic dictates that will do more harm than good.

A few days ago, in a speech at Georgetown University, I said our leaders have to stop looking only for political advantage and start looking for common ground. I challenged our leaders to do four things: First, we need more conversation and less combat. So let's settle our differences on welfare reform without resorting to legislative trench warfare designed to stop real reform at any cost. Sec-

ond, when we do differ, we ought to offer an alternative. When the vast majority of Americans and Members of Congress agree on an issue like welfare reform, a small minority shouldn't be able to get away with "just say no" politics. Third, we ought to look at our problems with a view toward the long-term. Moving people from welfare to work will save a lot more money in the long run than throwing children off the rolls. They'll be in trouble, and they'll cost us a lot of money in the long run and a lot of our national life as well. We are never going to end welfare unless people have the training and child care to be good workers and good parents. And finally, we shouldn't just berate the worst in America, we ought to spend more time concentrating on the best. That's what I have done, by giving 29 States the freedom from burdensome Federal Government regulations so they can lead the way in helping to find new ways to end welfare.

The only way our country can meet the profound challenges of the 21st century and the global economy is if we all pull together and we all look forward. We don't have a person to waste. That's why welfare reform is so critical. We can't afford to filibuster away our future.

So I say to those in Congress who have joined me in demanding responsibility from people on welfare, you have a responsibility, too. Don't place pride of partisanship ahead of our national pride. Don't pander to the partisan extremes. Let's not let politics stand in the way of making work and responsibility a way of life for the next generation.

Thanks for listening.

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

## Remarks at the Opening of Session I of the Family and Media Conference in Nashville, Tennessee

*July 10, 1995*

Thank you very much. I thought it might be nice to stop by here after having done my primary duty, which was delivering the soup to Mrs. Gore. [*Laughter*] I'm delighted to be here, Governor, Mayor, Senator, Members of Congress. To Representative Purcell and the other distinguished members of the Tennessee Legislature who are here, Dr. Erickson, and to all of you, let me say that I came here primarily to listen. And I find that I always learn a lot more when I'm listening than when I'm talking, so I will be quite brief.

I want to say a few things, however. First, I want to thank Al and Tipper Gore for their lifetime of devotion not only to their family but to the families of this State and this Nation, as manifested by this Family Reunion, the fourth such one, something they have done in a careful and sustained way. It's already been mentioned twice that Tipper has worked on the whole issue that we're here to discuss today for many, many years, never in the context of politics but always in the context of what's good for families and what we can do to move the ball forward for our children and for our future. And I think this country owes them a great debt of gratitude. And I'm glad to be here.

Secondly, I'd just like to frame this issue as it appears to me as President and as a parent. I gave a speech at Georgetown a few days ago in which I pointed out that the world in which I grew up, the world after World War II, was basically shaped by two great ideas: the middle class dream, that if you work hard you'll get ahead and your kids can do better than you did; and middle class values, that of family and community and responsibility and trustworthiness, and that both of those things were at some considerable risk today as we move out of the cold war into the global economy and the whole way we live and work is subject to sweeping challenge.

The family is the focus of both middle class dreams and middle class values, for it is the center around which we organize child rearing—our country's most important responsibility—and work. And how we work determines how we live and what will become of us over the long run.

We have seen enormous changes in both work and child rearing in the last several years. We know now that a much higher percentage of our children live in poverty, particularly in the last 10 years, even as we have a percentage of elderly people in poverty going below that of the general population

for the first time in history in the last 10 years, a considerable achievement of which we ought to be proud as a country. But still, our children are becoming more and more poor.

We know that a higher percentage of our children are being born out of wedlock. What you may not know, but is worth noting, is that the number of children being born out of wedlock is more or less constant for the last few years. So we not only have too many children being born out of wedlock, we have more and more young couples where both of them are working and having careers who are deferring child bearing and, in many cases, not having children at all. I would argue that is also a very troubling thing in our country—the people in the best position to build strong families and bring up kids in a good way deciding not to do so.

We know that most children live in families where, whether they have one parent or two parents in the home, whoever their parents are in the home are also working. We know that we do less for child care and for supervised care for children as a society than any other advanced country in the world.

We know, too, that most of our parents for the last 20 years have been working a longer work week for the same or lower wages, so that while Representative Purcell here complimented the Governor on his budget because it maintained a commitment to children in terms of public investment, you could make a compelling argument that the private investment in children has been going down because most families have both less time and less money to spend on their children.

And we know that as parents spend less time with their children, by definition the children are spending more time with someone or something else, so that the media has not only exploded in its ramifications in our lives but also has more access to more of our children's time than would have been the case 20 years ago if all these technological developments had occurred when the family and our economy were in a different place. And I think we have to look at all these issues in that context.

Now, it's commonplace to say that most of us believe that there's too much indiscriminate violence, too much indiscriminate sex, and too much sort of callous degradation of women and sometimes of other people in various parts of our media today. I believe that the question is, so what? What we ought to be talking about today is, so what are we all going to do about that? Because our ability to change things, I think, consists most importantly in our ability to affirmative steps.

At this talk at Georgetown, I made a commitment that I would try to set an example for what I thought our political leaders ought to be doing. We ought to have more conversation and less combat. When we criticize, we ought to offer an alternative. We ought to be thinking about the long run; these trends that we're dealing with have been developing over quite a long while now. And we ought to celebrate what is good as well as condemn what we don't like. And I think if we do those four things, then we will be able to make good decisions.

So let me just make two specific suggestions, and then I'd like to get on with listening to other people. First of all, in the spirit of alternatives and celebrating what is good, I'm for balancing the budget, but I'm against getting rid of public television or dramatically cutting it. In our family this is known as the ''Leave Big Bird alone'' campaign. [*Laughter*] I say that because we are going to have to cut a bunch of stuff, folks, and we are going to have to cut a lot of things. The budget would be in balance today but for the interest we're paying on the debt run up between 1981 and 1993. Next year, interest on the debt will exceed the defense budget. This is a big problem for our families, their incomes, their living standards, their future.

But consider this. Public TV gives, on average, 6 hours of educational programming a day. Sometimes the networks have as little as a half an hour a week. Public television goes to 98 percent of our homes. Forty percent of our people don't have access to cable channels like the Learning Channel or A&E. Fourteen percent, only 14 percent of overall public television channel funding comes from Federal money, but often times in rural places, like Senator Conrad's North Dakota, over half of the money comes from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Sixty percent of the viewers have family incomes

below $40,000. It costs you a $1.09 a year, per citizen, to fund it. And for every dollar public television and radio get from the Government, they raise $5 or $6 from the private sector. So I think that's my first suggestion.

My second suggestion relates to the presence of Senator Conrad here. If we don't believe in censorship, and we do want to tell parents that they have a responsibility, that television, to use Reverend Jackson's phrase that the Vice President mentioned, may be the third parent, but it can't be the first or the second, and that's up to the parents—if we want to say that, but we know we live in a country where most kids live in families where there's one or two parents there working and where we have less comprehensive child care than any other advanced country in the world, the question is how can we get beyond telling parents to do something that they physically cannot do for several hours a day unless they literally do want to be a home without television or monitor their kids in some other way?

There is one technological fix now being debated in the Congress which I think is very important. It's a little simple thing; I think it's a very big deal. In the telecommunications bill, Senator Conrad offered an amendment which ultimately passed with almost three-quarters of the Senate voting for it. So it's a bipartisan proposal that would permit a so-called V-chip to be put in televisions with cables which would allow parents to decide which—not only which channels their children could not watch but within channels, to block certain programming.

This is not censorship; this is parental responsibility. This is giving parents the same access to technology that is coming into your home to all the people who live there, who turn it on. So I would say when that telecommunications bill is ultimately sent to the President's desk, put the V-chip in it and empower the parents who have to work to do their part to be responsible with media. Those are two specific suggestions that I hope will move this debate forward.

Having said what I meant to say, I would like to now go on, Mr. Vice President, to hear the people who really know something about this. I want to thank you all for your care and concern. And let me echo something the Governor said: There is a huge consensus in this country today that we need to do something that is responsible, that is constructive, that strengthens our families and gives our kids a better future, and that celebrates the fact that this is the media center of the world. And we want it to be that way 10, 20, 50 years from now. But we also want to be that way in a country that is less violent, that has a more wholesome environment for our children to grow up in, where our children are strong and taking advantage of the dominant position the United States enjoys in the world media.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 9:15 a.m. in Polk Theater at the Tennessee Performing Arts Center to participants in Family Re-Union IV: The Family and the Media. In his remarks, he referred to the Vice President's mother, Pauline Gore; Gov. Don Sundquist of Tennessee; Mayor Philip Bredesen of Nashville, TN; and Bill Purcell and Marty Erickson, cohosts of the conference.

## Remarks at the Closing of Session I of the Family and Media Conference in Nashville

*July 10, 1995*

I don't want to end on a downer, but I just want to ask you all to think about the implications of what we are discussing here. And I wish we had time for all the audience to ask their questions and make their comments, but let me just point this out.

Almost every major city in America has had a decline in the crime rate in the last 3 or 4 years, but the rate of random violence among very young people is still going up, notwithstanding the decline in the crime rate. That is just one example. After years of making progress on reducing drug use, the rate of apparently random drug use across racial and income lines among quite young people is now going back up again. The rate of perceived risk or the pointlessness of not doing it seems to be going down.

The ultimate answer may be in programs like the "I Have A Future" program and all these one-on-one programs for all these children. But I would ask you just to remember

what one of our psychologists said, which is that most of our young people learn about violence or are affected by it between the ages of 2 and 8. Most of them learn—deal with sex and gender stereotypes between 8 and whenever.

It may be that people between 8 and whenever are more subject to argument at least or counter information or the kind of publicity or you name it on these other issues we can put out. So let's focus at least on the violence. I see no alternative to solving this problem than to reduce the aggregate amount of violence to which these children are subject. And we're going to have to have some help from the media to get that done. I just don't see any alternative to that.

The V-chip is something we ought to do, but if we're going to raise positive role models we also have to reduce the aggregate amount of violence. We must find a systematic way to do it. And in our country, with the first amendment and other things being the way they are, we're going to have to have some voluntary initiatives and some disciplined support from the media in America to get it done.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. in Polk Theater at the Tennessee Performing Arts Center.

## Remarks at the Closing of Session II of the Family and Media Conference in Nashville

*July 10, 1995*

I just want to say one thing, if I might. Let me, first of all, start by saying thank you to all of you for being here and for caring enough about this subject to be here and for giving us a chance to discuss this issue in a nonpolitical atmosphere of good citizenship. I thank you for that. I also thank you for what you've done.

But I'd like to comment if I could on what's been said and what has not been said and end with something Mr. Selleck said. First of all, we know that we need to support and get more of the kind of programming reflected on the Nickelodeon, the Disney Channel, "Christy," the Fox Children's Network, and public television, and whoever I left out. We know that, we know we need that.

Secondly, we know we need some guideposts to the future which might be what John Cook talked about or another kind of rating system. And at least some of us would like to see some parents be able to turn some things off now and again, which is why we like the V channel.

Then you get to the next level which is what the gentleman from the Ad Council talked about. And I agree with—we've got to make sure that no matter how far we go with technology we save some private space along the way. Then you get to the question of whether we could systematically move the market system a little bit, to take off on Gary's comment.

His is a significant commitment, the Ad Council has made, for two reasons. One is, $8 billion over 8 years is $800 million a year. I'll tell you how much that is; I just sat there and figured it out. In the Presidential elections we spend about $100 million in the general election, telling you how great we are, how terrible our opponents are. And you see a lot of our ads. So if you spend $800 million a year and you do it right, you can make an impact. That's not an insignificant thing, and it should be lauded.

But the other suggestion you made, coming back to what Mr. Selleck said, is that the people who do all this should not be defensive; they should be open. They should realize there are no simple answers. A few years ago, there was an attempt to do what Oprah Winfrey's doing on her own on a systematic basis through all different kinds of television shows through education. I saw you out there, John. Do you remember when I came out there to Hollywood and they had me give a little speech, because there was an organized effort to try to say, let's take a year and put some positive message about education in all of our programs, our cops and robbers programs, our cowboy programs, our—everything. In this case, it would be the Internet and all that.

And they did it for a year. I don't know that we had any way of measuring what the results were, but I do know what the gentleman from the Ad Council said makes a lot of sense. What I hope will happen is, in

the end, that there will be some systematic effort which will not only have more good programs like "Christy" on the air, but which will make everybody think before they put their police show on the air or their you-name-it, whatever show it is: What picture of women am I presenting to America; what message am I sending to these kids about violence; what am I doing?

In other words, if we're going to change the American culture, we have to somehow change the media culture. And we have to do it without finger pointing, but we've got to be honest about it.

I think this Ad Council commitment is a good one, but I think what we need to do—and maybe Gary's right, maybe you have to change the people running the show a little bit—but we need a systematic debate there about what we don't do and what we do do in our regular programming. I really think that's important. I think if we leave that out, we'll leave a big piece of this undone. And I thank you for being willing to deal with that.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:15 p.m. in Polk Theater at the Tennessee Performing Arts Center. In his remarks, he referred to actor Tom Selleck; John Cook, head of the Disney channel; and Gary David Goldberg, television writer and producer. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

## Remarks Honoring the 1995 National Hockey League Champion New Jersey Devils

*July 10, 1995*

Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the White House. Governor Whitman, thank you for coming. Governor Byrne, good to see you back there. Congressman Menendez—I've been waiting for several Members of Congress who are trying to get here. I was trying to wait for them, but I think we should start when they come in—especially if Senator Bradley is the first one; we'll notice them all. And we'll be glad to acknowledge them. I thank those who—are they here? Senator Lautenberg, welcome. Senator Bradley, thank you.

I welcome you all here to the White House and congratulate the New Jersey Devils' first Stanley Cup victory in their 13-year history. I identified with you because you were cast as classic underdogs. But your determination and teamwork paid off.

It occurred to me as we were preparing for this that hockey is a lot like what goes on around here. [*Laughter*] You get behind; you get ahead; you never know you're going to win until the last minute. It's more often a contact sport than it ought to be. The difference is here we don't have a penalty box, and sometimes the referees back there pile on, too. [*Laughter*]

But the most important thing is the teamwork. You know, the Stanley Cup is the oldest professional athletic trophy in North America; it's 102 years old. I'm glad we have it in the White House today again in a place of honor. I noted that it hasn't always enjoyed a place of honor. The Stanley Cup was once forgotten on a roadside, and once it was actually kicked into a frozen canal.

Coach Lemaire has accomplished quite a lot in his first 2 years, I would say. In the first year, the Devils had a record 106 points, 19 more than in any previous year, and of course, this year you won the Stanley Cup. Martin Brodeur has had a busy 2 years after being a rookie of the year last year—I like this nickname—"The Kid" continued to be an outstanding goalie this year.

I also want to congratulate Claude Lemieux on his outstanding performance and on being named the Consummate Trophy winner. Let me congratulate all the players and thank those who have come here. Hockey is becoming an American sport: the teams now are more widely placed across the United States; more and more people understand it and watch it on television; and thanks to television, we are coming to understand it, those of us who live in places where there's never any ice. And I must say, I was very, very impressed and I really got into the Stanley Cup finals this year, so I'm delighted to have all of you here.

I'd like to now ask the NHL Commissioner, Gary Bettman, to take the microphone and introduce the team, the players, and do whatever else he would like to do.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:07 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Christine T. Whitman and former Gov. Brendon Byrne of New Jersey.

## Statement on Budget Rescission Legislation

*July 10, 1995*

The agreement on the rescissions bill that my administration has reached with Democrats and Republicans in the Congress is a good one, and it ought to be passed now.

I was disappointed when the Senate failed to complete the job before its recent recess. Now that they have returned, I call on Senators to resolve their differences and pass the bill as early as possible.

The bill achieves needed deficit reduction while protecting key investments in children and education and in national service, job training, and the environment. I believe it can be a model for future deficit reduction efforts.

Moreover, the rescissions legislation includes funds I requested that are urgently needed for the Federal Emergency Management Agency's disaster relief activities, for the Federal response to the Oklahoma City bombing, for expanding antiterrorism efforts, and for providing debt relief to Jordan, which is critical to the Middle East peace process.

I urge the Senate to act quickly on this vital legislation.

## Message to the Senate Transmitting the Republic of Georgia-United States Investment Treaty

*July 10, 1995*

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Georgia Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with Annex, signed at Washington on March 7, 1994. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to this Treaty.

The bilateral investment Treaty (BIT) with Georgia was the eighth such treaty between the United States and a newly independent state of the former Soviet Union. The Treaty is designed to protect U.S. investment and assist the Republic of Georgia in its efforts to develop its economy by creating conditions more favorable for U.S. private investment and thus strengthen the development of its private sector.

The Treaty is fully consistent with U.S. policy toward international and domestic investment. A specific tenet of U.S. policy, reflected in this Treaty, is that U.S. investment abroad and foreign investment in the United States should receive national treatment. Under this Treaty, the Parties also agree to international law standards for expropriation and compensation for expropriation; free transfer of funds related to investments; freedom of investments from performance requirements; fair, equitable, and most-favored-nation treatment; and the investor of investment's freedom to choose to resolve disputes with the host government through international arbitration.

I recommend that the Senate consider this Treaty as soon as possible, and give its advice and consent to ratification of the Treaty, with Annex, at an early date.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
July 10, 1995.

## Message to the Senate Transmitting the Latvia-United States Investment Treaty

*July 10, 1995*

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Latvia Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with Annex and Protocol, signed at Washington on January 13, 1995. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to this Treaty.

The bilateral investment Treaty (BIT) with Latvia will protect U.S. investors and assist Latvia in its efforts to develop its economy by creating conditions more favorable for U.S. private investment and thus strengthening the development of the private sector.

The Treaty is fully consistent with U.S. policy toward international and domestic investment. A specific tenet of U.S. policy, reflected in this Treaty, is that U.S. investment abroad and foreign investment in the United States should receive national treatment. Under this Treaty, the Parties also agree to international law standards for expropriation and compensation for expropriation; free transfer of funds associated with investments; freedom of investments from performance requirements; fair, equitable, and most-favored-nation treatment; and the investor's or investment's freedom to choose to resolve disputes with the host government through international arbitration.

I recommend that the Senate consider this Treaty as soon as possible, and give its advice and consent to ratification of the Treaty, with Annex and Protocol, at an early date.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
July 10, 1995.

## Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting

*July 10, 1995*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 396(i)), I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) for Fiscal Year 1994 and the Inventory of the Federal Funds Distributed to Public Telecommunications Entities by Federal Departments and Agencies: Fiscal Year 1994.

Since 1967, when the Congress created the Corporation, CPB has overseen the growth and development of quality services for millions of Americans.

This year's report, entitled "American Stories," is a departure from previous reports. It profiles people whose lives have been dramatically improved by public broadcasting in their local communities. The results are timely, lively, and intellectually provocative. In short, they're much like public broadcasting.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
July 10, 1995.

## Remarks Prior to a Meeting With Congressional Leaders and an Exchange With Reporters

*July 11, 1995*

### *Legislative Agenda*

***The President.*** Ladies and gentlemen, I want to welcome the congressional leadership back here today. There are many things that we will discuss today. We have a lot of work to do. This summer we are working on finishing the rescission bill, and I very much hope we can succeed in passing the terrorism legislation and welfare reform.

And I hope that we can begin as soon as possible the budget debate. We have major differences over how the budget ought to be balanced, and I think it would be in error to delay it and run the risk of having a crisis in Government. I think the quicker we can begin it and the fuller and more open it can be and the more the American people can hear of it, the better off we'll be.

So those are the things that I hope we can discuss today and I think are very important.

### *President Boris Yeltsin of Russia*

***Q.*** Mr. President, have you heard anything about the condition of Boris Yeltsin?

***The President.*** No.

***Q.*** Any reports on his health?

***The President.*** No. Nothing other than the last time I saw him, he was in good health and seemed to be doing well.

***Q.*** Well, he's been hospitalized this morning for heart problems.

***The President.*** Yes, I know, but I have heard nothing this morning about the condition.

### *Bosnia*

***Q.*** Sir, the Bosnian Serbs are moving into Srebrenica fast, according to the reports. Is it time for NATO air strikes?

***The President.*** We may have something to say on that later today. But let me say I'm concerned about the people who are there, and I'm also concerned about the UNPROFOR troops, the Dutch, who are there. And we may have something later today to say about that.

### *Vietnam*

***Q.*** [*Inaudible*]—the decision on Vietnam, how much more difficult is it for you personally and politically, given your failure to serve in Vietnam?

***The President.*** None.

***Q.*** Does it enter into your decision at all?

***The President.*** No.

### *Base Closings*

***Q.*** Are you going to do base closings——

***The President.*** I don't know yet. We're working very hard on that, worked on it yesterday and last night. We have some more work to do, and I'm waiting for some more information to come back this morning. We spent quite a bit of time on it. It won't be long, but I can't say for sure.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:30 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

## Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With the Congressional Black Caucus

*July 11, 1995*

***Q.*** Mr. President, do you have reaction to the air strikes in Bosnia?

### *Affirmative Action*

***Q.*** Mr. President, are you prepared to deliver your affirmative action review next Wednesday, as has been speculated?

***The President.*** What date is that?

***Q.*** The 19th. [*Laughter*]

***The President.*** I believe that's the day we're going to do it.

***Q.*** Have you already reached a conclusion? Are you going to brief these Members today on what your thoughts are dealing with affirmative action?

***The President.*** I'm going to deal with their agenda today. I'm here and I'm listening to them and they're going to go through an agenda and I'm going to respond to it.

### *President Boris Yeltsin of Russia*

***Q.*** Any further word on Boris Yeltsin and how that might impact on U.S.-Russian relations?

***The President.*** No. I got another report after this morning's meeting with congressional leadership, and our latest report is that he seems to be resting well and feeling pretty good and making some decisions from the hospital. That's the latest report I got—is about 30 minutes ago.

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:44 a.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

## Remarks Announcing the Normalization of Diplomatic Relations With Vietnam

*July 11, 1995*

Thank you very much. I welcome you all here, those who have been introduced and distinguished Members of Congress and military leaders, veterans, others who are in the audience.

Today I am announcing the normalization of diplomatic relationships with Vietnam.

From the beginning of this administration, any improvement in relationships between America and Vietnam has depended upon making progress on the issue of Americans who were missing in action or held as prisoners of war. Last year, I lifted the trade embargo on Vietnam in response to their cooperation and to enhance our efforts to secure the remains of lost Americans and to determine the fate of those whose remains have not been found.

It has worked. In 17 months, Hanoi has taken important steps to help us resolve many cases. Twenty-nine families have received the remains of their loved ones and at last have been able to give them a proper burial. Hanoi has delivered to us hundreds of pages of documents shedding light on what happened to Americans in Vietnam.

And Hanoi has stepped up its cooperation with Laos, where many Americans were lost. We have reduced the number of so-called discrepancy cases, in which we have had reason to believe that Americans were still alive after they were lost to 55. And we will continue to work to resolve more cases.

Hundreds of dedicated men and women are working on all these cases, often under extreme hardship and real danger in the mountains and jungles of Indochina. On behalf of all Americans, I want to thank them. And I want to pay a special tribute to General John Vessey, who has worked so tirelessly on this issue for Presidents Reagan and Bush and for our administration. He has made a great difference to a great many families. And we as a nation are grateful for his dedication and for his service. Thank you, sir.

I also want to thank the Presidential delegation, led by Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs Hershel Gober, Winston Lord, James Wold, who have helped us to make so much progress on this issue. And I am especially grateful to the leaders of the families and the veterans organizations who have worked with the delegation and maintained their extraordinary commitment to finding the answers we seek.

Never before in the history of warfare has such an extensive effort been made to resolve the fate of soldiers who did not return. Let me emphasize, normalization of our relations with Vietnam is not the end of our effort. From the early days of this administration I have said to the families and veterans groups what I say again here: We will keep working until we get all the answers we can. Our strategy is working. Normalization of relations is the next appropriate step. With this new relationship, we will be able to make more progress. To that end, I will send another delegation to Vietnam this year. And Vietnam has pledged it will continue to help us find answers. We will hold them to that pledge.

By helping to bring Vietnam into the community of nations, normalization also serves our interest in working for a free and peaceful Vietnam in a stable and peaceful Asia. We will begin to normalize our trade relations with Vietnam, whose economy is now liberalizing and integrating into the economy of the Asia-Pacific region. Our policy will be to implement the appropriate United States government programs to develop trade with Vietnam consistent with U.S. law.

As you know, many of these programs require certifications regarding human rights and labor rights before they can proceed. We have already begun discussing human rights issues with Vietnam, especially issues regarding religious freedom. Now we can expand and strengthen that dialog. The Secretary of State will go to Vietnam in August where he will discuss all of these issues, beginning with our POW and MIA concerns.

I believe normalization and increased contact between Americans and Vietnamese will advance the cause of freedom in Vietnam, just as it did in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. I strongly believe that engaging the Vietnamese on the broad economic front of economic reform and the broad front of democratic reform will help to honor the sacrifice of those who fought for freedom's sake in Vietnam.

I am proud to be joined in this view by distinguished veterans of the Vietnam war. They served their country bravely. They are of different parties. A generation ago they had different judgments about the war which divided us so deeply. But today they are of a single mind. They agree that the time has come for America to move forward on Vietnam. All Americans should be grateful especially that Senators John McCain, John Kerry, Bob Kerrey, Chuck Robb and Representative Pete Peterson, along with other Vietnam veterans in the Congress, including Senator Harkin, Congressman Kolbe and Congressman Gilchrest, who just left, and others who are out here in the audience have kept up their passionate interest in Vietnam but were able to move beyond the haunting and painful past toward finding common ground for the future. Today, they and many other veterans support the normalization of relations, giving the opportunity to Vietnam to fully join the community of nations and being true to what they fought for so many years ago.

Whatever we may think about the political decisions of the Vietnam era, the brave Americans who fought and died there had noble motives. They fought for the freedom

and the independence of the Vietnamese people. Today the Vietnamese are independent, and we believe this step will help to extend the reach of freedom in Vietnam and, in so doing, to enable these fine veterans of Vietnam to keep working for that freedom.

This step will also help our own country to move forward on an issue that has separated Americans from one another for too long now. Let the future be our destination. We have so much work ahead of us. This moment offers us the opportunity to bind up our own wounds. They have resisted time for too long. We can now move on to common ground. Whatever divided us before let us consign to the past. Let this moment, in the words of the Scripture, be a time to heal and a time to build.

Thank you all. And God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:03 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. John W. Vessey, Jr., USA (Ret.), Special Emissary for POW/MIA Affairs; and Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs Herschel Gober, Assistant Secretary of State Winston Lord, and Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense James Wold, members of the Presidential Delegation on POW/MIA Issues.

## Message to the Congress on Trade With Romania

*July 11, 1995*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

On May 19, 1995, I determined and reported to the Congress that Romania is in full compliance with the freedom of emigration criteria of sections 402 and 409 of the Trade Act of 1974. This action allowed for the continuation of most-favored-nation (MFN) status for Romania and certain other activities without the requirement of a waiver.

As required by law, I am submitting an updated Report to Congress concerning emigration laws and policies of Romania. You will find that the report indicates continued Romanian compliance with U.S. and international standards in the area of emigration policy.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
July 11, 1995.

## Message to the Senate Transmitting the Trinidad and Tobago-United States Investment Treaty

*July 11, 1995*

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with Annex and Protocol, signed at Washington on September 26, 1994. I transmit also for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to this Treaty.

The bilateral investment Treaty (BIT) with Trinidad and Tobago is the third such treaty between the United States and a member of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). The Treaty will protect U.S. investment and assist the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago in its efforts to develop its economy by creating conditions more favorable for U.S. private investment and thus strengthen the development of its private sector.

The Treaty is fully consistent with U.S. polity toward international and domestic investment. A specific tenet of U.S. policy, reflected in this Treaty, is that U.S. investment abroad and foreign investment in the United States should receive national treatment. Under this Treaty, the Parties also agree to international law standards for expropriation and compensation for expropriation; free transfer of funds related to investments; freedom of investments from performance requirements; fair, equitable, and most-favored-nation treatment; and the investor or investment's freedom to choose to resolve disputes with the host government through international arbitration.

I recommend that the Senate consider this Treaty as soon as possible, and give its advice

and consent to ratification of the Treaty, with Annex and Protocol, at an early date.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
July 11, 1995.

## Remarks at James Madison High School in Vienna, Virginia

*July 12, 1995*

Thank you, Secretary Riley, for the introduction but more for your outstanding leadership of the Department of Education and the work you have done not only to increase the investment of our country in education but also to lift the quality and the standards of education and to deal forthrightly with some of the more difficult but important issues in education that go to the heart of the character of the young people we build in our country.

Superintendent Spillane, congratulations on your award and the work you are doing here in this district; Dr. Clark; Ms. Lubetkin; to Danny Murphy—I thought he gave such a good speech I could imagine him on a lot of platforms in the years ahead—[*laughter*]—he did a very fine job; Mayor Robinson; and to the Board of Supervisors—Chair Katherine Hanley; and to all the religious leaders, parents, students who are here; the teachers; and especially to the James Madison teachers, thank you for coming today.

Last week at my alma mater, Georgetown, I had a chance to do something that I hope to do more often as President, to have a genuine conversation with the American people about the best way for us to move forward as a nation and to resolve some of the great questions that are nagging us today. I believe, as I have said repeatedly, that our Nation faces two great challenges: first of all, to restore the American dream of opportunity, and the American tradition of responsibility; and second, to bring our country together amidst all of our diversity in a stronger community so that we can find common ground and move forward together.

In my first 2 years as President, I worked harder on the first question, how to get the economy going, how to deal with the specific problems of the country, how to inspire more responsibility through things like welfare reform and child support enforcement. But I have come to believe that unless we can solve the second problem we'll never really solve the first one. Unless we can find a way to honestly and openly debate our differences and find common ground, to celebrate all the diversity of America and still give people a chance to live in the way they think is right, so that we are stronger for our differences, not weaker, we won't be able to meet the economic and other challenges before us. And therefore, I have decided that I should spend some more time in some conversations about things Americans care a lot about and that they're deeply divided over.

Today I want to talk about a subject that can provoke a fight in nearly any country town or on any city street corner in America, religion. It's a subject that should not drive us apart. And we have a mechanism as old as our Constitution for bringing us together.

This country, after all, was founded by people of profound faith who mentioned Divine Providence and the guidance of God twice in the Declaration of Independence. They were searching for a place to express their faith freely without persecution. We take it for granted today that that's so in this country, but it was not always so. And it certainly has not always been so across the world. Many of the people who were our first settlers came here primarily because they were looking for a place where they could practice their faith without being persecuted by the Government.

Here in Virginia's soil, as the Secretary of Education has said, the oldest and deepest roots of religious liberty can be found. The First Amendment was modeled on Thomas Jefferson's Statutes of Religious Liberty for Virginia. He thought so much of it that he asked that on his gravestone it be said not that he was President, not that he had been Vice President or Secretary of State but that he was the founder of the University of Virginia, the author of the Declaration of Independence and the author of the Statutes of Religious Liberty for the State of Virginia.

And of course, no one did more than James Madison to put the entire Bill of Rights in our Constitution, and especially, the first amendment. Religious freedom is

literally our first freedom. It is the first thing mentioned in the Declaration of Independence. And as it opens, it says Congress cannot make a law that either establishes a religion or restricts the free exercise of religion. Now, as with every provision of our Constitution, that law has had to be interpreted over the years, and it has in various ways that some of us agree with and some of us disagree with. But one thing is indisputable: The first amendment has protected our freedom to be religious or not religious, as we choose, with the consequence that in this highly secular age the United States is clearly the most conventionally religious country in the entire world, at least the entire industrialized world. We have more than 250,000 places of worship. More people go to church here every week or to synagogue or to their mosque or other place of worship than in any other country in the world. More peoples believe religion is directly important to their lives than in any other advanced, industrialized country in the world. And it is not an accident. It is something that has always been a part of our life.

I grew up in Arkansas which is, except for West Virginia, probably the State that's most heavily Southern Baptist Protestant in the country. But we had two synagogues and a Greek Orthodox church in my hometown. Not so long ago in the heart of our agricultural country in eastern Arkansas one of our universities did a big outreach to students in the Middle East, and before you know it, out there on this flat land where there was no building more than two stories high, there rose a great mosque. And all the farmers from miles around drove in to see what the mosque was like and try to figure out what was going on there. [*Laughter*]

This is a remarkable country. And I have tried to be faithful to that tradition that we have of the first amendment. It's something that's very important to me.

Secretary Riley mentioned when I was at Georgetown, Georgetown is a Jesuit school, a Catholic school. All the Catholics were required to take theology, and those of us who weren't Catholic took a course in world's religion, which we called Buddhism for Baptists. [*Laughter*] And I began a sort of love affair with the religions that I did not know anything about before that time.

It's a personal thing to me because of my own religious faith and the faith of my family. And I've always felt that in order for me to be free to practice my faith in this country, I had to let other people be as free as possible to practice theirs, and that the Government had an extraordinary obligation to bend over backwards not to do anything to impose any set of views on any group of people or to allow others to do it under the cover of law.

That's why I was very proud—one of the proudest things I've been able to do as President was to sign into law the Religious Freedom Restoration Act in 1993. And it was designed to reverse the decision of the Supreme Court that essentially made it pretty easy for Government, in the pursuit of its legitimate objectives, to restrict the exercise of people's religious liberties. This law basically said—I won't use the legalese—the bottom line was that if the Government is going to restrict anybody's legitimate exercise of religion they have to have an extraordinarily good reason and no other way to achieve their compelling objective other than to do this. You have to bend over backwards to avoid getting in the way of people's legitimate exercise of their religious convictions. That's what that law said.

This is something I've tried to do throughout my career. When I was Governor, for example, we were having—of Arkansas in the eighties—you may remember this—there were religious leaders going to jail in America because they ran child care centers that they refused to have certified by the State because they said it undermined their ministry. We solved that problem in our State. There were people who were prepared to go to jail over the home schooling issue in the eighties because they said it was part of their religious ministry. We solved that problem in our State.

With the Religious Freedom Restoration Act we made it possible, clearly, in areas that were previously ambiguous for Native Americans, for American Jews, for Muslims to practice the full range of their religious practices when they might have otherwise come in contact with some governmental regulation.

And in a case that was quite important to the Evangelicals in our country, I instructed the Justice Department to change our position after the law passed on a tithing case where a family had been tithing to their church and the man declared bankruptcy, and the Government took the position they could go get the money away from the church because he knew he was bankrupt at the time he gave it. And I realized in some ways that was a close question, but I thought we had to stand up for the proposition that people should be able to practice their religious convictions.

Secretary Riley and I, in another context, have also learned as we have gone along in this work that all the religions obviously share a certain devotion to a certain set of values which make a big difference in the schools. I want to commend Secretary Riley for his relentless support of the so-called character education movement in our schools, which is clearly led in many schools that had great troubles to reduce drop-out rates, increased performance in schools, better citizenship in ways that didn't promote any particular religious views but at least unapologetically advocated values shared by all major religions.

In this school, one of the reasons I wanted to come here is because I recognize that this work has been done here. There's a course in this school called combating intolerance, which deals not only with racial issues, but also with religious differences, and studies times in the past when people have been killed in mass numbers and persecuted because of their religious convictions.

You can make a compelling argument that the tragic war in Bosnia today is more of a religious war than an ethnic war. The truth is, biologically, there is no difference in the Serbs, the Croats and the Muslims. They are Catholics, Orthodox Christians and Muslims, and they are so for historic reasons. But it's really more of a religious war than an ethnic war when properly viewed. And I think it's very important that the people in this school are learning that and, in the process, will come back to the distilled essence that every great religion teaches honesty and trustworthiness and responsibility and devotion to family and charity and compassion toward others.

Our sense of our own religion and our respect for others has really helped us to work together for two centuries. It's made a big difference in the way we live and the way we function and our ability to overcome adversity. The Constitution wouldn't be what it is without James Madison's religious values. But it's also, frankly, given us a lot of elbow room. I remember, for example, that Abraham Lincoln was derided by his opponents because he belonged to no organized church. But if you read his writings and you study what happened to him, especially after he came to the White House, he might have had more spiritual depth than any person ever to hold the office that I now have the privilege to occupy.

So we have followed this balance, and it has served us well. Now what I want to talk to you about for a minute is that our Founders understood that religious freedom basically was a coin with two sides. The Constitution protected the free exercise of religion but prohibited the establishment of religion. It's a careful balance that's uniquely American. It is the genius of the first amendment. It does not, as some people have implied, make us a religion-free country. It has made us the most religious country in the world.

It does not convert—let's just take the areas of greatest controversy now. All the fights have come over 200 years over what those two things mean: What does it mean for the government to establish a religion, and what does it mean for a government to interfere with the free exercise of religion. The Religious Freedom Restoration Act was designed to clarify the second provision, government interfering with the free exercise of religion and to say you can do that almost never. You can do that almost never.

We have had a lot more fights in the last 30 years over what the Government establishment of religion means. And that's what the whole debate is now over the issue of school prayer, religious practices in the schools and things of that kind. And I want to talk about it because our schools are the places where so much of our hearts in America and all of our futures are. And I'd like to begin by just sort of pointing out what's going on today and then discussing it if I could. And again, this is always kind of in-

flammatory; I want to have a noninflammatory talk about it. [*Laughter*]

First of all, let me tell you a little about my personal history. Before the Supreme Court's decision in Engel against Vitale, which said that the State of New York could not write a prayer that had to be said in every school in New York every day, school prayer was as common as apple pie in my hometown. And when I was in junior high school, it was my responsibility either to start every day by reading the Bible or get somebody else to do it. Needless to say, I exerted a lot of energy in finding someone else to do it from time to time, being a normal 13-year-old boy.

Now, you could say, ''Well, it certainly didn't do any harm. It might have done a little good.'' But remember what I told you. We had two synagogues in my hometown. We also had pretended to be deeply religious, and there were no blacks in my school. They were in a segregated school. And I can tell you that all of us who were in there doing it never gave a second thought most of the time to the fact that we didn't have blacks in our schools and that there were Jews in the classroom who were probably deeply offended by half the stuff we were saying or doing or maybe made to feel inferior.

I say that to make the point that we have not become less religious over the last 30 years by saying that schools cannot impose a particular religion, even if it's a Christian religion and 98 percent of the kids in the schools are Christian and Protestant. I'm not sure the Catholics were always comfortable with what we did either. We had a big Catholic population in my school and in my hometown. But I did that—I have been a part of this debate we are talking about. This is a part of my personal life experience. So I have seen a lot of progress made and I agreed with the Supreme Court's original decision in *Engel* v. *Vitale.*

Now, since then, I've not always agreed with every decision the Supreme Court made in the area of the first amendment. I said the other day I didn't think the decision on the prayer at the commencement, where the Rabbi was asked to give the nonsectarian prayer at the commencement—I didn't agree with that because I didn't think it any coercion at all. And I thought that people were not interfered with. And I didn't think it amounted to the establishment of a religious practice by the Government. So I have not always agreed.

But I do believe that on balance, the direction of the first amendment has been very good for America and has made us the most religious country in the world by keeping the Government out of creating religion, supporting particular religions, interfering, and interfering with other people's religious practices.

What is giving rise to so much of this debate today I think is two things. One is the feeling that the schools are special and a lot of kids are in trouble, and a lot of kids are in trouble for nonacademic reasons, and we want our kids to have good values and have a good future.

Let me give you just one example. There is today, being released, a new study of drug use among young people by the group that Joe Califano was associated with, Council for a Drug-Free America, massive poll of young people themselves. It's a fascinating study, and I urge all of you to get it. Joe came in a couple of days ago and briefed me on it. It shows disturbingly that even though serious drug use is down overall in groups in America, casual drug use is coming back up among some of our young people who no longer believe that it's dangerous and have forgotten that it's wrong and are basically living in a world that I think is very destructive.

And I see it all the time. It's coming back up. Even though we're investing money and trying to combat it in education and treatment programs and supporting things like the D.A.R.E. program. And we're breaking more drug rings than ever before around the world. It's almost—it's very disturbing because it's fundamentally something that is kind of creeping back in.

But the study shows that there are three major causes for young people not using drugs. One is they believe that their future depends upon their not doing it; they're optimistic about the future. The more optimistic kids are about the future, the less likely they are to use drugs. Second is having a strong, positive relationship with their parents. The closer kids are to their parents and the more

tuned in to them they are and the more their parents are good role models, the less likely kids are to use drugs. You know what the third is? How religious the children are. The more religious the children are, the less likely they are to use drugs.

So what's the big fight over religion in the schools and what does it mean to us and why are people so upset about it? I think there are basically three reasons. One is, people believe that—most Americans believe that if you're religious, personally religious, you ought to be able to manifest that anywhere at any time, in a public or private place. Second, I think that most Americans are disturbed if they think that our Government is becoming anti-religious, instead of adhering to the firm spirit of the first amendment: don't establish, don't interfere with, but respect. And the third thing is people worry about our national character as manifest in the lives of our children. The crime rate is going down in almost every major area in America today, but the rate of violent random crime among very young people is still going up.

So these questions take on a certain urgency today for personal reasons and for larger social reasons. And this old debate that Madison and Jefferson started over 200 years ago is still being spun out today especially as it relates to what can and cannot be done in our schools, and the whole question, specific question, of school prayer, although I would argue it goes way beyond that.

So let me tell you what I think the law is and what we're trying to do about it, since I like the first amendment, and I think we're better off because of it, and I think that if you have two great pillars—the government can't establish and the government can't interfere with—obviously there are going to be a thousand different factual cases that will arise at any given time, and the courts from time to time will make decisions that we don't all agree with. But the question is, are the pillars the right pillars, and do we more or less come out in the right place over the long run.

The Supreme Court is like everybody else. It's imperfect, and so are we. Maybe they're right, and we're wrong. But we are going to have these differences. The fundamental balance that has been struck it seems to me has been very good for America, but what is not good today is that people assume that there is a positive-antireligious bias in the cumulative impact of these court decisions with which our administration, the Justice Department and the Secretary of Education and the President, strongly disagree. So let me tell you what I think the law is today and what I have instructed the Department of Education and the Department of Justice to do about it.

The first amendment does not—I will say again—does not convert our schools into religion-free zones. If a student is told he can't wear a yarmulke, for example, we have an obligation to tell the school the law says the student can, most definitely, wear a yarmulke to school. If a student is told she cannot bring a Bible to school, we have to tell the school, no, the law guarantees her the right to bring the Bible to school.

There are those who do believe our schools should be value-neutral and that religion has no place inside the schools. But I think that wrongly interprets the idea of the wall between church and state. They are not the walls of the school.

There are those who say that values and morals and religions have no place in public education; I think that is wrong. First of all, the consequences of having no values are not neutral, the violence in our streets—not value neutral. The movies we see aren't value neutral. Television is not value neutral. Too often we see expressions of human degradation, immorality, violence, and debasement of the human soul that have more influence and take more time and occupy more space in the minds of our young people than any of the influences that are felt at school anyway. Our schools, therefore, must be a barricade against this kind of degradation. And we can do it without violating the first amendment.

I am deeply troubled that so many Americans feel that their faith is threatened by the mechanisms that are designed to protect their faith. Over the past decade we have seen a real rise in these kind of cultural tensions in America. Some people even say we have a culture war. There have been books written about culture war, the culture of dis-

belief, all these sort of trends arguing that many Americans genuinely feel that a lot of our social problems today have arisen in large measure because the country led by the Government has made an assault on religious convictions. That is fueling a lot of this debate today over what can and cannot be done in the schools.

Much of the tension stems from the idea that religion is simply not welcome at all in what Professor Carter at Yale has called the public square. Americans feel that instead of celebrating their love for God in public, they're being forced to hide their faith behind closed doors. That's wrong. Americans should never have to hide their faith. But some Americans have been denied the right to express their religion and that has to stop. That has happened, and it has to stop. It is crucial that government does not dictate or demand specific religious views, but equally crucial that government doesn't prevent the expression of specific religious views.

When the first amendment is invoked as an obstacle to private expression of religion it is being misused. Religion has a proper place in private and a proper place in public because the public square belongs to all Americans. It's especially important that parents feel confident that their children can practice religion. That's why some families have been frustrated to see their children denied even the most private forms of religious expression in public schools. It is rare, but these things have actually happened.

I know that most schools do a very good job of protecting students' religious rights, but some students in America have been prohibited from reading the Bible silently in study hall. Some student religious groups haven't been allowed to publicize their meetings in the same way that nonreligious groups can. Some students have been prevented even from saying grace before lunch. That is rare, but it has happened, and it is wrong. Wherever and whenever the religious rights of children are threatened or suppressed, we must move quickly to correct it. We want to make it easier and more acceptable for people to express and to celebrate their faith.

Now, just because the first amendment sometimes gets the balance a little bit wrong in specific decisions by specific people doesn't mean there's anything wrong with the first amendment. I still believe the first amendment as it is presently written permits the American people to do what they need to do. That's what I believe. Let me give you some examples and you see if you agree.

First of all, the first amendment does not require students to leave their religion at the schoolhouse door. We wouldn't want students to leave the values they learn from religion, like honesty and sharing and kindness, behind at the schoolhouse door, and reinforcing those values is an important part of every school's mission.

Some school officials and teachers and parents believe that the Constitution forbids any religions expression at all in public schools. That is wrong. Our courts have made it clear that that is wrong. It is also not a good idea. Religion is too important to our history and our heritage for us to keep it out of our schools. Once again, it shouldn't be demanded, but as long as it is not sponsored by school officials and doesn't interfere with other children's rights, it mustn't be denied.

For example, students can pray privately and individually whenever they want. They can say grace themselves before lunch. There are times when they can pray out loud together. Student religious clubs in high schools can and should be treated just like any other extracurricular club. They can advertise their meetings, meet on school grounds, use school facilities just as other clubs can. When students can choose to read a book to themselves, they have every right to read the Bible or any other religious text they want.

Teachers can and certainly should teach about religion and the contributions it has made to our history, our values, our knowledge, to our music and our art in our country and around the world, and to the development of the kind of people we are. Students can also pray to themselves—preferably before tests, as I used to do. [*Laughter*]

Students should feel free to express their religion and their beliefs in homework, through art work, during class presentations, as long as it's relevant to the assignment. If students can distribute flyers or pamphlets that have nothing to do with the school, they can distribute religious flyers and pamphlets

on the same basis. If students can wear T-shirts advertising sports teams, rock groups, or politicians, they can also wear T-shirts that promote religion. If certain subjects or activities are objectionable to their students or their parents because of their religious beliefs, then schools may, and sometimes they must, excuse the students from those activities.

Finally, even though the schools can't advocate religious beliefs, as I said earlier, they should teach mainstream values and virtues. The fact that some of these values happen to be religious values does not mean that they cannot be taught in our schools.

All these forms of religious expression and worship are permitted and protected by the first amendment. That doesn't change the fact that some students haven't been allowed to express their beliefs in these ways. What we have to do is to work together to help all Americans understand exactly what the first amendment does. It protects freedom of religion by allowing students to pray, and it protects freedom of religion by preventing schools from telling them how and when and what to pray. The first amendment keeps us all on common ground. We are allowed to believe and worship as we choose without the Government telling any of us what we can and cannot do.

It is in that spirit that I am today directing the Secretary of Education and the Attorney General to provide every school district in America before school starts this fall with a detailed explanation of the religious expression permitted in schools, including all the things that I've talked about today. I hope parents, students, educators, and religious leaders can use this directive as a starting point. I hope it helps them to understand their differences, to protect student's religious rights, and to find common ground. I believe we can find that common ground.

This past April a broad coalition of religious and legal groups—Christian and Jewish, conservative and liberal, Supreme Court advocates, and Supreme Court critics—put themselves on the solution side of this debate. They produced a remarkable document called "Religion in Public Schools: A Joint Statement of Current Law." They put aside their deep differences and said, we all agree on what kind of religious expression the law permits in our schools. My directive borrows heavily and gratefully from their wise and thoughtful statement. This is a subject that could have easily divided the men and women that came together to discuss it. But they moved beyond their differences, and that may be as important as the specific document they produced.

I also want to mention over 200 religious and civic leaders who signed the Williamsburg Charter in Virginia in 1988. That charter reaffirms the core principles of the first amendment. We can live together with our deepest differences and all be stronger for it.

The charter signers are impressive in their own right and all the more impressive for their differences of opinion, including Presidents Ford and Carter; Chief Justice Rehnquist and the late Chief Justice Burger; Senator Dole and former Governor Dukakis; Bill Bennett and Lane Kirkland, the president of the AFL–CIO; Norman Lear and Phyllis Schlafly signed it together—(*laughter*)—Coretta Scott King and Reverend James Dobson.

These people were able to stand up publicly because religion is a personal and private thing for Americans which has to have some public expression. That's how it is for me. I'm pretty old-fashioned about these things. I really do believe in the constancy of sin and the constant possibility of forgiveness, the reality of redemption and the promise of a future life. But I'm also a Baptist who believes that salvation is primarily personal and private, that my relationship is directly with God and not through any intermediary. Other people can have different views. And I've spent a good part of my life trying to understand different religious views, celebrate them, and figure out what brings us together.

I will say again, the first amendment is a gift to us. And the Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution in broad ways so that it could grow and change but hold fast to certain principles. They knew—they knew that all people were fallible and would make mistakes from time to time. And as I said, there are times when the Supreme Court makes a decision, if I disagree with it, one of us

is wrong. There's another possibility: both of us could be wrong. [*Laughter*] That's the way it is in human affairs.

But what I want to say to the American people and what I want to say to you is that James Madison and Thomas Jefferson did not intend to drive a stake in the heart of religion and to drive it out of our public life. What they intended to do was to set up a system so that we could bring religion into our public life and into our private life without any of us telling the other what to do.

This is a big deal today. One county in America, Los Angeles County, has over 150 different racial and ethnic groups in it, over 150 different. How many religious views do you suppose are in those groups? How many? Every significant religion in the world is represented in significant numbers in one American county and many smaller religious groups in one American county.

We have got to get this right. We have got to get this right. And we have to keep this balance. This country needs to be a place where religion grows and flourishes.

Don't you believe that if every kid in every difficult neighborhood in America were in a religious institution on the weekends, the synagogue on Saturday, a church on Sunday, a mosque on Friday, don't you really believe that the drug rate, the crime rate, the violence rate, the sense of self-destruction would go way down and the quality of the character of this country would go way up?

But don't you also believe that if for the last 200 years we had had a State governed religion, people would be bored with it, think that it would—[*laughter*]—they would think it had been compromised by politicians, shaved around the edges, imposed on people who didn't really cotton to it, and we wouldn't have 250,000 houses of worship in America? I mean, we wouldn't.

It may be imperfect, the first amendment, but it is the nearest thing ever created in any human society for the promotion of religion and religious values because it left us free to do it. And I strongly believe that the Government has made a lot of mistakes which we have tried to roll back in interfering with that around the edges. That's what the Religious Freedom Restoration Act is all about. That's what this directive that Secretary Riley and the Justice Department and I have worked so hard on is all about. That's what our efforts to bring in people of different religious views are all about. And I strongly believe that we have erred when we have rolled it back too much. And I hope that we can have a partnership with our churches in many ways to reach out to the young people who need the values, the hope, the belief, the convictions that comes with faith, and the sense of security in a very uncertain and rapidly changing world.

But keep in mind we have a chance to do it because of the heritage of America and the protection of the first amendment. We have to get it right.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:58 a.m. In his remarks, he referred to Superintendent Robert Spillane, Fairfax County School System; Principal Robert Clark; Assistant Principal Linda Lubetkin; Student Council President Danny Murphy; Mayor Charles A. Robinson, Jr., of Vienna; Chairman Katherine Hanley, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors; television producer Norman Lear; and conservative spokespersons Bill Bennett, Phyllis Schlafly, and Rev. James Dobson.

## Memorandum on Religious Expression in Public Schools

*July 12, 1995*

*Memorandum for the Secretary of Education, the Attorney General*

*Subject:* Religious Expression in Public Schools

Religious freedom is perhaps the most precious of all American liberties—called by many our "first freedom." Many of the first European settlers in North America sought refuge from religious persecution in their native countries. Since that time, people of faith and religious institutions have played a central role in the history of this Nation. In the First Amendment, our Bill of Rights recognizes the twin pillars of religious liberty: the constitutional protection for the free exercise of religion, and the constitutional prohibition on the establishment of religion by the state. Our Nation's founders knew that religion helps to give our people the character without which a democracy cannot sur-

vive. Our founders also recognized the need for a space of freedom between government and the people—that the government must not be permitted to coerce the conscience of any individual or group.

In the over 200 years since the First Amendment was included in our Constitution, religion and religious institutions have thrived throughout the United States. In 1993, I was proud to reaffirm the historic place of religion when I signed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which restores a high legal standard to protect the exercise of religion from being inappropriately burdened by government action. In the greatest traditions of American citizenship, a broad coalition of individuals and organizations came together to support the fullest protection for religious practice and expression.

### *Religious Expression in Public Schools*

I share the concern and frustration that many Americans feel about situations where the protections accorded by the First Amendment are not recognized or understood. This problem has manifested itself in our Nation's public schools. It appears that some school officials, teachers and parents have assumed that religious expression of any type is either inappropriate, or forbidden altogether, in public schools.

As our courts have reaffirmed, however, nothing in the First Amendment converts our public schools into religion-free zones, or requires all religious expression to be left behind at the schoolhouse door. While the government may not use schools to coerce the consciences of our students, or to convey official endorsement of religion, the government's schools also may not discriminate against private religious expression during the school day.

I have been advised by the Department of Justice and the Department of Education that the First Amendment permits—and protects—a greater degree of religious expression in public schools than many Americans may now understand. The Departments of Justice and Education have advised me that, while application may depend upon specific factual contexts and will require careful consideration in particular cases, the following principles are among those that apply to religious expression in our schools:

*Student prayer and religious discussion:* The Establishment Clause of the First Amendment does not prohibit purely private religious speech by students. Students therefore have the same right to engage in individual or group prayer and religious discussion during the school day as they do to engage in other comparable activity. For example, students may read their Bibles or other scriptures, say grace before meals, and pray before tests to the same extent they may engage in comparable non-disruptive activities. Local school authorities possess substantial discretion to impose rules of order and other pedagogical restrictions on student activities, but they may not structure or administer such rules to discriminate against religious activity or speech.

Generally, students may pray in a nondisruptive manner when not engaged in school activities or instruction, and subject to the rules that normally pertain in the applicable setting. Specifically, students in informal settings, such as cafeterias and hallways, may pray and discuss their religious views with each other, subject to the same rules of order as apply to other student activities and speech. Students may also speak to, and attempt to persuade, their peers about religious topics just as they do with regard to political topics. School officials, however, should intercede to stop student speech that constitutes harassment aimed at a student or a group of students.

Students may also participate in before or after school events with religious content, such as "see you at the flag pole" gatherings, on the same terms as they may participate in other non-curriculum activities on school premises. School officials may neither discourage nor encourage participation in such an event.

The right to engage in voluntary prayer or religious discussion free from discrimination does not include the right to have a captive audience listen, or to

compel other students to participate. Teachers and school administrators should ensure that no student is in any way coerced to participate in religious activity.

*Graduation prayer and baccalaureates:* Under current Supreme Court decisions, school officials may not mandate or organize prayer at graduation, nor organize religious baccalaureate ceremonies. If a school generally opens its facilities to private groups, it must make its facilities available on the same terms to organizers of privately sponsored religious baccalaureate services. A school may not extend preferential treatment to baccalaureate ceremonies and may in some instances be obliged to disclaim official endorsement of such ceremonies.

*Official neutrality regarding religious activity:* Teachers and school administrators, when acting in those capacities, are representatives of the state and are prohibited by the establishment clause from soliciting or encouraging religious activity, and from participating in such activity with students. Teachers and administrators also are prohibited from discouraging activity because of its religious content, and from soliciting or encouraging antireligious activity.

*Teaching about religion:* Public schools may not provide religious instruction, but they may teach *about* religion, including the Bible or other scripture: the history of religion, comparative religion, the Bible (or other scripture)-as-literature, and the role of religion in the history of the United States and other countries all are permissible public school subjects. Similarly, it is permissible to consider religious influences on art, music, literature, and social studies.

Although public schools may teach about religious holidays, including their religious aspects, and may celebrate the secular aspects of holidays, schools may not observe holidays as religious events or promote such observance by students.

*Student assignments:* Students may express their beliefs about religion in the form of homework, artwork, and other written and oral assignments free of discrimination based on the religious content of their submissions. Such home and classroom work should be judged by ordinary academic standards of substance and relevance, and against other legitimate pedagogical concerns identified by the school.

*Religious literature:* Students have a right to distribute religious literature to their schoolmates on the same terms as they are permitted to distribute other literature that is unrelated to school curriculum or activities. Schools may impose the same reasonable time, place, and manner or other constitutional restrictions on distribution of religious literature as they do on nonschool literature generally, but they may not single out religious literature for special regulation.

*Religious excusals:* Subject to applicable State laws, schools enjoy substantial discretion to excuse individual students from lessons that are objectionable to the student or the students' parents on religious or other conscientious grounds. School officials may neither encourage nor discourage students from availing themselves of an excusal option. Under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, if it is proved that particular lessons substantially burden a student's free exercise of religion and if the school cannot prove a compelling interest in requiring attendance, the school would be legally required to excuse the student.

*Released time:* Subject to applicable State laws, schools have the discretion to dismiss students to off-premises religious instruction, provided that schools do not encourage or discourage participation or penalize those who do not attend. Schools may not allow religious instruction by outsiders on school premises during the school day.

*Teaching values:* Though schools must be neutral with respect to religion, they may play an active role with respect to teaching civic values and virtue, and the moral code that holds us together as a community. The fact that some of these

values are held also by religions does not make it unlawful to teach them in school.

*Student garb:* Students may display religious messages on items of clothing to the same extent that they are permitted to display other comparable messages. Religious messages may not be singled out for suppression, but rather are subject to the same rules as generally apply to comparable messages. When wearing particular attire, such as yarmulkes and head scarves, during the school day is part of students' religious practice, under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act schools generally may not prohibit the wearing of such items.

I hereby direct the Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Attorney General, to use appropriate means to ensure that public school districts and school officials in the United States are informed, by the start of the coming school year, of the principles set forth above.

### *The Equal Access Act*

The Equal Access Act is designed to ensure that, consistent with the First Amendment, student religious activities are accorded the same access to public school facilities as are student secular activities. Based on decisions of the Federal courts, as well as its interpretations of the Act, the Department of Justice has advised me of its position that the Act should be interpreted as providing, among other things, that:

*General provisions:* Student religious groups at public secondary schools have the same right of access to school facilities as is enjoyed by other comparable student groups. Under the Equal Access Act, a school receiving Federal funds that allows one or more student noncurriculum-related clubs to meet on its premises during noninstructional time may not refuse access to student religious groups.

*Prayer services and worship exercises covered:* A meeting, as defined and protected by the Equal Access Act, may include a prayer service, Bible reading, or other worship exercise.

*Equal access to means of publicizing meetings:* A school receiving Federal funds must allow student groups meeting under the Act to use the school media—including the public address system, the school newspaper, and the school bulletin board—to announce their meetings on the same terms as other noncurriculum-related student groups are allowed to use the school media. Any policy concerning the use of school media must be applied to all noncurriculum-related student groups in a nondiscriminatory matter. Schools, however, may inform students that certain groups are not school sponsored.

*Lunch-time and recess covered:* A school creates a limited open forum under the Equal Access Act, triggering equal access rights for religious groups, when it allows students to meet during their lunch periods or other noninstructional time during the school day, as well as when it allows students to meet before and after the school day.

I hereby direct the Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Attorney General, to use appropriate means to ensure that public school districts and school officials in the United States are informed, by the start of the coming school year, of these interpretations of the Equal Access Act.

**William J. Clinton**

## Statement on Reforms to Environmental Programs To Assist Homeowners

*July 12, 1995*

I am pleased to announce significant reforms to the Endangered Species Act and Clean Water Act wetlands programs to benefit homeowners. Under these reforms, the vast majority of all American homeowners will never have to worry about endangered species or wetlands requirements.

Specifically, for Endangered Species Act programs, the Department of the Interior will essentially eliminate restrictions on single family homeowners with five or fewer acres of land. Similarly, for wetlands programs, the Army Corps of Engineers will

issue a new nationwide permit to allow homeowners to construct or expand their residences without an individual permit. This will apply even if these activities involve filling as much as a half-acre of nontidal wetland.

Finally, I have instructed the heads of each of the relevant departments and agencies to examine all of their programs to determine if there are other actions that they can take to benefit homeowners.

Home ownership and the opportunity for homeowners to use their property without unnecessary restrictions are an essential part of the American dream. We can provide homeowners greater freedom and still protect the environment. This is common sense, reasonable reform—not a reckless, destructive rollback of health and environmental safeguards, as others are proposing.

## Message to the Congress on Libya

*July 12, 1995*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of January 30, 1995, concerning the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order No. 12543 of January 7, 1986. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa–9(c).

1. On December 22, 1994, I renewed for another year the national emergency with respect to Libya pursuant to IEEPA. This renewal extended the current comprehensive financial and trade embargo against Libya in effect since 1986. Under these sanctions, all trade with Libya is prohibited, and all assets owned or controlled by the Libyan government in the United States or in the possession or control of U.S. persons are blocked.

2. There has been one amendment to the Libyan Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 550 (the "Regulations"), administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) of the Department of the Treasury, since my last report on January 30, 1995. The amendment (60 *Fed. Reg.* 8300, February 14, 1995) added 144 entities to appendix A, Organizations Determined to Be Within the Term "Government of Libya" (Specially Designated Nationals ("SDNs") of Libya). The amendment also added 19 individuals to appendix B, Individuals Determined to Be Specially Designated Nationals of the Government of Libya. A copy of the amendment is attached to this report.

Pursuant to section 550.304(a) of the Regulations, FAC has determined that these entities and individuals designated as SDNs are owned or controlled by, or acting or purporting to act directly or indirectly on behalf of, the Government of Libya, or are agencies, instrumentalities or entities of that government. By virtue of this determination, all property and interests in property of these entities or persons that are in the United States or in the possession or control of U.S. persons are blocked. Further, U.S. persons are prohibited from engaging in transactions with these individuals or entities unless the transactions are licensed by FAC. The designations were made in consultation with the Department of State and announced by FAC in notices issued on January 10 and January 24, 1995.

3. During the current 6-month period, FAC made numerous decisions with respect to applications for licenses to engage in transactions under the Regulations, issuing 119 licensing determinations—both approvals and denials. Consistent with FAC's ongoing scrutiny of banking transactions, the largest category of license approvals (83) concerned requests by Libyan and non-Libyan persons or entities to unblock bank accounts initially blocked because of an apparent Government of Libya interest. The largest category of denials (14) was for banking transactions in which FAC found a Government of Libya interest. One license was issued authorizing intellectual property protection in Libya and another for travel to Libya to visit close family members.

In addition, FAC issued one determination with respect to applications from attorneys to receive fees and reimbursement of expenses for provision of legal services to the Government of Libya in connection with

wrongful death civil actions arising from the Pan Am 103 bombing. Civil suits have been filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and in the Southern District of New York. Representation of the Government of Libya when named as a defendant in or otherwise made a party to domestic U.S. legal proceedings is authorized by section 550.517(b)(2) of the Regulations under certain conditions.

4. During the current 6-month period, FAC continued to emphasize to the international banking community in the United States the importance of identifying and blocking payments made by or on behalf of Libya. The FAC worked closely with the banks to implement new interdiction software systems to identify such payments. As a result, during the reporting period, more than 171 transactions involving Libya, totaling more than $6.5 million, were blocked. As of May 25, 27 of these transactions had been licensed to be released, leaving a net amount of more than $5.2 million blocked.

Since my last report, FAC collected 37 civil monetary penalties totaling more than $354,700 for violations of the U.S. sanctions against Libya. Eleven of the violations involved the failure of banks to block funds transfers to Libyan-owned or -controlled banks. Two other penalties were received from companies for originating funds transfers to Libyan-owned or -controlled banks. Two corporations paid penalties for export violations. Twenty-two additional penalties were paid by U.S. citizens engaging in Libyan oilfield-related transactions while another 54 cases of similar violations are in active penalty processing.

Various enforcement actions carried over from previous reporting periods have continued to be aggressively pursued. The FAC has continued its efforts under the "Operation Roadblock" initiative. This ongoing program seeks to identify U.S. persons who travel to and/or work in Libya in violation of U.S. law.

Several new investigations of potentially significant violations of the Libyan sanctions have been initiated by FAC and cooperating U.S. law enforcement agencies, primarily the U.S. Customs Service. Many of these cases are believed to involve complex conspiracies to circumvent the various prohibitions of the Libyan sanctions, as well as the utilization of international diversionary shipping routes to and from Libya. The FAC has continued to work closely with the Departments of State and Justice to identify U.S. persons who enter into contracts or agreements with the Government of Libya, or other third-country parties, to lobby United States Government officials or to engage in public relations work on behalf of the Government of Libya without FAC authorization. In addition, during the period FAC attended several bilateral and multilateral meetings with foreign sanctions authorities, as well as with private foreign institutions, to consult on issues of mutual interest and to encourage strict adherence to the U.N.-mandated sanctions.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from January 7 through July 6, 1995, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the Libyan national emergency are estimated at approximately $830,000.00. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Office of the General Counsel, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of State, and the Department of Commerce.

6. The policies and actions of the Government of Libya continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. In adopting UNSCR 883 in November 1993, the Security Council determined that the continued failure of the Government of Libya to demonstrate by concrete actions its renunciation of terrorism, and in particular its continued failure to respond fully and effectively to the requests and decisions of the Security Council in UNSCRs 731 and 748, concerning the bombing of the Pan Am 103 and UTA 772 flights, constituted a threat to international peace and security. The United States continues to believe that still stronger international measures than those mandated by UNSCR 883, possibly including a worldwide oil embargo, should be imposed if Libya continues to defy the will of the international community as expressed in UNSCR 731. We remain determined to ensure that the perpetrators of the terrorist acts against Pan Am

103 and UTA 772 are brought to justice. The families of the victims in the murderous Lockerbie bombing and other acts of Libyan terrorism deserve nothing less. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against Libya fully and effectively, so long as those measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments as required by law.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
July 12, 1995.

## Remarks on Welfare Reform and an Exchange With Reporters

*July 13, 1995*

***The President.*** Good morning. I want to thank Senator Daschle, Senator Moynihan, Senator Mikulski, Senator Breaux, Senator Harkin for coming. Governor Carper; Mayor Archer; a county executive from Madison, Wisconsin, Rick Phelps; and the majority leader of the Tennessee House of Representatives, Bill Purcell, for joining members of our administration here.

We have just had a good talk about welfare reform and the growing consensus around the approach taken by the bill offered by Senators Daschle and Mikulski and Breaux on welfare reform.

The American people have made it abundantly clear that they want us to fix the welfare system. It doesn't work for the people who are stuck on it, and it doesn't work for the taxpayers.

Welfare reform furthers both of the primary objectives of our administration. If it works, it will further the American dream of opportunity, and it will further the American value of responsibility. Our goal should be to help people be successful and independent workers and to build strong families.

We ought to be able to do this. We've come a long way in this debate. There's a broad consensus, for example, on tougher child support enforcement requirements. And not so very long ago, liberals opposed work requirements; they don't anymore. Not so very long ago, conservatives opposed spending money to provide child care when people move from welfare to work; most conservatives out in the country don't any more.

In America, where people live with this issue, there is a great deal of consensus about what we ought to do. And we ought to build on that consensus here in Washington. The reason we can't is that some people on the far right are blocking any action on welfare reform, and the Senate especially now, that doesn't cut off children and parents if the parents are young, poor, and unmarried. I think that is a terrible mistake. We shouldn't punish babies for their parents' mistakes. We ought to be building strong families and independent workers.

I'm not the only person who feels this way. Yesterday, I had a meeting with the Catholic bishops, who deeply oppose the extreme position of these far right Senators, and they're helping to lead the fight against it. They think it's cruel, and they believe it will even lead to more abortions.

I also think that people in the State legislatures and the Governors' offices throughout the country should think about the approach that is being offered on the other side. We believe it could constitute a huge, unfunded burden on State and local governments, people actually dealing with the welfare reform issue in the years ahead.

Now, there is an alternative. This shouldn't be hard. We basically all agree on what ought to be in a welfare reform proposal. It isn't getting done because a few Senators with an extreme position have decided that it is in their political interest to block any welfare legislation. The United States Senate should not practice "just say no" politics on welfare reform. We can fix this problem.

Every week that goes by, thousands of welfare mothers stay on welfare instead of going to work simply because they can't afford child care. Every week we don't make our child support laws as tough as we possibly can, we leave 800,000 people on welfare who could be off welfare if they got the child support to which they are legally entitled. Every day without welfare reform drains our economic strength, saps our community spirit, and prevents Americans from being able to live up to their full potential.

We need to work together and get this job done. This coalition is growing. We're going

to continue to work. We need help. We cannot pass welfare reform without Republicans and Democrats working together. It is time to move away from the extreme position toward the common ground of sensible welfare reform.

I thank all these people who are here for supporting that.

### *Bosnia*

***Q.*** Mr. President, is it time for the U.N. troops to get out of Bosnia and for the U.S. to lift the arms embargo, as Senator Dole and others are proposing?

***The President.*** Well, first of all, let me comment on the events of the last few days. I am very disturbed about what has happened in Srebrenica. We are very concerned about the fate of the refugees. And we have been working hard for the last couple of days to determine what options there are to deal with the immediate humanitarian problems. And we intend to do everything we can on that. And that is the first and foremost thing.

The truth is that the Bosnian Serbs should do what they did the last time this crisis arose, they should withdraw. And the United Nations should go back in there and reestablish the safe area, and the people should be able to go home. But we have to deal with the humanitarian crisis.

Now on the second issue, let me remind you of what my position has always been and what it still is today. The Europeans have tried to take the lead, under the umbrella of the United Nations, in minimizing the loss of life in Bosnia, in keeping the conflict from spreading, and in urging a diplomatic resolution of the war. They are still committed to do that.

I believe if the Rapid Reaction Force idea, which the French and the British have pushed, had been fully implemented before this occurred, this problem could have been minimized.

I still do not believe that it is in the interest of the United States to collapse and force the Europeans out of their willingness to put ground troops on the ground in Bosnia to try to minimize the loss of life and limit the spread. If the United Nations mission does collapse, then I believe that, together, the allies should all vote on the arms embargo. That is the best way to keep the NATO position unified, to keep the world position unified, and to avoid overly Americanizing the dealings in Bosnia should the U.N. mission collapse.

I'm quite concerned about that. The Europeans have been willing to try to solve what is clearly the toughest problem they face on their own continent in the aftermath of the cold war. I have tried to be supportive of that. There are serious problems now with this. Unless we can restore the integrity of the U.N. mission, obviously, its days will be numbered.

But let's not forget that it has accomplished a dramatic reduction in the loss of life since 1992, and the conflict has not spread. This is a serious challenge to the U.N. mission. It must either be resolved or there will have to be some changes there.

### *Tobacco*

***Q.*** Mr. President, on another welfare issue that's headed for your desk, what are you going to do about this tobacco issue that is headed for your decision?

***The President.*** Well, I haven't—let me say this—I have not received a recommendation from the FDA. I saw the news reports today, and they struck me as somewhat premature inasmuch as I have not yet received either a recommendation or, as the news reports indicated, requests for my own guidance on that yet.

But we have had some discussions, and I can tell you this: My concern is apparently what the FDA's concern is, and that is the impact of cigarette smoking, particularly on our young people, and the fact that cigarette smoking seems to be going up among our young people and certainly among certain groups of them. And I think we ought to do more about that than is being done, and I'm willing to do that. But I want to see exactly what their recommendation is.

### *Base Closing Process*

***Q.*** Mr. President, how do you answer the charge that the White House has injected politics into the base closing process?

***The President.*** First of all, it is absolutely false. I intend to answer it in the letter that

I write today, but since you gave me a chance to do it, I'll answer it.

Let's look at the facts here. Where is the politics? This Base Closing Commission made far more changes in the Pentagon plan than either any of the three previous base closing commissions, far more. They've been under a lot of political pressure. I understand that. I don't disagree with all the changes they made.

They acknowledge—secondly, under the law they are supposed to take into account economic impact. Based on their report, which I have read—and I urge all of you to read it if you haven't—before you make any judgments about where there was political influence, I urge all of you to read it. They took 23 bases or realignments off that the Pentagon recommended, off the list and then put 9 more on, 3 of which happen to be in California, with the biggest job loss by far in San Antonio at Kelly Air Force Base, rejecting the Defense Department's recommendation that instead of closing these 2 big Air Force depots, they take an across-the-board cut in all 5 of them. That's what they did.

Apparently, in all of their deliberations the only place where they took economic impact into account was at the Red River Depot on the border of Texas and my home State. It is clear that—I think they have a case there. It would have almost doubled unemployment in that community.

But let's look at the facts on this politics. This is about economics. In the report itself they acknowledge that at Kelly Air Force Base 60 percent of the employees are Hispanic; 45 percent of the Hispanics employed in the entire area work there; that it will have a devastating impact. And they were willing to shut down about 16,000 jobs, when there was another alternative that saved at least as much money, according to the Pentagon, or nearly as much, according to them.

Secondly, in California here are the facts. I have not seen these anywhere. I have not seen these anywhere. The law requires economic impact to be taken into account. Here are the facts.

When this Base Closing Commission process started, California had 13 percent of the population, 15 percent of the people in military, 20 percent of the defense budget. In the first 3 base closings they sustained 52 percent of the direct job losses. We're not talking about indirect jobs; we're not talking about speculation—52 percent.

In this recommendation the Pentagon hit them pretty hard, recommended closing Long Beach, a big facility. This Base Closing Commission, not satisfied with that, made a decision that they had to add back a lot of other jobs. So they decided to take almost all the jobs they took out, out of one place, San Antonio, Texas, and by closing 3 California bases, taking the California job loss in this round to almost 50 percent.

Now, you tell me that my concern over that economic situation when their unemployment rate is 8.5 percent, they have borne over 50 percent of the burden of the job loss, is political. My concern in San Antonio, Texas, where one decision could virtually wipe out the Hispanic middle class is political, when there was another alternative that the Pentagon said was better for national security—I am tired of these arguments about politics. My political concern is the political economy of America and what happens to the people in these communities and are they being treated fairly.

Now, I do not disagree with every recommendation the Base Closing Commission made, but this is an outrage. And there has been a calculated, deliberate attempt to turn this into a political thing and to obscure the real economic impact of their recommendations in San Antonio and California, which were made solely so they could put back a lot of other things.

Now, let's not——

***Q.*** Why do you think they did that?

***Q.*** Have you accepted their recommendations?

***Q.*** What is the reason that they did that?

***The President.*** I don't know. I'm not imputing motives to them. I'm just saying it's very interesting to me that there has been almost no analysis of anything. This whole thing immediately became, well, this is a big political story about California. This is an economic story, and it's a national security story. And there has been no analysis of what got put back and why, and what got taken off and why.

And I have been doing my best to deal with what is in the national interest. There are two considerations here. We have to reduce our base capacity. That's the most important thing. We have twice as much base capacity as we need, more or less, for the size of the military force we have. That is a national security interest. And that is my first and most important duty. But secondly, under the law, economic impact was supposed to be taken into account, and as nearly as I can determine, it wasn't anywhere—never in these determinations, with the possible exception of the Red River Depot, based on my reading of the report.

Now, the question is, is there a way to accept these recommendations, because even though I think they're far—they're not as good as what the Pentagon recommended and they do a lot more economic harm for very little extra security gain—is there a way to accept them and minimize the economic loss in the areas where I think it is plainly excessive. And that is what we have been working on. That is what I've been working hard on. But I just want you to know that I deeply resent the suggestion that this is somehow a political deal.

I have not seen anything written anywhere that the State of California lost 52 percent of the jobs in the first three base closings and that this commission took them back up to nearly 50 percent in this one, even though they only have 15 percent of the soldiers and their unemployment rate is 50 percent above the national average. I haven't seen anywhere what this was likely to do to the Hispanic middle class and to the people of San Antonio, Texas, unless we can save a lot of those jobs there so that a lot of other things could be put back in 10 or 11 places around the country.

And I think that you folks need to look at the real impact of this. I am trying to do my job to reduce the capacity of the bases in the country consistent with the national interest and still be faithful to the statute requiring us to deal with the economic impact on these communities.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:08 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Tom Carper of Delaware and Mayor Dennis Archer of Detroit, MI.

## Statement on the Appointment of the Chairman of the Commission on the Roles and Capabilities of the United States Intelligence Community

*July 13, 1995*

I am announcing today my intention to appoint Harold Brown to chair the congressionally mandated Commission on the Roles and Capabilities of the United States Intelligence Community. This appointment fills the post held by Les Aspin. Like Les, Harold Brown brings a rich combination of experience, creativity, and vision to this crucial job.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank former Senator Warren Rudman, who so ably served as Acting Chairman in the interim and who will again assume the position of Vice Chairman. He and Tony Harrington, as Acting Vice Chairman, have done an excellent job keeping up the momentum of the Commission's work. They and the rest of the Commission are conducting a thorough assessment of the kind of intelligence community we will need to address the security challenges of the future.

Harold Brown is a counselor at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. Prior to this post, he has served as Secretary of Defense from 1977 to 1981. He also served as Director of Defense Research and Engineering from 1961 to 1965, and Secretary of the Air Force from 1965 to 1969. In addition, he was president of the California Institute of Technology from 1969 to 1977, and he was chairman of the Johns Hopkins Foreign Policy Institute from 1984 to 1992.

## Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting the Report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

*July 13, 1995*

*Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. Chairman:)*

I am pleased to transmit the 1994 Annual Report of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA).

The ACDA was established in 1961 in part because Dean Rusk, Secretary of State at that

time, believed the President needed access to unfiltered arms control analysis.

After a comprehensive review in 1993 and a second review in early 1995, it is clear to me that Secretary Rusk was correct: sound arms control and nonproliferation policy requires an independent, specialized, and technically competent arms control and nonproliferation agency.

In the absence of such an agency, neither I nor any future President could count on receiving independent arms control advice, unfiltered by other policy considerations. A President would thus at times have to make the most consequential national security decisions without the benefit of vigorous advocacy of the arms control point of view.

Moreover, I have found that ACDA's unique combination of single-mission technical expertise with its painstakingly developed capability for multilateral negotiation and implementation of the most intricate arms control and nonproliferation agreements could not be sustained with equal effectiveness outside of a dedicated arms control agency.

The ACDA's first major success was the establishment of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Twenty-five years later, its most recent major success is its long-term effort culminating in permanent and unconditional extension of that same Treaty. On both counts, America and the world are far more secure because of the ability and dedication of ACDA's leadership and professional staff.

I have therefore decided that ACDA will remain independent and continue its central role in U.S. arms control and nonproliferation policy.

Whether the issue is nuclear nonproliferation, nuclear missile reduction, chemical weapons elimination, or any of the other growing arms control and nonproliferation challenges America faces, ACDA is an essential national security asset.

In that spirit, I commend this report to you.

Sincerely,

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Jesse Helms, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

## Remarks at the Central Intelligence Agency in Langley, Virginia

*July 14, 1995*

Thank you so much. Director Deutch and Mrs. Deutch, Deputy Director and Mrs. Tenet, Members of Congress, members of the Aspin Commission who are here, men and women of the intelligence community: I can't help thinking here at the Central Intelligence Agency that if we were giving intelligence awards today they would go to the people back there under the trees. [*Laughter*] Congratulations to all of you for your adaptation of the natural environment to the task at hand.

Before I begin my remarks today I'd like to take care of an important piece of business. Just a month ago it was with regret but great gratitude for his 32 years of service to our country that I accepted the resignation of Admiral Bill Studeman as the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence. Today it is with great pleasure that I award him the President's National Security Medal. Admiral Studeman, Mrs. Studeman, please come up.

This is the highest award a member of our intelligence community, military or civilian, can receive. And no one deserves it more and the honor it represents. Most of you are well aware of Bill's extraordinary and exemplary career in the Navy, at the National Security Agency, and then here at the CIA. Let me say that as Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, he served two Presidents and three DCI's. For two extended periods he took on the responsibilities of Acting Director. He provided continuity and leadership to this community at a time of change and great challenge. Here, in Congress, and throughout the executive branch, he earned a reputation for integrity, competence, and reliability of the highest order. He has dedicated his professional life to making the American people safer and more secure. And today it is only fitting among those who know best the contributions he has made to our country to award him this medal as a small measure of thanks for a job well done and a life well lived.

Thank you, Admiral.

You know as the Studemans make their way back to their chairs, I have to tell you that even though I have a lot of important things to say, I am loathe to make this speech in this heat. Once in the middle of a campaign for Governor I went up to a place in northeast Arkansas to make a speech for a county judge who was determined that I had to come to celebrate this road that he had built with funds that I gave him. He neglected to tell me that the road ended in the middle of a rice field. [*Laughter*] The only people that are laughing are the people that understand what this means. In the summertime in a rice field, there is nothing but heat and mosquitos. And a swarm of mosquitos came up in the middle of his introduction, literally hundreds of thousands of mosquitos. It was so bad that people were slapping at their cheeks and their legs and blood was streaming down people's faces and cheeks. And this judge was one of the rare people that mosquitoes would never bite. I had been Governor for 10 years; these people knew me better than he did. He took 6 minutes to introduce me. It seemed like it was 6 years. [*Laughter*] And I finally was introduced, and I gave the following speech: Folks, I have a good speech, if you want to hear it, come to the air-conditioned building down there. If we don't get out of here, we'll all die. If you reelect me, I'll kill every mosquito in the county. [*Laughter*]

I have to tell you that after that I never received less than two-thirds of the vote in that county. [*Laughter*] So I'm loath to give this speech. But I will cut it down and say what I have to say to you because it's very important that I say these things, and very important that America know that you're here and what you're doing.

Fifty-four years ago, in the weeks that led up to Pearl Harbor, there was a wide range of intelligence suggesting a Japanese attack that made its way to Washington. But there was no clear clearinghouse to collect the information and to get it to the decisionmakers. That is what led President Truman to establish a central intelligence organization.

In the years since, the men and women of the CIA and its sister agencies have done more than most Americans will or can ever know to keep our Nation strong and secure and to advance the cause of democracy and freedom around the world.

Today, because the cold war is over, some say that we should and can step back from the world and that we don't need intelligence as much as we used to, that we ought to severely cut the intelligence budget. A few have even urged us to scrap the central intelligence service. I think these views are profoundly wrong. I believe making deep cuts in intelligence during peacetime is comparable to canceling your health insurance when you're feeling fine.

We are living at a moment of hope. Our Nation is at peace, our economy is growing, all right. All around the world democracy and free markets are on the march. But none of these developments are inevitable or irreversible, and every single study of human psychology or the human spirit—every single religious tract tells us that there will be troubles, wars and rumors of war until the end of time.

Now instead of a single enemy, we face a host of scattered and dangerous challenges, but they are quite profound and difficult to understand. There are ethnic and regional tensions that threaten to flare into full-scale war in more than 30 nations. Two dozen countries are trying to get their hands on nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. As these terrible tools of destruction spread, so too spreads the potential for terrorism and for criminals to acquire them. And drug trafficking, organized crime, and environmental decay threaten the stability of new and emerging democracies, and threaten our well-being here at home.

In the struggle against these forces, you, the men and women of our intelligence community, serve on the front lines. By necessity, a lot of your work is hidden from the headlines. But in recent months alone you warned us when Iraq massed its troops against the Kuwaiti border. You provided vital support to our peacekeeping and humanitarian missions in Haiti and Rwanda. You helped to strike a blow at a Colombian drug cartel. You uncovered bribes that would have cheated American companies out of billions of dollars. Your work has saved lives and promoted America's prosperity. I am here today first

and foremost to thank you and your families for the work and sacrifices you have made for the security of the United States of America.

I want to work with you to maintain the information and the intelligence advantage we have and to meet the demands of a new era. Today our Government is deluged with more and more information from more and more sources. What once was secret can now be available to anybody with cable TV or access to the Internet. It moves around the world at record speed. And in order to justify spending billions of dollars in this kind of environment on intelligence and to maintain our edge, you have to deliver timely, unique information that focuses on real threats to the security of our people on the basis of information not otherwise available.

That means we have to rethink what we collect and how we organize the intelligence community to collect it. We must be selective. We can't possibly have in a world with so many diverse threats and tight budgets the resources to collect everything. You need and deserve clear priorities from me and our national security team.

Earlier this year I set out in a Presidential decision directive what we most want you to focus on, priorities that will remain under constant review but still are clear enough at the present time. First, the intelligence needs of our military during an operation. If we have to stand down Iraqi aggression in the Gulf or stand for democracy in Haiti, our military commanders must have prompt, thorough intelligence to fully inform their decisions and maximize the security of our troops. Second, political, economic, and military intelligence about countries hostile to the United States. We must also compile all source information on major political and economic powers with weapons of mass destruction who are potentially hostile to us. Third, intelligence about specific transnational threats to our security, such as weapons proliferation, terrorism, drug trafficking, organized crime, illicit trade practices, and environmental issues of great gravity.

This work must be done today, and it is vital to our security. But it cannot be immune to the tough budget climate in which we are all living. That's why I'm pleased that more than every before, our intelligence agencies are cooperating to work efficiently and to eliminate duplication. You are already implementing on or ahead of schedule 33 streamlining recommendations set out by Vice President Gore and former DCI Woolsey, as well as changes proposed by Director Deutch. Acting apart, our agencies waste resources and squander opportunities to make our country more secure. But acting together, they bring a powerful force to bear on threats to our security.

Let me also say that I believe there is no zero sum choice to be made between the technological and human dimensions of intelligence. We need both, and we will have both. We've used satellites and signals to identify troop movements, to point agents in the right direction, to tap into secret important conversations. Today, some of your extraordinary in-house innovations are available for broader use, and I am interested in learning more about them: imagery technology, developed for the cold war, now being used in aid to natural disaster relief; imagery technology with great hope for the fight against breast cancer. We have to keep moving on this kind of technological frontier.

But no matter how good our technology, we'll always rely on human intelligence to tell us what an adversary has in mind. We'll always need gifted, motivated case officers at the heart of the clandestine service. We'll always need good analysts to make a clean and clear picture out of the fragments of what our spies and satellites put on the table.

And if we're going to continue to attract and keep the best people, we have to do a better job of rewarding work. I think the best way to do that is for the communities leadership to demonstrate to you that excellence of performance, equal opportunity, and personal accountability are the only standards that will count when it comes to promotion. And that is what Director Deutch has pledged to do.

Let me say that I know the Ames scandal has colored a lot of what is the current debate over the future of the CIA. I imagine most of you who work here think that the Ames scandal has colored what the average American thinks about the CIA, although my guess

is that you're probably overestimating that and underestimating the common sense and balance of an average American citizen. It's important that we don't minimize the damage that Ames did or the changes that need to be made to prevent future scandals. But Aldridge Ames was a terrible exception to a proud tradition of service, a tradition that is reflected in the 59 stars that shine on the CIA's memorial wall in honor of those who gave their lives to serve our country.

So we owe it to all of you in the intelligence community and to the American people to make sure we act on the lessons of his treason, but also to remind the American people that the people who work for the Central Intelligence Agency are patriotic Americans who have made a decision that they are going to devote their careers to keeping this country safe and strong. And I thank you for that.

As soon as Ames was brought to justice, I ordered a comprehensive reexamination in both internal and external studies of our counterintelligence operations. As a result, we changed the way intelligence community does its business. Each agency now requires more attention and continuous training in counterintelligence and evaluates its employees more thoroughly and frequently.

Above all, we are insisting that those involved in an operation take responsibility for its integrity. That requires careful advanced planning that integrates counterintelligence into everything you do from day one. This isn't just about safes and locks, it's about designing operations that minimize the possibility of a security breakdown.

Director Deutch and I want to ensure that these new policies are carried out carefully so that we can avoid creating a climate of suspicion that embitters rather than empowers you. As we guard against a repeat of the Ames episode, we have to be careful not to produce a culture so risk averse that case officers refuse to take chances and analysts are afraid to speak their minds. You must not be paralyzed by the fear of failure.

This administration will continue to support bold and aggressive actions by the intelligence community consistent with the laws of the land, consistent with our interests, and consistent with our values. I applaud Director Deutch's plan, for example, to issue new rules on dealing with foreign agents suspected of human rights abuses. We owe you clear guidance on this issue. And as a country, we have to resolve it in the right way.

Finally, we owe the American public and Congress a full role in the debate over the future of intelligence. For over 40 years, bipartisan support for the work you perform has been central to your success. That support and the confidence of the American people were built on the unique oversight and consultative role Congress plays in intelligence. That's why Director Deutch and I will take with the utmost seriousness the concerns and suggestions of both the Congress and the Aspin commission.

Every morning I start my day with an intelligence report. The intelligence I receive informs just about every foreign policy decision we make. It's easy to take it for granted, but we couldn't do without it. Unique intelligence makes it less likely that our forces will be sent into battle, less likely that American lives will have to put at risk. It gives us a chance to prevent crises instead of forcing us to manage them.

So let me say to all the men and women of our intelligence community, I know and you know the challenges we face today will not be easy, but we know that you are already working every day to increase the security of every American. You are making a difference. Now we have to work together and I have to support you so that we can meet the challenge of doing this work even better with even more public support and confidence in its integrity and long-term impact. That is my commitment to you as you renew your commitment to America in a world fraught with danger but filled with promise that you will help us to seize.

Thank you very much, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:45 a.m. In his remarks, he referred to Director of Central Intelligence, John M. Deutch, and his wife, Patricia; Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, George J. Tenet, and his wife Stephanie; and former Director of Central Intelligence, Adm. John O. Studeman, USN, (Ret.), and his wife, Diane.

## Statement on the 30th Anniversary of the Older Americans Act

*July 14, 1995*

Today I am pleased to mark the 30th anniversary of the Older Americans Act, an act which has allowed millions of elderly Americans to live with dignity, safety, and independence.

When President Johnson signed this bill into law 30 years ago, he characterized the best intentions of a Nation when he said:

"The Older Americans Act clearly affirms our Nation's sense of responsibility toward the well-being of all of our older citizens. But even more, the results of this act will help us to expand our opportunities for enriching the lives of all of our citizens in this country, now and in the years to come."

Indeed, we should be proud of our Nation's compact with older Americans and the public private partnership that is embodied in the Older Americans Act. This compact has included community-based services such as Meals on Wheels, transportation, ombudsman services, and other efforts to prevent abuse of the elderly.

As the Congress considers reauthorization of the Older Americans Act this year, my administration is committed to keeping the act whole and preserving the core principles which have guided its success—grassroots support, citizen input, bottom-up planning, and coordination of services. Programs like the Title V Senior Community Service Employment Program have been instrumental in helping us all benefit from the accumulated experience and judgment of older Americans. I will fight to keep these programs strong and to maintain the active role of the national aging network in assisting elderly Americans.

While we commemorate an important anniversary today, every American should be proud that we have greatly improved the way our people live their lives as they grow older, providing new hope for entire lifetimes of purpose and dignity. We must remember that with this kind of opportunity in a democracy goes continued responsibility. Our job today is to preserve this progress not only for our current seniors in their lifetimes but for all generations of Americans to come.

## 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.

### *July 10*

In the morning, the President traveled to Nashville, TN, where he visited the Vice President's mother, Pauline Gore, at the Vanderbilt University Medical Center. He returned to Washington, DC, in the afternoon.

In the evening, the President hosted a dinner for congressional leaders on the State Floor.

The White House announced that the President has invited Prime Minister P.J. Patterson of Jamaica for a working visit on September 13.

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

### *July 11*

The President announced his intention to nominate Joseph H. Neely to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

### *July 12*

The President declared a major disaster in West Virginia and ordered Federal funds to supplement State and local recovery efforts in communities struck by severe storms, heavy rain, and flash flooding on June 23–27.

The President announced his intention to nominate James Franklin Collins as Ambassador at Large and Special Adviser to the Secretary of State for the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union.

The President announced his intention to nominate Joseph A. Presel for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Special Negotiator for Nagorno-Karabakh.

The President announced his intention to nominate Stanley Tuemler Escudero as Ambassador to Uzbekistan.

The President announced his intention to nominate Darcy E. Bradbury as Assistant Secretary for Financial Markets at the Department of the Treasury.

The President announced his intention to nominate Joe Scroggins, Jr., as Commissioner of the Federal Maritime Commission.

The President announced his intention to appoint the following individuals to be members of the National Commission on Crime Control and Prevention:

—Lee Fisher, Chair;
—Dennis Wayne Archer;
—Paul Helmke;
—Deborah Prothrow-Stith;
—Andrew J. Shookhoff; and
—Esta Soler.

***July 13***

In the morning, the President met with President Nicephore Soglo of Benin in the Oval Office. Following their meeting, the President hosted a working lunch for President Soglo in the Old Family Dining Room.

In the late afternoon, the President had a telephone conversation with President Jacques Chirac of France to discuss the situation in Bosnia.

In the evening, the President had a telephone conversation with Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany to discuss the situation in Bosnia. He and Hillary Clinton then attended a fundraiser at a private residence in Sandy Spring, MD.

The President announced his intention to nominate Michael Paul Dombeck as Director of the Bureau of Land Management at the Department of the Interior.

The President announced his intention to nominate Charles H. Twining as Ambassador to Cameroon.

***July 14***

In the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton went to the Central Intelligence Agency in Langley, VA, where they participated in a wreath-laying ceremony.

In the afternoon, the President had a telephone conversation with Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom to discuss the situation in Bosnia.

The President announced his intention to nominate Greta Joy Dicus to serve as a Commissioner of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

The President announced his intention to nominate Donald S. Wasserman to the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

## 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 July 10***

Cheryl F. Halpern,
of New Jersey, to be a member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term of one year (new position).

Marc B. Nathanson,
of California, to be a member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term of 3 years (new position).

Stanley A. Riveles,
of Virginia, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as U.S. Commissioner to the Standing Consultative Commission.

Carl Spielvogel,
of New York, to be a member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term of one year (new position).

John R. Tunheim,
of Minnesota, to be a U.S. District Judge for the District of Minnesota, vice Donald D. Alsop, retired.

***Submitted July 12***

James Franklin Collins,
of Illinois, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador at Large and Special Adviser to the Secretary of State on the New Independent States.

Stanley Tuemler Escudero,
of Florida, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Uzbekistan.

Joseph A. Presel,
of Rhode Island, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, for rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Special Negotiator for Nagorno-Karabakh.

Stephen D. Potts,
of Maryland, to be Director of the Office of Government Ethics for a term of 5 years (reappointment).

***Submitted July 14***

Darcy E. Bradbury,
of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, vice Hollis S. McLoughlin, resigned.

Michael P. Dombeck,
of Wisconsin, to be Director of the Bureau of Land Management, vice Jim Baca.

Jeanne R. Ferst,
of Georgia, to be a member of the National Museum Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 1999, vice Roy L. Shafer, term expired.

Jill L. Long,
of Indiana, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Rural Economic and Community Development (new position).

Joseph H. Neely,
of Mississippi, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of 6 years, vice C.C. Hope, Jr.

Joe Scroggins, Jr.,
of Florida, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 2000 (reappointment).

Charles H. Twining,
of Maryland, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cameroon.

## 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 July 10***

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the announcement by Burmese authorities of the release of Aung San Suu Kyi

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the visit of Jamaican Prime Minister P.J. Patterson

Announcement of U.S. District Judge for the District of Minnesota

***Released July 11***

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by National Security Adviser Anthony Lake, Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs Hershel Gober, and Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian Affairs Winston Lord on the President's decision to normalize diplomatic relations with Vietnam

Transcript of a press briefing by Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, Education Secretary Richard Riley, Director of the Office of Management and Budget Alice Rivlin, and Deputy Secretary of Labor Tom Glynn on proposed balanced budget legislation

Press package on the President's announcement on Vietnam, which included:

—Fact sheet on progress
—Fact sheet on background on POW/MIA accounting
—Fact sheet on background on economic relationships
—Fact sheet on background on diplomatic relationships

***Released July 12***

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Education Secretary Richard Riley and Assistant Attorney General Walter Dellinger on religious expression in public schools

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on National Security Adviser Anthony Lake's meeting with Ching-lee Chen, wife of human rights activist Harry Wu

***Released July 13***

Transcripts of press briefings by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's meeting with President Nicephore Soglo of Benin

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's approval of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommendations

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's telephone conversations with French President Jacques Chirac and German Chancellor Helmut Kohl on Bosnia

***Released July 14***

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

## Acts Approved by the President

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