Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, October 21, 1996
Volume 32—Number 42
Pages 2047–2106

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Bill Signings
California
Community in San Diego—2093
Presidential debate in San Diego—2071
Santa Ana—2096
Colorado
Departure from Denver—2056
Red Rocks Amphitheater in Denver—2051
New Mexico
Community in Albuquerque—2058
Native American Tribal Leaders, endorsement in Albuquerque—2070
Second annual report on television violence, announcement in Albuquerque—2068
Radio address—2050

Bill Signings

Water Resources Development Act of 1996, statement—2062
Wildfire Suppression Aircraft Transfer Act of 1996, remarks in Albuquerque, NM—2063

Communications to Congress

Executive Order 13020 (export controls), letter transmitting—2067
Generalized System of Preferences, letter—2102
Notice on Colombian narcotics traffickers, letter transmitting—2095

Executive Orders

Amendment to Executive Order 12981 (export controls)—2066

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Albuquerque, NM—2063, 2068, 2070
San Diego, CA—2071

Notices

Continuation of Emergency With Respect to Significant Narcotics Traffickers Centered in Colombia—2095

Proclamations

Columbus Day—2049
Honoring the Filipino Veterans of World War II—2103
National Character Counts Week—2047
National Children's Day—2049
National School Lunch Week—2048
To Amend the Generalized System of Preferences—2100
White Cane Safety Day—2065

Statements by the President

See also Bill Signings
Anti-crime initiatives—2056

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—2104
Checklist of White House press releases—2104
Digest of other White House announcements—2103
Nominations submitted to the Senate—2104

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.*

Proclamation 6937—National Character Counts Week, 1996

October 11, 1996

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

One of our most important goals as a Nation is to make this a better world for all people. Millions around the globe look to America as a champion of justice, and we must always strive to encourage the good and denounce the bad.

This week, as a Nation, we celebrate the fact that "Character Counts." Whether in civic activities or in our daily lives at work and at home, we all contribute regularly to our American community and our national purpose—our sense of who we are as a people. In the end, the character of our Nation is determined by the character of our citizens.

During this special week, we recognize that character is not a quality we are born with; we must learn it. This means we must ensure that it is taught, clearly and thoughtfully, to our youth. Individual character involves honoring and embracing certain core ethical values: honesty, respect, responsibility, hard work, fairness, caring, civic virtue, and citizenship. Americans must do everything possible to create a society in which these virtues are not only taught but also acted out in daily life so that our young people can witness firsthand their value and learn right from wrong.

My Administration has made this effort a top priority. Our Improving America's Schools Act promotes initiatives in character education, just as the Goals 2000: Educate America Act recognizes the crucial role of the family in nurturing strong values and encouraging children to embrace academic achievement. Our AmeriCorps national service program offers young people a practical means through which to demonstrate their beliefs in the civic virtues that traditionally have given our Nation much of its strength of character.

The family remains, of course, the core source of our values. Parents must teach their children from the earliest age, the difference between right and wrong. But we all must do our part. Teachers, religious leaders, and other early-childhood role models must display the highest standards of respect for themselves and others; young people must commit themselves to dealing nonviolently with the inevitable problems and difficulties they will encounter; and both public- and private-sector institutions must adopt corporate behavior that encourages individual character development.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim October 13 through 19, 1996, as National Character Counts Week. I call upon the people of the United States, Government officials, educators, and volunteers, to observe this week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eleventh day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-first.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:31 a.m., October 15, 1996]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 12, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on October 16.

Proclamation 6938—National School Lunch Week, 1996

October 11, 1996

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

This school year, schools across the country are serving more healthful and more appealing school meals, and school-children are learning to make food choices for a nutritious diet. The National School Lunch Program, which began in 1946, is celebrating its 50th anniversary year with historic changes that will reduce diet-related diseases and improve the health outlook for America's children.

The 1996–97 school year is the first year that school meals must meet the Dietary Guidelines for Americans under the new School Meals Initiative for Healthy Children. This initiative, created to help schools make necessary improvements, is providing nutrition education for children and training and technical assistance for school food-service professionals. Early reports from pilot communities tell us that we are getting results. Food-service professionals are seeing children eat more fruits and vegetables. With the help of dedicated teachers, they are becoming better educated about what their bodies need.

Improvements in school meals and nutrition education enhance the health of the 50 million children in the Nation's 94,000 schools—strengthening the safety net for poor children who rely on school meals as their primary source of daily nutrition. Wholesome meals improve our children's ability to learn today and brighten their health outlook for tomorrow.

These improvements are already a reality at the local level. Team Nutrition Schools—of which there are now more than 14,000—reach 8.1 million children. These schools are community focal points for change, leading the way in bringing together teachers, parents, health professionals, local businesses, and industry leaders to promote nutrition education and to work for more healthful school meals. These schools benefit from the resources made available through an innovative network of public-private partnerships. More than 200 organizations are part of an extensive support network that dramatically increases the impact and reach of a relatively small Federal investment.

Since President Truman signed the National School Lunch Act 50 years ago, the Federal Government and local school food-service professionals have worked in partnership to meet the nutritional needs of America's children. Now, together, they are ushering in an era of historic change and continuous improvement that promise a healthier future for all Americans.

In recognition of the contributions of the National School Lunch Program to the nutritional well-being of children, the Congress, by joint resolution of October 9, 1962 (Public Law No. 87–780), has designated the week beginning the second Sunday in October of each year as "National School Lunch Week" and has requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of that week.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week beginning October 13, 1996, as National School Lunch Week. I call upon all Americans to recognize those individuals whose efforts contribute to the success of the National School Lunch Program and to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eleventh day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-first.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:32 a.m., October 15, 1996]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 12, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on October 16.

Proclamation 6939—National Children's Day, 1996

October 11, 1996

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Our Nation benefits when every American child is truly valued and cherished. We have no greater responsibility or hope for our future than our children, and the promise of a better tomorrow depends upon the love, support, education, and encouragement that we give to each of them. It is up to all of us—parents and families, schools, churches, and community organizations—to join in the critical endeavor of putting the needs of our children first. Only when we reaffirm our commitment to our children's well-being can we truly say that we are prepared for the challenges that await us in the next century.

America is a country of many blessings—a rich land, a thriving democracy, a diverse and determined people. Our culture is built on faith in freedom, and opportunity, and on the spirit of community. In a Nation of such infinite promise, too many of our children face great obstacles in reaching their full potential, and it is imperative that we not turn our backs on them.

Because safety, health, a clean environment, quality education, and economic security are the keys to a brighter future, they are necessary investments in the healthy growth and development of our children. Through measures such as expanding Head Start and child care, preserving Medicaid, enhancing child protection, protecting the environment, and increasing educational opportunity for all students, my Administration has demonstrated its commitment to ensuring that every child has the tools to become a productive citizen.

As we work together in a spirit of community, let us seek to instill confidence, hope, pride, and self-esteem in our young people. Because today's children are tomorrow's leaders, educators, and parents, all of us—adults and children—forever will benefit from this commitment.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim October 13, 1996, as National Children's Day. I urge all Americans to express their love and appreciation, not only on this day but also on all days, for their children and all of the children of this Nation. I invite Federal officials, State and local governments, and particularly the American family, to join in observing this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities to honor our Nation's children.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eleventh day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-first.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:33 a.m., October 15, 1996]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 12, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on October 16.

Proclamation 6940—Columbus Day, 1996

October 11, 1996

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Throughout our history, America has been inspired by the courage and daring of Christopher Columbus. Like him, we are a people who dare to dream, to chart a bold course, and to surmount formidable obstacles to reach new horizons.

Columbus' arrival in North America not only confirmed his beliefs about our planet, but also initiated an epic struggle between the Old and New Worlds. Yet out of that triumphant voyage and the meeting of many peoples developed a Nation and a way of life vastly unlike those Columbus left behind.

The expedition that Columbus—an Italian supported by the Spanish Crown—began more than 500 years ago, continues today as we experience and celebrate the vibrant in-

fluences of varied civilizations, not only from Europe, but also from around the world. America is stronger because of this diversity, and the democracy we cherish flourishes in the great mosaic we have created since 1492. Americans of Italian and Spanish heritage can be particularly proud, not only of Columbus' achievements, but also of their own contributions to our country.

As we honor and remember Christopher Columbus, let us use his example as a beacon to help guide us into the 21st century. His life, his voyages, and—above all—his vision can inspire us as we prepare for the challenges that lie ahead. Let us remember that all of us, regardless of our origins, are important participants in that journey, and that our uncertainty about what lies over the horizon should not shake our faith that, together, we will succeed.

In recognition of Columbus' epic achievement, the Congress, by joint resolution of April 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 657), and an Act of June 28, 1968 (82 Stat. 250), has requested the President to proclaim the second Monday in October of each year as "Columbus Day."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 14, 1996, as Columbus Day. I call upon the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities. I also direct that the flag of the United States be displayed on all public buildings on the appointed day in honor of Christopher Columbus.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eleventh day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-first.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:34 a.m., October 15, 1996]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 12, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on October 16.

The President's Radio Address

October 12, 1996

The President. Good morning. Today is Columbus Day, marking the day an Italian explorer came upon the New World. It's a day that holds special significance and much pride for Italian-Americans, Spanish- and Hispanic-Americans, and all Americans who dare to dream and reach for new horizons. All of these people have shaped who we are, and today we all celebrate their contributions.

We can only imagine the beauty of the land the explorers found. In the centuries since as we grew, our environment and resources often paid a price. Some have been depleted, destroyed, endangered, and some, thankfully, have been preserved, restored, and replenished. This doesn't just happen. Every generation must work to ensure that the next generation can enjoy the blessings of America in clean air and pure water. We must work to pass upon to our children the Earth that God gave us.

In just a few moments, I'll sign into law a bill to help us protect our environment, the Water Resources Development Act. And with me here in the Oval Office is someone who has devoted much of his life to a better environment, our Vice President, Al Gore. I'd like him to tell you what this bill will do.

[*At this point, Vice President Gore explained that the bill would advance the administration's commitment to save the Everglades and Florida Bay by ensuring clean and abundant water, strengthening the relationship between the Federal Government and the State of Florida, and giving the Army Corps of Engineers new tools and authority to protect the Nation's water resources.*]

The President. Thank you, Mr. Vice President.

This new law reflects our commitment to manage wisely our Nation's water resources and preserve the environment even as we balance the budget, but our work is not done. Today I am also announcing my intention to sign the parks bill which Congress has approved. This bill will create or improve almost 120 national parks, trails, rivers, or historical sites in 41 of our States. It will pre-

serve the historic Presidio, a former Army post in San Francisco, by creating a nonprofit trust to run it as a national park.

This bill will save the Sterling Forest on the New York and New Jersey border, just 40 miles from midtown Manhattan, where families go for recreation and which millions of people depend upon for clean water. This forest was denuded a century ago by industry, but it grew back, and we must protect it.

And this bill will help to restore 11,000 acres of the tallgrass prairie in Kansas, an ecosystem of grass as tall as 9 feet, trees, flowers, birds, and other wildlife. This bill will bring back other overlooked natural sites all around our Nation.

These are our national treasures. When we maintain our national parks, nourish our wildlife refuges, protect our water, and preserve places like the Everglades, we are standing up for our values and our future, and that is something all Americans can be proud of. God created these places, but it is up to us to care for them. Now we are, and we're doing it the right way, by working together.

I'm pleased that Congress turned aside confrontation to enact these laws in a bipartisan manner and in the public interest. Five hundred years ago, no one could have imagined the greatness that would bloom between our shores, nor foreseen that the nation born here would become the model for people of all kinds working together for the common good. Preserving our environment and restoring its wonders are for our common good.

Let us truly celebrate this day as a day of rediscovery, a day in which we pledge to keep working across the lines that divide us to make America more beautiful and better than ever.

Thanks for listening. Now I will sign the Water Resources Development Act.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 8:38 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. S. 640, approved October 12, was assigned Public Law No. 104–303.

Remarks at Red Rocks Amphitheater in Denver, Colorado

October 12, 1996

The President. Thank you.

Audience members. Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you. I must tell you, I have heard a great deal about this magnificent place, but nothing I have heard could have prepared me for how beautiful it is and how beautiful you are. Thank you for being here.

I want to thank the schools who are here, the people who are here from Red Rocks Community College, the people who are here from Red Rocks Elementary School. I want to thank Hazel Miller and the band who entertained us before we came here. They were good. I thank all of those who join me here, those who have spoken and others who are back there: Mrs. Romer, Mrs. Webb, the county commissioners, the legislators, Lieutenant Governor Schoettler, and others.

Let me just say that, first of all, I was profoundly impressed with what Karoline Smith had to say and with the life that she has made for herself. And I thank her for that. Last month the First Lady was here, and Hillary had a chance to visit Red Rocks Community College school-age child care program at the Stevens Elementary School. And I want to say more about this in a minute, but I want you to keep in mind what Karoline said, because whether you believe what she said—or remember the story your county commissioner and candidate for Congress, Betty Miller, said about she and her husband coming from families that didn't own cars and what they made of their lives—I want you to remember these stories because they embody a decision that you have to make about the future of America.

I want to thank Governor Roy Romer for being my friend and being your Governor and being a true inspiration to people all across America who believe in the nobility of public service and the possibility of educational improvement. I thank Mayor Wellington Webb for so many things, for being a great mayor and for—I want to thank him

especially for the nice letter he wrote to Senator Dole before he came out here, detailing all the things that we had done together to make Denver a greater city. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I like that.

I want to thank Representative Pat Schroeder for her service to America in the Congress. Thank you. I want to thank David Skaggs for his fight for the environment of our country, for the education of our children, and for standing up with me against the budget that would have divided our country much more than it did when it shut the Government down. Thank you, David Skaggs, for being there when these people needed you.

I want to thank Tom Strickland—I'll say more about him in a minute—but I'm proud to be running on the same ticket as Tom Strickland and David and Betty.

Audience members. Joan!

The President. Joan, I mean—I'm sorry. I heard you.

I want to talk to you now a minute about the stories I asked you. I had all these notes; I'm not going to use them. I want you to think about it. You know, in this great debate we're having here, much more is at stake than whether I become President or Senator Dole does. What is really at stake here is what our country will look like when we start into that new century in a new millennium. It's what our Nation will look like when these children are their parents' age and when their children are their parents' age.

And there are these two different views about how we should go forward. The one view is that the Government is basically the problem in America and you are the solution and you know better than the Government how to do everything. And that makes a lot of sense, except that this is a democracy. The Government is you. It belongs to you.

The other view at one time might have been that most of our problems had to be solved by Government, but we've abandoned that long ago. I wanted to break out of this old debate when I became President and ask Americans to look to the future with common sense and a compassionate heart, to create a future in which there is opportunity for all, responsibility from all, and in which we all have a role to play and a place in this mosaic of America's community. And to me, what we need is a Government that is smaller and less bureaucratic. And we have, by the way, reduced the size of the Government and the burden of its regulations by more than our friends on the other side did in the 12 years they had to do it.

But the difference is, I believe that the Government should be smaller and less bureaucratic, but there are some things that we can do together better than we can do them alone. Sometimes we do them in our work units. Sometimes we do them in our religious institutions. Sometimes we do them in our organizations, our clubs, our charities, our nonprofits. Sometimes we do them in city and county government. Sometimes we do them in the State government. But there are some things that we do better together as a nation; we do. And that's the difference.

I think this is a better country because we made a national commitment to low-cost student loans that are even better and more affordable than they were before. That is not something you could have done on your own.

I believe this is a better country because we gave people like Karoline Smith a chance to move from welfare to education to work, to succeed at home as a parent and in the workplace. I think that's a national obligation. I think we're better.

I think this is a better country because we took action to protect Yellowstone National Park from a gold mine, because I signed a bill just this morning before I flew out here to continue our work to recover and preserve the Florida Everglades, because a few days ago I followed in the steps of Theodore Roosevelt and took Executive action to protect the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument in Utah. I believe it's a better country because of that.

I believe this is a better country because we have invested more in research, because in the last 4 years we have uncovered two of the genes which cause breast cancer among women and which may permit us not only to cure it but to prevent it in the future. That's something we had to do together, and we did it together.

I believe we're a better country because of the money we put into research in dealing with drugs to help deal with HIV and AIDS,

and the life expectancy has more than doubled in just 4 years. We are a better country because of that. We are a better country because of that.

Many of you just heard at the Democratic Convention in Chicago Christopher Reeve's moving address calling for a recommitment to medical research. About the same time, for the very first time ever, a laboratory animal whose spine had been completely severed had movement in its lower limbs because of nerve transplants to the spine from other parts of the body. This is a better country. And if we can do that for people, it will be a much better country. And you can't do that by yourself; we have to do that together. We're a better country because of that.

So this election is whether we're going to build a bridge to the future that we can all walk across together, or we're all going to try to build our separate little bridges. This election is whether we are better off saying you're on your own and anybody you elect to office immediately becomes your enemy and a big part of the problem, or whether you think my wife was right, it does take a village to build a country and bring us together and go forward.

It is true, as Tom Strickland said, that we're better off than we were 4 years ago. And I'm grateful for the chance to have been a part of that. You deserve a lot of the credit. Our role was to create the conditions and give you the tools to make the most of your own lives. But we do have more jobs, lower unemployment, much higher incomes—average income finally going up for the first time in a decade, about $1,600 after inflation in the last 2 years alone for middle class people.

I'm especially proud that last year we had the biggest drop in inequality among all classes of people who are working for a living in 27 years, the biggest drop in child poverty in 20 years, and the lowest poverty rate among American senior citizens ever recorded. I'm proud of that. We're moving in the right direction.

I'm proud that the crime rate has gone down for 4 years in a row. And I know and you know that most of the credit goes to the people who are out there on the street, the police officers, the others in the criminal justice system, the citizens of this country, and I might add also, the teachers, the parents, the community leaders who are trying to keep our kids out of trouble in the first place. I'm proud of that.

But we had 30 years of evidence. In 30 years before I became President, the violent crime rate tripled; the police forces of this country increased by only 10 percent. We were right to say this is something we should do together as a nation to put 100,000 more police on the street, to pass the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban to make this a safer country. It was the right thing to do; we're a stronger, better country because of it.

Now, I know when we did some of these things, a lot of people thought it was wrong in Colorado. And a lot of people thought it was wrong in my native State of Arkansas, where half the people have a hunting or a fishing license or both—actually, more than half. And they were all told—I got all these calls in Washington from people who still call me Bill, or worse—[*laughter*]—from home saying, ''They say you're going to take my guns away.'' I said, ''I'll tell you what, I'll buy you a new rifle if you miss a single hunting season because of the Brady bill or the assault weapons ban.''

Well, it's been 2 years, and you heard the statistics: tens of thousands of felons, fugitives, and stalkers lost their handguns. We didn't take any hunting rifles away; we took weapons away. And now people who beat up their spouses and their children can't buy handguns either. And I think we're a better country because of it. I think we're a better country because of it.

So I ask you to think about the future. Think what happened—I think most everybody instinctively knows that it's right—look what happened in the last couple of weeks when your voices began to be heard in Washington; then an agenda that I had been advocating for 2 years all of the sudden became popular. We said you can't lose your health insurance anymore just because you changed jobs or somebody in your family's been sick. We said insurance companies can't force hospitals to kick women and their newborn babies out of the hospital after a day. We're finally going to help families that have—fam-

ilies that need some help with mental health coverage to get that.

We are finally going for the—we did something else that I'm particularly proud of for the very first time in history.

Audience member. Let me hear it. [*Laughter*]

The President. That's good. Keep doing that. That's good. [*Laughter*]

For the very first time in history, in a bill I signed just a few days ago, we are giving benefits to the children of American veterans who were injured because of their parents' service, because a lot of servicemen in Vietnam were exposed to Agent Orange and, terribly, some of their children got spina bifida. Finally, after all these years we're going to give them health care and disability payments that they need. And I'm proud of that. That's something we had to do together.

I think we did the right thing to raise the minimum wage for 10 million people. I think we did the right thing to say that we heard the cries of small-business people. We made every small business in the country eligible for a tax cut if they invest more in their business. We made it easier for them to take out pensions and for their employees to do so and to keep those pensions when they move from job to job—really important. Most of you work for small business today, and only half the American people have a good pension plan. And we made people who were self-employed eligible for a bigger tax deduction if they have to insure themselves. I'm proud that we did that. I think we're a stronger country.

I'm also glad we gave a $5,000 tax credit to people who will adopt children. There are lots of children out there that need homes, and we did the right thing.

So I guess Karoline was right: We started building that bridge to the 21st century 4 years go, but we've got a ways to go. Yes, we've reduced the deficit by 60 percent, 4 years in a row, first time that's happened in this century. I'm proud of that. But we ought to go on and balance the budget because that will keep interest rates down and America growing and prosperity coming. But we have to do it in a way that protects our obligations to each other, the things that we should be doing together.

We should reform Medicare, not wreck it. We should not walk away from the guarantee Medicaid gives to help working families whose parents are in nursing homes, who have children with disabilities. We should not walk away from pregnant women and little children. We should continue that. And we definitely should not undermine our investment in our future by cutting back on education, the environment, research, and technology.

Because the economy is strong and the deficit has been reduced, we should build on the tax cuts that have been passed in the last 4 years. We cut taxes for all small businesses, for 15 million of our hardest pressed working families. We can do more. But we ought to pay for it line by line. We shouldn't promise you we can do something we can't pay for and then blow up the deficit, wind up seeing bigger cuts than the ones I vetoed, weakening our economy.

So I want tax cuts that are paid for in my balanced budget, targeted to the things you need the most, to childrearing, to education, to buying a first home, not paying taxes when you sell your home, investing in health care. These are things we can afford. We ought to have them, and we will have them if you'll help us build that bridge to the 21st century.

We have more work to do in helping people to succeed at home and at work. I'm very proud the first bill I signed was the family and medical leave law. Again, I say, this is a classic example of this dilemma. If you believe that the Government is them and you are us, and you know best and people you elect don't know anything, that the minute you vote for them they lose all sense of connection with you, then you might agree with my opponent that the family and medical leave law was a terrible idea.

But I believe the biggest challenge we face today as a people is helping good, hard-working people to meet the conflicting demands of parenthood and work. Most parents are working. We're a stronger country because 12 million people got to take some time off when a baby was born or sick, or a parent or a spouse was sick, without losing their job. We're a better, stronger country, and our economy proves it. That's the kind of thing

we ought to be doing, and we ought to build on it and make it stronger.

We passed this welfare reform bill after we had reduced the welfare rolls by 1.9 million—Karoline's one of them—1.9 million people moving into a more productive life, becoming educated, becoming taxpayers instead of receivers of tax dollars.

The new law says this—this is the challenge for the Governor and others in State government and for the county commissioners here and people in local government—it says we will continue to guarantee to people who are poor health care for themselves and their children and nutrition and, if they go to work, more for child care than ever before. But the portion of the Federal money that used to go to people in a monthly check will now be sent to the States, where they and the local communities will have 2 years to figure out how to turn everyone who's like Karoline into Karoline—to move people from welfare to work. That is the right thing to do. And I have a plan to help create a million jobs for those people. You cannot make people go to work unless they have work. Will you help me do that and build that bridge to the 21st century? [*Applause*]

But if you think about the future of Colorado and you look around here in this hallowed place, no two issues more define the future of this State than the decisions we make as a people on the environment and, even more, on education.

You know, when I was talking to Tom Strickland before we came out here, I said, "I can't go out there and ask them to vote for you just because you're a Democrat. Most people don't care that much about it. Why do you want this job? Why do you want this job? Why are you doing this? This other guy's a Member of Congress. He's got all this money. He's hard to beat. It's a rigorous endeavor. Why are you doing this?"

And he said, "Because I want my children to grow up in a State and a nation that preserves instead of destroys its natural heritage and because I want every child in this country to have the same chance my kids are going to have. And we cannot afford to continue the direction that the present Congress tried to take to undermine the environment and to walk away from our common obligation to educate all our people." That's a pretty good reason to vote for somebody for the United States Senate. That's a pretty good reason.

Folks, those Senators get a long term. They get 6 years. That's longer than the President gets. And they get to run more than once which means they get to serve longer than a President can serve. And there's something I think you all ought to think about, whatever your party or philosophy is, when you look at somebody who wants to go the Senate and says, "Give me a 6-year term, and by the way, I might ask you for another one and I might ask you for another one after that," you have to imagine what will happen to this person in those 6 years. Does this person have the capacity to continue to absorb all the changes that are going on in America, to feel the needs of all the people in this country, to understand when to say yes and when to say no and to grow into greatness in that role? I think Tom Strickland does. And that's another good reason to vote for him for the United States Senate, and I hope you will.

So let me say to you, the air and the drinking water is cleaner than it was 4 years ago. Our food safety standards are higher than they were 4 years ago. We saved an attack on our national parks, and we've done everything we could to expand them with new important preservation of our previous heritage. But we have more to do.

Do you know that two-thirds of our toxic waste dumps are very serious and that 10 million children still live within 4 miles of a toxic waste dump? So if you'll give us 4 more years, among other things we'll do on the environment is clean up those 500 dumps, so our kids will be growing up next to parks, not poison. Will you help us do that? [*Applause*]

And the last thing I want to ask you to do is to help me implement our education agenda. Their education agenda, the other side, their education agenda was to cut Head Start, cut back on college loans, eliminate the AmeriCorps program, the national service program——

Audience members. Boo-o-o!

The President. ——and eliminate the Department of Education. That was their agenda.

Audience members. Boo-o-o!

The President. My agenda is as follows: Expand Head Start and keep doing it until all the kids who need to be there are there; recognize that 40 percent of the 8-year-olds in this country still cannot read independently and mobilize an army of reading volunteers to make sure by the year 2000 every 8-year-old can pick up a book and say, ''I can read this all by myself.''

I want to hook up every single classroom and library in this country to the information superhighway so that every child has access to the same information every other child has. And I intend to open the doors of college to every American of any age who wants to go.

We ought to say—there's been a lot of cheering here for Red Rocks Community College. But let me tell you, in the next 4 years, if we have the will and vision to do it, we can make 2 years of education after high school just as universal as a high school diploma is today. And I know how to do it. I want to give the American people a tax credit, a dollar-for-dollar reduction on their taxes for the cost of the typical community college tuition in America. It would be the best money we ever spent. Will you help me do that? [*Applause*] And will you help me give the American people a deduction of up to $10,000 a year for the cost of any college tuition at any level for people of any age, 40, 50, 60, if they need to go back? [*Applause*]

Folks, that's what this election is about. Does it take a village, or are you on your own? Does everybody want to build their own little bridge, or do you want to build a bridge to the 21st century wide enough, big enough, and strong enough for every single one of us to walk across?

Now, remember, this election is not in 24 days for you; for you, it starts Tuesday. Vote early, bring others, and lead the way in Colorado for all of America to walk in to the best days we have ever known.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:55 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to entertainer Hazel Miller; Gov. Roy Romer's wife, Bea; Mayor Wellington Webb of Denver and his wife, Wilma; Lt. Gov. Gail Schoettler of Colorado; Betty Miller, Jefferson County commissioner; Representative David Skaggs; senatorial candidate Tom Strickland; and congressional candidate Joan Fitz-Gerald.

Statement on Anticrime Initiatives

October 13, 1996

All Americans can be pleased with today's report that our Nation's crime rate is at a 10-year low and we have reduced murder and violent crime rates to their lowest levels since 1989. Our anticrime strategy—to put more police on the street while working to get drugs, gangs, and guns out of our neighborhoods—is working.

We can be proud of the progress we have made, but there is still much work to be done. We must bear down even harder on violent juvenile crime. Last May, I submitted to Congress the Anti-Gang and Youth Violence Control Act of 1996. Enacting that bill's tough, new measures is my top anticrime priority.

NOTE: This statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 11, and it was embargoed for release until October 13.

Remarks on Departure From Denver, Colorado

October 13, 1996

Good morning. I'd like to thank Mayor Webb; Chief Michaud; Sheriff Pat Sullivan from Arapahoe County; the Denver DA, Bill Ritter; Pat Alstrom; Aries Zavaras; the members of the Denver Police Department and the Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office for being here with me today.

Today I sign legislation to crack down on criminals who employ illegal drugs in a sick attempt to facilitate their violent crimes. This law will strengthen penalties against anyone who uses the date rape drug, Rohypnol, in connection with violent crime.

Even though Rohypnol is already illegal to produce or prescribe in the United States, sometimes it is illegally obtained by criminals who use it to incapacitate their intended victims. We must do everything we can to stop it. In March, I ordered the Secretary of the Treasury and the customs department to seize all Rohypnol coming across our bor-

ders, and we are succeeding in cutting off the supply. Now we'll have the power to come down hard on those who use the date rape drug in pursuit of their own illegal goals.

This legislation is another example of what we can do in Washington to help law-abiding citizens and local law enforcement officials fight crime in their own communities. Today we have more evidence that this strategy is working. The FBI reports that America's crime rate is at a 10-year low. Here in Denver, overall crime is down 13 percent since 1993. The murder rate and the overall crime rate—violent crime rate—are at their lowest levels in the United States since 1989.

This is good news for Americans. It shows that law-abiding citizens working with our police can take back our streets. It also shows that we can help. After years of Washington finger-pointing and rhetoric over who was to blame for rising crime, we came to Washington and started out with a different question: What can we all do together to help people in their local communities fight crime and lower the crime and violence rates, put more police on the beat, put tougher penalties on the books, get guns off the street, and steer our young people away from crime and drugs and gangs in the first place?

Our plan is putting 100,000 police officers on our streets. We've already funded nearly half of those since 1994. I understand that all these who are here with Sheriff Sullivan are among those who have come into law enforcement since the crime bill passed with those funds.

We banned deadly assault weapons, but not one hunter in Colorado, Arkansas, or any other State lost his hunting or sporting weapon. Sixty thousand felons, fugitives, and stalkers were stopped from buying a gun because of the Brady bill. We made ''three strikes and you're out'' the law of the land. We passed the death penalty for drug kingpins and cop-killers. In the last month we extended the Brady bill to prevent anyone convicted of beating up a spouse or a child from buying a handgun, and we required drug testing for all parolees and prisoners as a condition of getting Federal prison construction funds.

Today's news shows that we are on the right track, but we have so much more to do. Crime and violence in our country are still too high. Even juvenile crime is starting to go down, but it's still too high. We've taken a special aggressive effort to deal with the problems of domestic violence and violence against women, but there is still too much of it. There is too much killing, too much violence, too much gang-related criminal activity.

We must tackle the violent street gangs that rob too many children of their futures. We must break the vicious cycle of crime and drugs. We have to finish putting those 100,000 police officers on the street. We should ban cop-killer bullets that are designed for one reason only, to pierce the bullet-proof vests that police officers wear and kill them. And we have to work to create an environment for our children to grow up in free of crime, drugs, violence and free from the influences that make them more likely to get involved in those things or less sensitive to violence and crime when they occur.

One of the most remarkable things about the crime statistics—I'd just like to say in passing that I commend all of you—is the percentage of people who are now killed by people who don't know them. Just 20 years ago, about two-thirds of all killings in our country were people who knew their victims, family members, friends, others who had deep, personal feuds. Then in 1990, it had dropped to just a little over half. In these latest crime statistics, 55 percent of all the people who were killed in this country were killed by people who did not know them, who were the victims of crimes, drive-by shootings, random acts of violence. We have got to do what we can to continue to change the environment in which our children grow up as well.

I know we will never eliminate crime completely, but we proved we can turn it around. Four years in a row, the crime rate has dropped. It's now at a 10-year low. If we can bring it down for 4 more years, maybe we will create an America which at least when people come home from work and turn on the television news, if the leading story is a report of a violent crime, they will be shocked, instead of numb to it as too many

are today. That's the kind of America we can build if we work together.

And again, let me close with my heartfelt thanks to the law enforcement officials and the other officials from the city and the State and county who are here with me today for the work they do to make our streets safe, our homes safe, our schools safe, our businesses safe—and the people they represent all across the United States. We have demonstrated, all of us working together, along with all the citizens who work in these citizens groups around America, that we can lower the crime rate. We need to keep going until we can bear it and feel that we're living in a safe country again.

Thank you all very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:12 a.m. on the tarmac at Denver International Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Wellington Webb of Denver; David Michaud, Denver chief of police; Pat Alstrom, executive director, Colorado Department of Public Safety; and Aries Zavaras, executive director, Colorado Department of Corrections. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks. H.R. 4137, the Drug-Induced Rape Prevention and Punishment Act of 1996, approved October 13, was assigned Public Law No. 104–305.

Remarks to the Community in Albuquerque, New Mexico

October 13, 1996

The President. Thank you. Hello, New Mexico! Thank you for making me feel so welcome. Well, you know, they asked me back in Washington why I was going to Albuquerque to prepare for my debate, and I said, ''Well, we've done an exhaustive amount of research all over America, and Mayor Chavez was holding this balloon event, and there were going to be 800 balloons in the air at the same time. And it seemed to me that that meant that there was more hot air here already than any other place in the country, and a little more wouldn't do any harm.'' So I thought I should be here.

I want to thank all of you for coming out today in this magnificent crowd, stretching out in all of these directions. I want to thank those who are here who entertained us, the Danita Native American Dancers, the God's Way Community Church African-American Choir, Perla Padilla, the Rio Grande High School Marching Band, the New Mexican Marimba Band, and Francisco LeFebrve who painted the murals in front of the armory. Let's give them all a hand. They were great, and I thank them. [*Applause*]

I am honored to be here with our candidates today, with John Wertheim, Shirley Baca, Art Trujillo, my good friend Eric Serna. I hope you will support them in this election just 23 days away. Will you do that? Will you help us? [*Applause*]

I want to thank your mayor for his friendship and support and for being one of the most innovative mayors in the United States. Thank you for that. I thank Secretary of State Stephanie Gonzalez for all that she said up here, for knowing and caring and supporting the work we are doing to try to build strong families and protect our children and give them a better future.

I want to thank my good friend Senator Jeff Bingaman, and I want to say one thing about that. Just the other day we announced—a couple of days ago—a major, major new contract for Los Alamos here, to build a new supercomputer with Cray, a new Cray supercomputer that will create a huge number of good paying jobs for our country, move us forward. And I want you to know not only that Jeff Bingaman had a lot to do with that contract, but more importantly, when our friends on the other side finally got a hold of the Congress and they proposed among other things to close down the Energy Department——

Audience members. Boo-o-o!

The President. ——and it was far enough away from election that they didn't come back and say, ''Oh, I didn't mean New Mexico.'' It's interesting, isn't it? You get close to the election, it's amazing how people's positions improve. [*Laughter*] Jeff Bingaman said, ''I will stand with you to the very end.'' We are going to save the laboratories of the Department of Energy, including Sandia and Los Alamos and the others as well.

I want to thank Bill Richardson for so many things, but you in New Mexico should be terribly proud of him that while working to represent his constituents and this State, he has also put in double time so that he

could go all around the world on behalf of the United States in the cause of peace and freedom. There is no Member of the House of Representatives who has done as much to make this a safer world for our children as Bill Richardson. And you should be very proud of that.

Well, folks, I made a joke a minute ago about the debate, but they're deadly serious. You've already seen two of these three debates, the first one with Senator Dole and me and then the Vice President's debate with Congressman Kemp. And Al Gore did a good job, didn't he? I was proud of him. [*Applause*]

What these debates reveal are two very different visions about how we should move forward as a nation into the 21st century. Do we believe that we ought to build a bridge big enough and wide enough for all of us to walk across?

Audience members. Yes!

The President. Or are they right that all these efforts don't amount to anything, and we ought to just say, "There's a river. You figure out how to get across it"?

Audience members. No-o-o!

The President. Do we believe we're better off being told, "Well, you're on your own, but we hope everything will work out for you. Good luck"?

Audience members. No-o-o!

The President. Or was the First Lady right when she said it does take a village to raise our children and build our country and move forward?

These views have dramatic practical consequences that affect us all. And sometimes, I think, my fellow Americans, we spend too much time arguing that our opponents are in the grip of some special interest which takes hold of their minds and makes them do something they don't want to do.

The truth is that we just look at the world in different ways. And you can see it. Their budget would have cut Head Start; I just signed a budget that expanded Head Start. I believe we were right. They did everything they could to kill the family and medical leave law; I signed it because I thought it would make us stronger, and it has. We're better off because of it.

When I tried to change the college loan program to make it more affordable and to make it easier for our younger people to repay their loans and to limit how much they could be required to repay in a year to a percentage of their income so that more of our young people could borrow money to go to college, they fought against it tooth and nail. We prevailed. Now millions of young people can do it. I think we were right, and they were wrong.

Four years ago, this debate we had was somewhat theoretical, and you took me in New Mexico on faith. But now there's a record. Now you don't have to guess anymore. I see in the audience there are a couple of people who actually knew me. Besides the folks on the stage—my former colleague, Governor Anaya, former Governor Apodaca, Senator Harris—there are a few people here I knew. But most of you didn't know anything about me, and you couldn't be sure this would work.

You don't have to guess anymore; we've got a record now. There are 10½ million more jobs than there were 4 years ago. New Mexico has a much lower unemployment than it had 4 years ago. We've got record numbers of new businesses and new exports. We are moving in the right direction.

We learned last week that we had the biggest drop in childhood poverty in 20 years last year—we're moving in the right direction—the biggest drop in the inequality of working people in 27 years.

[*At this point, there was audio system difficulty.*]

The President. Is it on? It is now.

And the census department told us that we have now the lowest rate of poverty among senior citizens in America since we started keeping statistics. We're moving in the right direction, and we ought to keep going.

Now, folks, today we learned that the FBI reports that come out every year say that our crime rate is at a 10-year low. The crime rate has gone down for 4 years in a row in this administration. I am proud of that. There are one million fewer victims. We're moving in the right direction. Our children should not

be afraid in their homes, in their schools, and on their streets.

You deserve a lot of credit for what's happened. When you stood with me and Jeff Bingaman and Bill Richardson when they shut the Government down to try to force their budget; eliminating the Department of Education and the Department of Energy and the Department of Commerce, which gave us our ability to compete for business abroad; cutting back on Medicare and Medicaid at unacceptable levels; reducing our commitment to education; crippling our ability to protect our environment, you stood with us, and you said, ''We think they're right, and those folks that shut the Government down to try to force their budget on America to divide us and weaken us are wrong.'' And I thank you for that. You deserve the credit for it.

So we began to do sensible things again right before the Congress was over. Ten million Americans got an increase in their minimum wage. Right before the Congress was over, 25 million Americans will potentially benefit from the bill we passed that says you can't lose your health insurance anymore just because you change jobs or someone in your family has been sick. Just before Congress was over, we finally passed a bill that did something you had already done in New Mexico, ending those drive-by deliveries. Insurance companies can't force mothers and their newborns out of the hospital after only a day anymore in this country.

So we're moving in the right direction. And we're better off than we were 4 years ago, but we have to do more. And let me say to you, one of the things that I have tried to do is to change the way we think about our purposes and working together as a people, the way we think about our responsibilities as citizens. I don't think like all that debate that goes on, or did go on in Washington for 10 or 12 years: liberal this, conservative that; this is a Democratic issue, that's a Republican issue; this is on the left, that's on the right.

You know, if I could go to dinner with any of those 42 people or 67 people Bill says have invited me to dinner—I'd like to do that, by the way—[*laughter*]—if I could do that and I could just sit there and not say a word, I'll bet you $100 that we wouldn't have that kind of sterile rhetoric. People would be talking about their hopes and their dreams for their children, the challenges they face on the job, how they can succeed in raising their kids and succeed in the work place, what's this country going to be like in 20 years. So that's the way I'm trying to get folks to talk and think in Washington.

And my program is simple: opportunity for all; responsibility from all; an American community that includes all of us without regard to our race, our gender, or when we showed up because, except for the Native Americans in the crowd, the rest of us are all immigrants. That's what I want to do.

So I say to you, that means that this old argument about Government that's been raging in Washington for 12 years doesn't have any relationship to your life. Yes, the Government cannot solve all your problems with a big bureaucracy. That Government is gone. It was our administration—not our friends in the other party, our administration—with the support of Jeff Bingaman and Bill Richardson, and the opposition of our friends in the other party, that cut the size of the Federal Government to its lowest since John Kennedy was President and reduced more regulations in 3 years than they did in 12. We did that.

But I'll tell you what, I believe that the National Government's responsibility is to do those things that we must do together. My opponent says, ''Oh, the President thinks the Government knows best.'' But I think you know best. Now, if we fall for that one again, we ought to be ashamed of ourselves. Their theory is, you know, that once you get elected to public office you no longer belong to the people, you lose all your common sense, and you become the enemy, unless you're a Republican, in which case you don't. [*Laughter*]

Their theory is that the Government is always the enemy. Read the Constitution: ''We the people . . .'' The Government is you. It belongs to you. It is a reflection of what you want. It is nothing more or less than yours. And I believe that our role is to create the conditions and then give you the tools to make the most of your own lives. I believe that we're supposed to help communities to fulfill their dreams and individuals and fami-

lies to do the same. I'm glad to support more communities in doing what Albuquerque had done, for example, in establishing a curfew that's lowering juvenile crime and keeping our kids safer. I think that's one of my jobs.

I want to finish the job of putting 100,000 police on the street. All we're doing is funding it. Those police are working for you on the streets in all the communities of this country, and that's one of the reasons we've got a 10-year low in crime.

Those are the things that we are doing. The family and medical leave law has helped 12 million American families to get a little time off from work without losing their jobs when a baby is born or a baby, a spouse, or a parent is sick. And we have a stronger economy because of it, not a weaker economy. That's one of our jobs.

I believe there ought to be a national program to guarantee that every young person, and now not-so-young people, who want and need to go to college—every single person who is willing to work for it ought to be able to go. I think that's a good thing for our country.

I believe we were right to fight against our friends in the other party when they tried to cut the funds for safe and drug-free schools. I think we need to help our kids in the beginning and help them stay out of trouble so we won't have to spend as much time and money and heartbreak and blood when they get in trouble. The safe and drug-free schools program is a good program, and I think we were right.

And let me say, because I believe we have to build a bridge to 21st century that will take us into a time full of greater prosperity and greater possibility than we've ever known, a bridge that's big enough for all of us to walk across, I want to say a special word of thanks to another community group that is here. We have hundreds of young people here today from the Bridge Builders to the 21st Century. Hold your hands up, everybody that's here. These young people have joined together to pledge that they will do everything they can to make their schools drug-free and to encourage every single citizen of the State of New Mexico to vote on election day. Let's give them a big hand. I'm proud of them. [*Applause*] Thank you.

So I say to you, there are big consequences to which path we choose to take. My bridge-building calls for the following path:

Should we balance the budget? You bet we should. It keeps interest rates down, keeps the economy growing, takes the burden of debt off these children. But we have to do it in a way that honors our obligations to each other and continues to invest in the future. So, yes, balance the budget, but we can do it without wrecking Medicare, Medicaid, education, the environment, or abolishing the laboratories of the Department of Energy and undermining our research budget.

We should cut taxes, but we shouldn't embrace a big tax scheme that actually raises taxes on 9 million of our hardest working people, blows a hole in the deficit which will increase interest rates and weaken the economy and require bigger cuts than the budget I vetoed when they shut the Government down. Let's try my tax cut. It's targeted to education, to childrearing, to buying a home, to dealing with a medical emergency, and not paying taxes on your home when you sell it if there's a gain. We can pay for that, and we need it.

One of the biggest differences I had with our friends on the other side was their obsession with weakening our ability to work together to protect our environment. They said we were hurting the economy by protecting the environment. Well, all I know is that the air is cleaner, the drinking water is safer, we have raised the standards for food safety, we've cleaned up more toxic waste dumps in 3 years than the previous administration did in 12. And we've still got faster job growth than any administration under the previous party had since the 1920's, in 70 years. It's a good thing to protect the environment, and I intend to continue to do it.

Finally, and most important of all, we have got to build a bridge to the 21st century in which the education of every single American is our highest priority. Will you help me do that? [*Applause*]

Forty percent of the third graders in America still cannot read a book independently. I want to mobilize 30,000 volunteers, AmeriCorps volunteers, reading specialists, to work with parents and teachers so that in

4 years, when we start that new century, every 8-year-old in this country can pick up a book and say, ''I can read this all by myself.'' Will you help me do this? [*Applause*]

I want to make sure we connect every single, solitary classroom and library in America to the information superhighway; to make sure we have the computers, the educational materials, the trained teachers; and most important, that all these classrooms are connected to the Internet, the World Wide Web, all these networks.

Now, if you're not a big computer person, you may not understand exactly what that means. Let me tell you what that means in practical terms. It means for the first time in history, children in the poorest rural school districts in America, children in every Native American schoolroom, children in every inner-city school, children in every suburban school, children in the poorest, the most middle class, and the wealthiest schools, public and private, in America for the first time ever, they will all have access to the same information in the same time in the same way. Will you help me do that? [*Applause*]

And finally, we can make a college education available to all Americans. And I propose to do it in three ways: Number one, I want you to be able to save in an IRA but withdraw from it without any penalties if you're spending your savings for a college education or medical costs or buying a first-time home. Number two, I propose to make 2 years of education after high school as universal as a high school diploma is today by simply saying, ''You can take off of your tax bill, dollar-for-dollar, the cost of the typical community college tuition for 2 years.'' Will you help me do that? [*Applause*] And finally, I believe you ought to be able to deduct from your taxes—you ought to be able to deduct up to $10,000 a year from your taxable income for the cost of college tuition, any kind of college, for people of any age. Will you help me do that? [*Applause*]

My fellow Americans, we are better off than we were 4 years ago and not just in economic terms, for this is not just about the economy. This is about what kind of America we want our children to live in. And I think every day—every day I think, what do I want my country to be like when we start that new century? What do I want my country to be like when my daughter is my age, when her children are my age?

And before you vote, I hope you will take just a little time and see if you can ask yourself, ''Can I say in 30 seconds or a minute what I want America to be like when we start that new century, when my children are my age, when my grandchildren are my age?'' If you will ask the question, I bet you will get an answer not very different than mine.

And then we will build that bridge to America's best days. There are 23 days left. I ask every one of you here today to take some time not only to vote but to reach out to others, to be a good citizen, to influence those whom you can influence and say, ''Will you help me build that bridge to the 21st century?''

Thank you. God bless you. Thank you, New Mexico.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:52 p.m. in front of the KiMo Theater on Central Ave. In his remarks, he referred to congressional candidates John Wertheim and Shirley Baca; senatorial candidate Art Trujillo; Eric Serna, New Mexico corporation commission; Mayor Martin Chavez of Albuquerque; former Gov. Toney Anaya and former Gov. Jerry Apodaca of New Mexico. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on Signing the Water Resources Development Act of 1996

October 12, 1996

Today I am signing into law S. 640, the ''Water Resources Development Act of 1996,'' which authorizes water resources development projects and programs in support of the Department of the Army's Civil Works mission.

I am very pleased that the Congress has passed this important legislation. It represents the culmination of a 4-year effort on the part of the Administration and the Congress to enact legislation to preserve and develop water infrastructure needs critical to the Nation's safety, environment, and economic security. It will serve to improve the Nation's water-related infrastructure, create new jobs for Americans, and encourage both

economic growth and environmental restoration and protection.

This bill represents another important step forward for the Florida Everglades—one of America's richest treasures. Three years ago, my Administration made the Everglades one of our highest environmental priorities, establishing a special task force to coordinate Federal activities in the area. In February of this year, the Vice President announced our comprehensive program to restore the Florida Everglades. Several weeks later, I signed a Farm Bill that provided a $200 million downpayment on Everglades restoration; it was sponsored by the Florida delegation with support from Republican and Democratic leaders in the Congress. I called on the Congress again to enact our comprehensive Everglades restoration plan.

This legislation enacts the majority of that plan, establishing the Everglades and South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Program. It directs the Secretary of the Army to work in partnership with various State and Federal agencies participating in the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force to coordinate a long-term restoration effort. It authorizes a number of projects to restore and protect the South Florida ecosystem.

After decades of decline in the Everglades, the people of South Florida and the Nation should take great pride in the steps we have taken together to bring them back. Restoration will take many years of hard work and cooperation, but we know we are on the right track.

Apart from the Everglades provisions, this legislation also includes revisions to cost sharing, which require non-Federal interests to provide a minimum of 35 percent of the costs of both flood control projects and environmental protection and restoration projects authorized in the future. I would have preferred that the non-Federal share be increased to 50 percent and that the new cost sharing apply to projects authorized in this bill. Nevertheless, the changes here represent a significant first step toward greater non-Federal participation in key water resource projects of the future. These changes also represent recognition of the need for non-Federal beneficiaries to share more fully in the cost of such projects in these times of Federal fiscal constraints. Flood control cost-sharing provisions also require the non-Federal project sponsors to develop flood management plans that will help reduce the potential for future flood damages.

I am concerned about the potential overall Federal cost of the bill. Under existing budget constraints, many projects and initiatives authorized by this bill cannot be funded within a reasonable timeframe. Thus, such authorizations may raise unrealistic expectations for non-Federal sponsors who expect timely project initiation and completion. I am also concerned about certain provisions of the bill that assign responsibilities to the Federal Government that more appropriately belong to State and local governments or the private sector, that are inconsistent with established cost-sharing rules, or that authorize projects that are not economically justified.

On balance though, this is important legislation that will not only help save the Everglades, but also promote responsible water resources projects and programs. I appreciate the diligent efforts of all involved to produce a bill that continues the vital role of the Army Corps of Engineers in building and maintaining a strong water resources program. This legislation will continue and in many ways strengthen the Federal/non-Federal partnership principles started in 1986. It will also allow the Army Corps of Engineers to maintain an orderly program for the construction of productive water resources projects.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
October 12, 1996.

NOTE: S. 640, approved October 12, was assigned Public Law No. 104–303. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 14.

Remarks After Signing the Wildfire Suppression Aircraft Transfer Act of 1996 and an Exchange With Reporters in Albuquerque

October 14, 1996

The President. Thank you, Senator Bingaman and Congressman Richardson. I want

to thank the representatives of New Mexico's firefighting community here from the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the volunteer firefighters, the New Mexico State forestry office. And of course, we've got some folks from the Albuquerque Fire Department over there, as well.

I'm delighted to be staying here for the next few days. As you look around New Mexico you can't help being awestruck by the awesome, the breathtaking natural beauty of this State and of the entire West, the deserts, the mountains, the play of light and color. We have to do everything we can to protect the treasures of New Mexico. The beauty we see here and, indeed, throughout the West is very deep, but it's also fragile. We know that wildfires can ravage the landscape, threaten people, devastate homes and farms and businesses.

This has been the worst year for wildfires in nearly four decades. I think I need to emphasize that because that is the importance of the legislation we signed today and the efforts that these firefighters and those whom they represent have made—the worst year in almost 40 years. The brave men and women who are with us today and the thousands of their colleagues put their lives on the line to protect their fellow citizens, our natural environment, as they battle these blazes. We owe them our thanks, and we should be deeply grateful that during this past year, despite the huge rash of wildfires, not a single firefighter lost his or her life in a wildfire. That's because their training, their dedication and because of the equipment that they have been provided.

We have to make sure that they have the very best possible equipment at their disposal. We can't tolerate a situation where any firefighter is unable to protect the public or themselves because of a lack of equipment, especially the air tankers that can muster such force and power to fight fires.

The legislation I have just signed will help these and other firefighters to do a better job with more safety, especially when they're faced with wildfires. Today, the Forest Service and other agencies rely on an aging and shrinking fleet of 39 air tankers to fight fires throughout our Nation. With this measure, we allow the Department of Defense to sell excess military aircraft to private contractors for conversion into air tankers that then can be leased to our Government to drench the fires from the sky.

This is a public-private partnership in the best sense, providing a vital service to the American public and its safety, using the skills and resources of the private sector to maintain a full fleet of modern air tankers for use by the Forest Service. It's especially fitting that this becomes law at the end of National Fire Prevention Week, a time we honor fallen firefighters and redouble our own efforts to be prudent and prevent fires from happening in the first place.

Again, I want to thank those brave men and women who are here with me today. I thank Senator Bingaman for his leadership. I thank Congressman Richardson, whose district has been especially affected. I'd also like to thank Senators Kempthorne and Craig for what they did and Senator Lott for making it possible for us to bring up this bill late in the congressional session and get it passed eventually in both Houses on a voice vote. This was a good thing for America, and I was glad to sign the bill.

Thank you very much.

1996 Election

Q. Mr. President, Newt Gingrich yesterday——

Q. Mr. President, Dole says he may make a renewed effort in California. Do you believe the race in California has tightened within 10 points?

The President. Well, I can't answer that question. I don't know. But I will say this, if California is to become a battleground in the last 3 weeks of the election, that is something that I would welcome, because I believe the people there are fundamentally fair-minded and forward-looking. And when I became President, California had the weakest economy in the country. Since I've been President, they've had to endure earthquakes and fires and floods. And in spite of all of that, they have shown a remarkable turnaround in so many areas, and I'm very proud of the partnership we have had.

No administration in history has worked as hard on so many fronts to make so much progress as we have. So if that's going to be

the issue for the last 3 weeks, I would be happy to engage in that discussion, and I believe I know how it will come out.

Q. What are you going to do if Bob Dole goes negative?

The President. I can't—I'm going to do what I always do. I'm preparing to do my debate, to answer whatever questions may be asked. As I understand it, the people who are coming are picked from undecided voters, a fairly small percentage of people who still have questions on their minds. Whatever they ask I'll do my best to answer. But Senator Dole will decide his strategy, and I will decide mine, and we'll see what the people have to say afterwards. There's nothing else to say.

I look forward to it, just as I looked forward to the last one, and the most important thing, I hope, is that it will be something that people will feel better about when it's over. Many people said to me after the last debate that they thought that it had been fundamentally positive and that people had really learned from the debate what the differences between us are and what practical impact that would have in the next 4 years. That's all any of us could hope for, and that's what I hope will come out of this debate.

Thank you.

Q. What's your reaction to Newt Gingrich, sir?

Q. Mr. President, you said FBI numbers show lowest crime rate, but here in Albuquerque we've had a record number of homicides.

Q. Any comment on Newt Gingrich?

The President. It's election time.

Q. It's a waste of time, did you say?

The President. It's election time, I said.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:03 a.m. outside the Holiday Inn Pyramid Hotel. S. 2078, the Wildfire Suppression Aircraft Transfer Act of 1996, approved October 14, was assigned Public Law No. 104–307. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Proclamation 6941—White Cane Safety Day, 1996

October 14, 1996

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

In the summer of 1996, the remarkable display of athletic excellence at the Tenth Paralympic Games in Atlanta, Georgia, inspired viewers around the world. Athletes from across our country, including many who are blind or visually impaired, participated in these games. The tenacity and commitment to excellence that these athletes showed in Atlanta are rich resources for our Nation. From their performance in the Paralympics, and indeed from their many contributions throughout our Nation's history, blind and visually impaired Americans have demonstrated how much they have to contribute.

Individuals with disabilities, like all people, use many tools in their everyday lives, some simple and some technologically sophisticated. The tool most commonly used by blind and visually impaired people is the white cane. This basic instrument enables them to detect obstacles, steps, drop-offs, and changes in surface textures. The independence that blind and visually impaired people gain through the use of the white cane enriches their lives—and those of all Americans—by allowing them to participate fully in and contribute generously to our society.

Blind and visually impaired individuals make valuable contributions to our society and our economy. But they need more than the white cane to achieve their full potential; they also need equal opportunity and protection from discrimination. That is why we must continue to vigorously enforce the Americans with Disabilities Act, which prohibits discrimination against blind and visually impaired people and those with other disabilities, and ensures them access to services that all other Americans take for granted.

To honor the numerous achievements of blind and visually impaired individuals, and to recognize the significance of the white cane as a symbol of their freedom and independence in our society, the Congress of the United States, by joint resolution approved October 6, 1964, has designated October 15 of each year as ''White Cane Safety Day,'' and authorized the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this commemoration.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 15, 1996, as White Cane Safety Day. I call upon the people of the United States, government officials, educators, and business leaders to observe this day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fourteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-first.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 16, 1996]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 17.

Executive Order 13020—Amendment to Executive Order 12981

October 12, 1996

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including but not limited to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), and in order to take additional steps with respect to the national emergency described and declared in Executive Order 12924 of August 19, 1994, and continued on August 15, 1995, and August 14, 1996, in order to amend Executive Order 12981 as that order applies to the processing of applications for the export of any commercial communication satellites and any hot-section technologies for the development, production, and overhaul of commercial aircraft engines that are transferred from the United States Munitions List to the Commerce Control List pursuant to regulations issued by the Departments of Commerce and State after the effective date of this order, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Amendment of Executive Order 12981.* (a) Section 5(a)(3)(B) of Executive Order 12981 is amended to read as follows:

> (B) The OC shall review all license applications on which the reviewing departments and agencies are not in agreement. The Chair of the OC shall consider the recommendations of the reviewing departments and agencies and inform them of his or her decision on any such matters within 14 days after the deadline for receiving department and agency recommendations. However, for license applications concerning commercial communication satellites and hot-section technologies for the development, production, and overhaul of commercial aircraft engines that are transferred from the United States Munitions List to the Commerce Control List pursuant to regulations issued by the Departments of Commerce and State after the date of this order, the Chair of the OC shall inform reviewing departments and agencies of the majority vote decision of the OC. As described below, any reviewing department or agency may appeal the decision of the Chair of the OC, or the majority vote decision of the OC in cases concerning the commercial communication satellites and hot-section technologies described above, to the Chair of the ACEP. In the absence of a timely appeal, the Chair's decision (or the majority vote decision in the case of license applications concerning the commercial communication satellites and hot-section technologies described above) will be final.

(b) Section 5(b)(1) of Executive Order 12981 is amended to read as follows:

> (1) If any department or agency disagrees with a licensing determination of the Department of Commerce made through the Chair of the OC (or a majority vote decision of the OC in the case

of license applications concerning the commercial communication satellites and the hot-section technologies described in section 5(a)(3)(B)), it may appeal the matter to the ACEP for resolution. A department or agency must appeal a matter within 5 days of such a decision. Appeals must be in writing from an official appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or an officer properly acting in such capacity, and must cite both the statutory and the regulatory bases for the appeal. The ACEP shall review all departments' and agencies' information and recommendations, and the Chair of the ACEP shall inform the reviewing departments and agencies of the majority vote decision of the ACEP within 11 days from the date of receiving notice of the appeal. Within 5 days of the majority vote decision, any dissenting department or agency may appeal the decision by submitting a letter from the head of the department or agency to the Secretary in his or her capacity as the Chair of the Board. Such letter shall cite both the statutory and the regulatory bases for the appeal. Within the same 5-day period, the Secretary may call a meeting on his or her own initiative to consider a license application. In the absence of a timely appeal, the majority vote decision of the ACEP shall be final.

Sec. 2. *Judicial Review.* This order is not intended to create, nor does it create, any rights to administrative or judicial review, or any other right or benefit or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable by a party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

Sec. 3. *Effective Date.* This order shall be effective immediately and shall remain in effect until terminated.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
October 12, 1996.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 16, 1996]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 15, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on October 17.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting Executive Order 13020

October 12, 1996

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

In order to take additional steps with respect to the national emergency described and declared in Executive Order 12924 of August 19, 1994, and continued on August 15, 1995, and August 14, 1996, necessitated by the expiration of the Export Administration Act on August 20, 1994, I hereby report to the Congress that pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b) ("the Act"), I have today exercised the authority granted by the Act to issue an Executive order (a copy of which is attached) to revise the existing procedures for processing export license applications submitted to the Department of Commerce.

The new Executive order relates to my decision to transfer certain commercial communications satellites and jet engine hot-section technology from the United States Munitions List administered by the Department of State to the Commerce Control List administered by the Department of Commerce. Specifically, when I made that decision I also decided to amend Executive Order 12981 of December 5, 1995, which set forth procedures for the interagency review and disposition of dual-use export license applications.

The new Executive order is designed to provide that the first-level license determination for the affected commercial communications satellites and jet engine hot-section technology would be made by majority vote, instead of by the Chair of the Operating Committee of the Advisory Committee on Export Policy. This change assures that national security and foreign policy considerations will be fully taken into account with

respect to license processing in these two sectors.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 15.

Remarks on the Second Annual Report on Television Violence and an Exchange With Reporters in Albuquerque

October 15, 1996

The President. Good afternoon. I want to thank Dr. Cole for being here today and for the extensive study that he has conducted. I want to thank Senator Paul Simon and the executives of the four major networks who agreed that this study should be done and then saw to it that it was done.

Nothing is more important than strengthening our families and helping our parents to teach their children good values. We know that television can be a positive force or a destructive force in the lives of our children. Every parent knows that exposure to TV violence can be numbing and send the wrong message to their kids. And parents whose children grew up watching programs like "Sesame Street," as our daughter did, know that television can teach as well as entertain.

Parents need our help to protect their children from harmful or inappropriate forces from outside the home and help them pass on their values to their children. This is something our administration cares deeply about. Tipper Gore sounded the first alarm almost a decade ago in her book "Raising PG Kids In An X-Rated Society." And Hillary wrote eloquently about this in her book. Today's comprehensive report shows that where broadcast television is concerned we are moving measurably in the right direction, away from violence and toward more programming for children. We have a long way to go, but we are making progress for our children.

The study notes several positive trends over the past year, including a decrease in the number of TV series and made-for-TV movies with frequent violence; fewer broadcasts of violent films originally released in theaters; fewer children's series with sinister combat violence; an increase in the use of advisories about violence. The picture is not all bright. Theatrical movies are still the most violent programs when they're broadcast on television. Even promotional ads for these films are violent. Some primetime specials have begun to feature real and staged animal attacks. Emerging broadcast networks are showing a higher percentage of violent shows.

So there is work still to be done. But this work has been begun, and it is bearing fruit. Everyone has a responsibility in bringing this kind of change: parents, the entertainment industry, government, each of us as individuals. Step by step, working together, our administration, especially the Vice President and I, have worked to make television better for our families, since my first year in office when I commended the leaders of broadcast television for their decision to include parental advisories on violence. We have challenged the entertainment industry to find their way back to family programming, and challenged parents to do their part as well.

We insisted that the Telecommunications Act require new TV sets to include a violence chip, a V-chip, that will give parents the ability to screen out violent or inappropriate programming for their young children. In my State of the Union Address, I challenged broadcasters to develop voluntary rating systems that would enable the V-chip to work. And earlier this year in a conference at the White House, the entertainment industry showed very good citizenship in agreeing to set up a voluntary rating system.

Over a year ago I asked the FCC to broadcast air at least 3 hours of educational children's programming each week. Last July, I invited the leaders of the entertainment industry and children's television and others to meet me in the White House to discuss how to improve the quality of children's television. As a result, I reached agreement with the broadcasters on a proposal under which each broadcaster now will air 3 hours a week of educational children's programming. The FCC adopted the proposal, and the market

for educational television for children is now booming.

I want to commend the entertainment industry for stepping up to this issue. And of course, I want to thank the thousands of parents across our country who served as a conscience and a prod for so long. The progress we're making shows how we can best meet our challenges: working together, employing common sense, and finding common ground.

It accomplishes nothing simply to rail against violence. That's like yelling at the TV or the movie screen alone in a room. We will continue to sit down, to work with entertainment leaders, to fight for the public interest. I'm confident we will continue to make progress for our families, and again, I want to thank Dr. Jeff Cole for the fine work that he has been doing. I'd like to ask him to come up now and make a few remarks about the report.

Dr. Cole?

[*At this point, Dr. Jeffrey I. Cole, director, UCLA Center for Communication Policy, gave a brief update on the study.*]

1996 Election

Q. Mr. President, Bob Dole says that you are willing to take responsibility for doing things like this or even the drop in the crime rate but not for problems, especially ethical ones, within your administration, things like firing the Travel Office figures or even towards acceptances of questionable campaign donations by the Democrats and by the campaign. I wonder what your response to that is?

The President. Well, we're going to have a debate tomorrow night. But I have not only tried to take responsibility for the things that I have some responsibility for, good and bad, but also to share responsibility for the good news with the American people who are responsible for helping to create the 10½ million more jobs and bringing the crime rate down, and in the case of where we're going to be tomorrow night, in San Diego County, reducing the problem of illegal immigration. So I tried to follow a balanced report.

Senator Dole takes the position if it's good, I didn't have anything to do with it, and if it's bad, I must have stayed up all night planning it. So that's just politics, and we'll see some more of that, I'm sure. But we'll have time to discuss that in the debate.

Q. Will your campaign contributions be returned?

Q. Mr. President, I'm wondering if you're worried about TV violence tomorrow night. Specifically, what goes through your mind when Senator Dole, as he is in a speech right now, questions your personal integrity and that of the administration itself?

Mr. President. Well, he's been doing quite a lot of that, and I'll have a chance to answer that at the appropriate time.

Q. Nothing——

The President. No, what I—again I will say, you know, my view is this country is better off than it was 4 years ago. And we have worked hard to make it so. And we've worked hard by concentrating on ideas and issues, not insults. We've spent very little time worrying about our opponents. And we spent a lot more time being concerned about the American people. I expect to do that tomorrow: issues, ideas, not insults. And the American people can simply make up their own mind. They'll have a lot of time to evaluate it; they can make up their own mind.

Q. He just finished his toughest attack so far on your integrity. He called your administration self-righteous, self-serving, arrogant, swaggering. It says you personally do not keep your word. Are you worried about this new tact they're using?

The President. No.

Q. Does Senator Dole get some credit for speaking out against Hollywood violence? Would he be entitled to some of the credit for this plan?

The President. Well, this project in particular was underway well before Senator Dole ever said anything. I think that anybody who speaks out in a constructive way is doing a responsible thing.

You know, I went to California in December of '93 and challenged the entertainment industry to work with me to reduce violence and to improve the quality of programming. We had people from all the networks meeting with me in early '94, and then they reached this agreement to work with Senator Simon and Dr. Cole in doing something which I think is quite important.

So I would hope that all Americans would be continually coming to grips with this, because we want to have total first amendment freedom of speech, but we also want to have a society in which the culture supports families in raising their children. There is no more important job; there is no more important agenda. So I think anyone who speaks out in an affirmative way can make a positive contribution.

And again, I want to say that, Dr. Cole, it's rather remarkable to me that this unusual partnership with all of the networks and Senator Simon and UCLA has worked out well, because you can tell by what he said today that nobody's attempted to censor him. He's been given full freedom to evaluate these programs, to report on them, and to say what he thinks.

Do you want to say anything about that?

Dr. Cole. No, I appreciate that, and it has been an absolutely independent project. We also extended an invitation to Senator Dole to be fully briefed on this if he would like, and we're waiting to hear if he's interested. But he has every opportunity to be briefed in the same way the President has been.

The President. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:55 p.m. at the Holiday Inn Pyramid Hotel.

Remarks on Receiving the Endorsement of Native American Tribal Leaders and an Exchange With Reporters in Albuquerque

October 15, 1996

The President. Thank you very, very much. Thank you, Congressman Richardson, for what you've said about the record that we have worked hard to make in partnership with the Native Americans. Thank you, Mayor Chavez, for being here. I want to thank the Native American leaders who have come here today to offer their support. And I thank President Hale and Governor Garcia for the words that they have given.

Let me say that there are many wonderful things about having the great honor of being President of the United States. But being able to be President of a country that includes the Native American tribes, to have the opportunity to work with them in a spirit of genuine respect, to work to improve the recognition of the integrity of their religious practices, to work to try to increase the level of independence and reduce the level of patronizing practices in the relationship of the Native American tribes to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, all these things are very, very important to me.

As the 42d President, I was honored to be the first President since our fifth President, James Monroe, in the 1820's, to invite the leaders of every tribe in the United States to meet with me at the White House. We have worked hard to expand tribal sovereignty and self-determination. We have worked hard to make sure every Federal agency knows that it should consult with tribal governments at any time we're making decisions that affect American Indians and Alaskan natives.

By working together, we have moved forward. We have kept some bad things from happening, but we have also made some good things happen. We have a lot more to do. But we can be proud of what has been done in protecting self-determination, in preserving natural resources, in providing educational and economic opportunity, in defending tribal rights to protect children, families, and culture.

America is going in the right direction in no small measure because every American and every American family and every American ethnic, racial, and religious group knows that in our America, they are all entitled to be treated with dignity and equality. But I am especially grateful for the Indian nations for standing with us as we have fought to preserve our common values, as we have worked to balance the budget without crippling our investments in people and our obligations to one another.

Now we have to continue the progress and build upon it. The endorsement of the leaders here and the work we will do together will be critical to keep our country moving into the right direction as we move into the 21st century. I value their friendship. I value their partnership, and I look forward to working with them.

Thank you all very, very much.

Gambling on Indian Reservations

Q. Mr. President—[*inaudible*]—meeting, and can your administration do anything, any more to resolve the current logjam?

The President. No. There are some Indian gaming issues around the country that we still have the capacity to resolve. But the ones here are in the courts. And there's really nothing more for us to do except to let them work their way through the courts.

Q. Mr. President, the so-called dean of Native American leaders is not here today, Mescalero Apache President Wendell Chino. And he wants you to fire U.S. Attorney John Kelly, the man who shut down his casino and so do, frankly, some people on the stage with you today. Is that going to happen, sir?

The President. This issue is in the courts now, and I have no further comment.

Campaign Contributions

Q. Mr. President, do you seek, in fact, the disputed $450,000? Everyone in the administration said there's nothing illegal—but there's some ethical issues been raised. We haven't heard you say much about it.

The President. Well I—first of all, I expect to have the opportunity to discuss that tomorrow night. But I believe that the political parties should not give back contributions that were legally made and legally received. And if they made a mistake and took any money that shouldn't have been taken, then they ought to give that back. I think that there are clear FEC rules on this. There's a law on this. That's what we've got a Federal Election Commission for. And we know they're capable of doing their job because they've taken action this year already.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:40 p.m. at the Holiday Inn Pyramid Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Albert Hale, President, Navajo Nation, and Leonard D. Garcia, Governor, Pueblo of Santa Ana, Southern Pueblos.

Exchange With Reporters in San Diego, California

October 16, 1996

Presidential Debate

Q. Can you tell us what you're thinking about—[*inaudible*]—today?

The President. It's been a long time since I've done one of these town halls, so I'm looking forward to that. I'm interested to see what the people have on their mind, and I'm looking forward to it. I've done my best to prepare. I've still got some reading to do. I'm going to go back and do a little work now.

Q. If Bob Dole goes real negative how are you going to respond to that today, Mr. President?

The President. Well, we're going to respond to the people who are in the audience. That's the way this was designed, and we'll just see what happens. I'm going to do my best to respond to their questions and to talk about what I'm going to do for the next 4 years.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:30 p.m. en route to the debate site. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Presidential Debate in San Diego

October 16, 1996

Jim Lehrer. Good evening from the Shiley Theatre at the University of San Diego, San Diego, California. I'm Jim Lehrer of the "NewsHour" on PBS. Welcome to this second 1996 Presidential debate between Senator Bob Dole, the Republican nominee, and President Bill Clinton, the Democratic nominee. It is sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates.

We will follow a townhall-type format tonight. The questions over the next 90 minutes will come from 113 citizens of the greater San Diego area. They were chosen in the past week by the Gallup organization to represent a rough cross-section of voters as to political views, age, gender, and other factors. Each said he or she is undecided about this Presidential race.

They were told to come tonight with questions. Nobody from the Debate Commission or the two campaigns has any idea what those questions are; neither do I. We will all be hearing them for the first time at the same time. I met with this group 3 hours ago, and we spoke only about how it was going to work tonight. They are sitting in five sections. I will call on individuals at random, moving from one section to another with each new

question, alternating the questions between the two candidates. My job is to keep things fair and the subjects as clear and as varied as possible.

The rules, drawn by the campaigns, are basically the same as they were for the Hartford and St. Petersburg debates: 90-second answers, 60-second rebuttals, 30-second responses for each question. The candidates are not allowed to question each other directly. There will be 2-minute opening and closing statements. The order for this evening was set by coin toss.

We begin now with Senator Dole and his opening statement.

Senator Dole.

Opening Statements

Senator Bob Dole. Thank you very much, Jim.

Let me first give you a sports update: the Braves, one; Cardinals, nothing—early on.

I want to thank you and I want to thank everybody here tonight, and I want a special thanks to my wife, Elizabeth, and my daughter, Robin, for their love and support, and thank the people who are listening and watching all over America.

In 20 days, you will help decide who will lead this country into the next century. It's an awesome responsibility. And you must ask yourself, do you know enough about the candidates? You should know as much as possible about each of us. Sometimes the views have been distorted—and millions and millions of dollars in negative advertising spent distorting my views—but I hope tonight you'll get a better feel of who Bob Dole is and what he's all about.

And I think first you should—I should understand that the question on your mind is, do I understand your problem? But I understand it if—it occurred to me and I might just say that I'm from a large family. I've got lots of relatives, and they're good, average, middle class, hard-working Americans. They live all across the country. They're not all Republicans—maybe all but one. [*Laughter*]

But in any event, I understand the problems, whether it's two parents working because one has to pay the taxes and one has to provide for the family, whether it's a single parent who just barely pays the pressing bills, or whether you're worried about an education for your children—are they going to the best schools, or whether you're worried about safe playgrounds, drug-free schools, crime-free schools.

This is what this election is all about. And hopefully tonight when we conclude this debate, you will have a better understanding and the viewing and listening audience will have a better understanding. Thank you. [*Applause*]

Mr. Lehrer. Mr. President, 2 minutes, opening statement.

The President. I was going to applaud, too. [*Laughter*]

Well, thank you, Jim, and thanks to the people of San Diego for giving us this opportunity to have another discussion about the decision we all face in front of people who will make the decision. Again I will say, I'll do my best to make this a discussion of ideas and issues, not insults. What really matters is what happens to your future and what happens to our country as we stand on the brink of a new century, a time of extraordinary possibility.

I have a simply philosophy that I tried to follow for the last 4 years: Do what creates opportunity for all, what reinforces responsibility from all of us, and what will help us build a community where everybody's got a role to play and a place at the table.

Compared to 4 years ago, we're clearly better off. We've got 10½ million more jobs; the deficit's been reduced by 60 percent; incomes are rising for the first time in a decade; the crime rates, the welfare rolls are falling; we're putting 100,000 more police on the street; 60,000 felons, fugitives, and stalkers have been denied handguns.

But that progress is only the beginning. What we really should focus on tonight is what we still have to do to help the American people make the most of this future that's out there. I think what really matters is what we can do to help build strong families. Strong families need a strong economy. To me, that means we have to go on and balance this budget while we protect Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment.

We should give a tax cut targeted to childrearing and education, to buying a first

home and paying for health care. We ought to help protect our kids from drugs and guns and gangs and tobacco. We ought to help move a million people from welfare to work. And we ought to create the finest education system in the world, where every 18-year-old can go on to college and all of our younger children have great educational opportunities. If we do those things, we can build that bridge to the 21st century. That's what I hope to get to talk about tonight.

Thank you.

Mr. Lehrer. All right, let's go now to the first question from this section, and it's for Senator Dole.

Yes, ma'am? Yes?

Q. Hello, Senator Dole.

Senator Dole. Hi.

Leadership To Promote Unity

Q. My name is Shannon MacAfee. I'm a beginning educator in this country, and I really think it's important what children have to say. They're still very idealistic, and everything they say comes from the heart. I have a quote for you from "If I Were President," compiled by Peggy Gavin. A sixth grader says, "If I were President, I would think about Abraham Lincoln and George Washington and what they did to make our country great. We should unite the white and black people and people of all cultures. Democrats and Republicans should unite also. We should all come together and think of the best ways to solve the economic problems of our country. I believe that when we are able to come together and stop fighting amongst ourselves, we will get along a lot better."

These are the ideals and morals that we are trying to teach our children in these days, yet we don't seem to be practicing them in our Government, in anything. If you are President, how will you begin to practice what we are preaching to our children, the future of our Nation?

Senator Dole. Well, I would say, first of all, I think it's a very good question, and I appreciate the quote from the young man.

There's no doubt about it that many American people have lost their faith in government. They see scandals almost on a daily basis. They see ethical problems in the White House today. They see 900 FBI files of private persons being gathered up by somebody in the White House; nobody knows who hired this man. So there's a great deal of cynicism out there.

But I've always tried, in whatever I've done, to bring people together. I said in my acceptance speech in San Diego about 2 months ago that the exits are clearly marked. If you think the Republican Party is someplace for you to come if you're narrow-minded or bigoted or don't like certain people in America, the exits are clearly marked for you to walk out of, as I stand here without compromise because this is the party of Lincoln.

I think we have a real obligation, obviously, public officials. I'm no longer a public official; I left public life on June 11th of this year. But it is very important. Young people are looking to us. They're looking to us for leadership. They're watching what we do, what we say, what we promise, and what we finally deliver. And I would think—it seems to me that there are opportunities here. When I'm President of the United States, I will keep my word. My word is my bond.

Mr. Lehrer. Mr. President?

The President. One of the reasons that I ran for President, Sandy, is because not just children, a lot of grownups felt that way. If you remember, 4 years ago we had not only rising unemployment but a lot of rising cynicism. I'd never worked in Washington as an elected official. It seemed to me that most of the arguments were partisan: Republican, Democrat; left, right; liberal, conservative. That's why I said tonight I'm for opportunity, responsibility, and community. And we've gotten some real progress in the last 4 years. I've also done everything I could at every moment of division in this country—after Oklahoma City, when these churches were burned—to bring people together and remind people that we are stronger because of our diversity. We have to respect one another.

You mentioned Washington and Lincoln; they were Presidents at historic times. This is an historic time. It's important that we go beyond those old partisan arguments and focus on people and their future. When we do that, instead of shutting the Government

down over a partisan fight on the budget, we're a better country, and that's why we're making progress now.

Mr. Lehrer. Senator?

Senator Dole. Well, bringing people together again is obviously a responsibility we all have. I know you do it. Everybody here does it. You do a lot of things nobody knows about. I have a little foundation for the disabled called the Dole Foundation. We've raised about $10 million. We don't talk about it. We try to help people with disabilities. We bring them back into the mainstream of public life.

So it seems to me that there's also a public trust. When you're the President of the United States, you have a public trust, and you have to keep that public trust, as George Washington did and as Abraham Lincoln did. And I think now that trust is being violated. And it seems to me we ought to face up to it, and the President ought to say tonight that he's not going to pardon anybody that he was involved in business with who might implicate him later on.

Mr. Lehrer. All right, the next question from this section right here. Right there in the middle, sir. Yes, sir?

Health Care

Q. Dr. Robert Berkeley; I'm a cardiologist from Fallbrook, California. Mr. President, I'd like to know if you'd please explain your plans for—in a substantive fashion, for addressing the problems with the health care system in our country.

The President. I will. First of all, let me say what we have done: In the last 4 years, we've worked hard to promote more competition to bring down the rate of inflation in health care costs without eroding health care quality. The Government pays for Medicare and Medicaid, as you know, and that's very important.

Secondly, we've added a million more children to the ranks of the insured through the Medicaid program. We have protected 25 million people through the passage of the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill that says you can't lose your health insurance if you change jobs or if someone in your family's been sick. We just recently ended those drive-by deliveries, saying people couldn't be kicked out of the hospital by insurance companies when they'd just had babies. So this is—that's a good start.

In the next 4 years, I want to focus on the following things: Number one, add another million children to the insured ranks through the Medicaid program; number two, keep working with the States, as we are now, to add 2.2 million more people to the insurance system; number three, cover people who are between jobs for up to 6 months—that could protect 3 million families, 700,000 kids; and number four, make sure we protect the integrity of the Medicare program and the Medicaid program and not do anything in cutting costs which would cause hundreds of hospitals to close, as could have been the case if the $270 billion Medicare cut that I vetoed had been enacted into law.

Senator Dole. First, let me say there you go again, Mr. President, talking about a Medicare cut. Now, I've heard you say this time after time, and I've heard you say on one TV appearance, ''The media made me do it.'' You were trying to defend your cut, which was not a cut either—a reduction in the growth of spending. And we always had at least 7 percent. You've said publicly that it's now 3 times the rate of inflation, we ought to cut the growth to twice the rate of inflation. That's about where we are now. So let's stop talking about cutting Medicare. In my economic plan we increase it 39 percent.

Don't forget what he tried to do with health care: 17 new taxes; spend $1.5 trillion; 50 new bureaucracies? Can you believe that? You couldn't even have been a cardiologist because they had quotas. You had—you couldn't—if you're a cardiologist it wouldn't affect you. But if somebody wanted to be a cardiologist, 10 years from now you'd have to be certain that you complied with some of the rules in this extreme medical plan the Government was going to take over for all Americans. There are things we can do like the Kassebaum bill, that retains many provisions I authored, to cover preexisting—existing—portability. And there are other things we can do. We still need to cover about 20 million people and a lot of children.

The President. I don't have time in 30 seconds to respond to fix all that. But let me just say, the American Hospital Association said that the budget I vetoed could have

closed 700 hospitals, not me. And on a per-person basis, it did cut way below the rate of inflation in medical costs.

But the important thing is, what are we going to do now? We need to help people who are between jobs. We need to cover more kids. We need to provide more preventive care. My balanced budget covers mammograms for ladies on—women on Medicare and also gives respite care to the million-plus families who have someone with Alzheimer's. These things are paid for in the balanced budget plan. It will move us forward.

Mr. Lehrer. The next question is for Senator Dole from here.

Yes, sir?

Armed Forces

Q. Senator Dole, my name is Jason Milligan, active-duty military and a small-business owner. And my question is, what is your position on closing the gap between military and civilian pay scales?

Senator Dole. Jason, I appreciate that very much, being a former military man myself.

You know, we have 17,000 men and women today wearing our uniform that receive food stamps. It shouldn't happen in America. We have men and women wearing our uniform in substandard housing. It shouldn't happen in America. And it's time we take a look at the pay scales. You did get a 3 percent increase this year, but that's not enough.

If we're going to ask young men and young women to protect us and defend us around the world, and we've had more deployments under this administration than any time in history—50 times we deployed troops around the world. Every time you do that, you take a risk—somebody you know, maybe your son, maybe your grandson, maybe somebody else. But I think anybody who wears a uniform is a great American. Remember Vietnam, remember when people almost used to walk across the street rather than have contact with somebody who was in Vietnam—that's all behind us now, and it should be behind us—and the forgotten war, the Korean war. But I guess, I can just answer you very plainly, Jason: Thank you for doing what you're doing. America owes you a debt of gratitude.

The President. May I ask you a question? What kind of—which service are you in?

Q. I'm in the United States Navy, sir.

The President. And what kind of small business do you have?

Q. I have an Amway business.

The President. Good for you. Well, let me say—Senator Dole mentioned this. I just signed a bill that we got through Congress to increase the amount of pay increase we could give for military personnel and to make sure the pay increase this year was above the rate of inflation. I also had presented to the Congress, and they adopted, a large package of quality-of-life improvements which are very important. I've spent a lot of time talking to military families, as well as military members, all over the world and in bases all across the United States. And I became convinced, after talking to the families and the personnel in uniform, that we needed to not only have the pay raise but we needed to invest more in child care, housing, and other things to support families, especially when there are longer deployments because of the downsizing of the military.

So we're going to do better, and we'll do better still. But this is a commitment I think that all Americans share, without regard to party.

Mr. Lehrer. Senator Dole?

Senator Dole. Well, Jason, I don't disagree with anything the President said except he waited 4 years to do these things. And my view is it ought to be—it'll be done on day one. We'll start working on it on day one in the Dole-Kemp administration. This is important. Now, we only have 10 divisions now; we used to have 18. We had 25 fighter wings; we're down to 13. We had 536 ships; we're down to 336 ships. I mean, we've cut defense spending too much in the first place. The President told you in '92 he would cut it $67 billion; he cut $112 billion. So we're right on the edge right now. But the last thing we ought to do is make those who wear the uniform sacrifice.

Mr. Lehrer. Next question here for President Clinton.

Yes, ma'am, here on the front row.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. President Clinton, my name is Cecily Kelly.

Yesterday Yasser Arafat said in Palestine that he thinks the key to success in the Middle East is the commitment of Americans. Would you, as President, send American troops to Israel or the West Bank as peacekeepers?

The President. Let me just take 2 seconds of my time, because I'm the Commander in Chief, to respond to one thing that was said. I propose to spend $1.6 trillion on defense between now and the year 2002. And there's less than one percent difference between my budget and the Republican budget on defense.

Now, on the Middle East, as you know, I've worked very hard for peace in the Middle East. The agreement between the Palestinians and the Israelis was signed at the White House. And the agreement, the peace treaty with Jordan, I went to Jordan to sign that, to be there. But—and I think the United States could do whatever we reasonably can.

I can say this: I do not believe Yasser Arafat wants us to send troops to the West Bank. We have never been asked to send troops to the West Bank.

I saw the agreement that Prime Minister Rabin and Yasser Arafat signed on the West Bank. It had 26 separate maps they had to sign, literally thousands of delineations of who would do what on the West Bank. And I believe if the parties will get together and in a good faith manner make that agreement, that they'll be able to do it. If—we cannot impose a peace on the Middle East.

My position has always been that the job of the United States was to minimize the risks of peace. You know, if they ask me to be part of some monitoring force—as we are in the Sinai and have been since 1978 to monitor the peace between Egypt and Israel—frankly, I would have to think about it; I would have to see what they wanted to do. But I don't believe that will be the request. I think what Mr. Arafat wants us to do is to make sure that everybody honors the agreements they've already made. That's why I brought the leaders to Washington a few days ago. I think they will, and I think we'll get there. Don't be too discouraged.

Senator Dole. Well, let me, Jason, come back to you a minute because there is a big difference in the defense budget. We had $7 billion this year, and $10 billion more than the President. He puts his money in the out years—even if he were reelected, you know, he'd be gone before anything happened. And nothing's going to happen, because we don't have modernization now. If we don't build more B–2 bombers in California—and we lost about 500,000 jobs out in California because of this devastation, these big, big cuts. We had to make cuts; we didn't have to make the cuts the President promised he'd make and then he doubled. And so I think we need to go back and take a look. We're increasing defense reasonably, not too much but we are increasing defense some, because we want to be prepared in case somebody here gets called up, Jason.

I would say I didn't hear what Yasser Arafat had to say, but I don't want to—you know, I think foreign policy is something we want to be very careful about. And I'm not here to argue about the President on some ongoing foreign policy matter. What I want the President to do, and I think he may have done it in his last statement, is call for an unconditional end to the violence and have the parties keep on talking as they should talk and have a resolution. The last thing we want to do is commit more forces anywhere.

But let's sort of keep this out of politics, because it's pretty dicey right now.

The President. When the change of government occurred in Israel, the people of Israel were saying, ''We don't want to abandon the peace process. We want more security.'' Then, a lot of mutual distrust developed. A lot of things happened which maybe shouldn't have happened.

When I asked Yasser Arafat and Prime Minister Netanyahu to come to Washington and got them together and they talked alone for 3 hours, I was convinced that they had to have a chance to make that peace. Again, I'd say if they ask us to play some reasonable role, I don't know how I would respond. It would depend entirely on what they ask us to do. But the real secret there is for them to abide by the agreements they've made and

find a way to trust each other. And they're going to have to spend some time and trust each other.

Prime Minister Rabin gave his life believing that that trust could be materialized, and I still think it can be.

Mr. Lehrer. All right, next question from this section, and it is for Senator Dole. Back in the back. Yes, sir, right there. Yes, sir.

Tobacco

Q. Senator Dole, Oscar Delgado.

Senator Dole. Oscar.

Q. Ex-smoker for 30 years. About 30 years ago I was a pack-plus-a-day man, okay? You mentioned in a statement, you said some time ago that you didn't think nicotine was addictive. Would you care to—you still hold to that statement, or do you wish to recant or explain yourself?

Senator Dole. Oh, that—that's very easy. My record going back to 1965 in the Congress, the first vote we had was whether or not you should put a little notice on cigarettes that they may be dangerous—I voted—I voted for everything since that time.

In fact, in 1992 we had a bill come before us that all the States had to comply or they're going to lose certain money. We sent it to the Clinton administration for implementation. They waited 3½ years. And during that period about 3,000 young kids every day started smoking. If you add it up, that's about 3 million—not until again 1996.

I don't want anybody to smoke. My brother probably died partly because of cigarettes. I was asked a technical question: Are they addictive? Maybe they—they probably are addictive. I don't know; I'm not a doctor. You shouldn't smoke. You ought to be glad you quit, Oscar—30 years?

Q. Yes.

Senator Dole. And it seems to me that what we need to do is to talk about not only tobacco but drugs, because drug use in 12- and 17-year-olds has doubled in this administration, the last 44 months. Marijuana use is up 141 percent; cocaine use, up 160 percent. They're your kids. It's all happened in this administration because they cut funding and they cut interdiction.

When I'm President of the United States, we're going to use the National Guard and whatever resources we need to stop some of the drugs coming into America. If you stop the drugs, nobody is going to use the drugs. So don't smoke, don't drink, don't use drugs. Just don't do it.

The President. Oscar, the question of what the Federal Government should do to limit the access of tobacco to young people is one of the biggest differences between Senator Dole and me.

We did propose a regulation 6 months after I became President under the law he mentioned. It simply says all these States—it made it illegal for kids to smoke—now they have to try harder if they want to keep getting Federal funds. Then we took comments, as we always do, and there were tens of thousands of comments about how we ought to do it. That's what drug it out.

Meanwhile, we started, also in '93, to look into whether cigarettes were addictive enough for the Federal Food and Drug Administration to ban the ability of cigarette companies to advertise, market, and distribute tobacco products to our kids. No President had ever taken on the tobacco lobby before. I did. Senator Dole opposed me. He went down and made a speech to people who were on his side, saying that I did the wrong thing. I think I did the right thing.

On drugs, I have repeatedly said drugs are wrong and illegal and can kill you. We have strengthened enforcement, and everybody in San Diego knows we've strengthened control of the border. We've done a lot more; I hope we get a chance to talk about it.

Senator Dole. Well, they also know, if they live in San Diego, Mr. President, if you're caught with 125 pounds of marijuana or less, you go back to Mexico; you're not prosecuted. You have a U.S. Attorney here that sends them back home. So I think that's pretty important. That's a lot of marijuana. That's a big supply.

But don't—you know, don't get into this smokescreen here, Oscar. The President, in the election year, decided, "Well, I ought to do something. I haven't done anything on drugs. I've been AWOL for 44 months. So let's take on smoking."

But see, they haven't even done it. They haven't said what's going to happen, whether they're going to have it declared addictive,

it's going to apply just to—once it's a drug, does it apply only to teenagers or to everybody in America?

Nobody should smoke, young or old. But particularly, young people should not smoke. And my record is there. It's been there. I've voted 8, 10 times since 1965.

Mr. Lehrer. The next question is for President Clinton, and it comes from right here. Yes, sir?

Social Security and Medicare

Q. President Clinton, my name is Jack Fleck. I'm a retired Air Force pilot. Sir, it's officially forecast that our annual Medicare and Social Security deficits are measured in the trillions of dollars next century. Depending upon who you listen to, Social Security will be bankrupt in either 2025 or 2030. I feel this is grossly unfair, especially to our younger generations, who are losing faith in the system.

My question is this: Assuming you agree that our entitlement programs are on an unsustainable course, what specific reforms do you propose?

The President. First of all, they're two different things. Social Security and Medicare are entirely different in terms of the financial stabilities. Let's talk about them separately.

Social Security is stable until, as you pointed out, at least the third decade of the next century. But we'd like to have a Social Security fund that has about 70 years of life instead of about 30 years of life.

What we have to do is simply to make some adjustments that take account of the fact that the Baby Boomers, people like me, are bigger in number than the people that went just before us and the people that come just after us. And I think what we'll plainly do is what we did in 1983, when Senator Dole served—and this is something I think he did a good job on—when he served on the Social Security Commission and they made some modest changes in Social Security to make sure that it would be alive and well into the 21st century. And we will do that. It's obvious that there are certain things that have to be done, and there are 50 to 60 different options. And a bipartisan commission, to take it out of politics, will make recommendations and build support for the people.

Medicare is different. Medicare needs help now. I have proposed a budget which would put 10 years on the life of the Medicare Trust Fund; that's more than it's had a lot of the time for the last 20 years.

It would save a lot of money through more managed care but giving more options, more preventive care, and lowering the inflation rate in the prices we're paying providers without having the kind of big premium increases and out-of-pocket costs that the budget I vetoed would provide. Then that will give us 10 years to do with Medicare what we're going to do with Social Security: have a bipartisan group look at what we have to do to save it when the Baby Boomers retire. But now we ought to pass this budget now and put 10 years on it right away so no one has to worry about it.

Senator Dole. Well, again, you know, if you're somebody thinking about the future, I think it's fair to say that it'll be—we'll work it out. I mean, this is a political year, and the President's playing politics with Medicare. But after this year's over we'll resolve it just as we did with Social Security in 1983. It was a nonpartisan commission. Ronald Reagan got together with Tip O'Neill and Howard Baker—two Republicans and one Democrat—and they formed a commission. I was on that commission. We resolved—we rescued Social Security. We suggested—I think it's been over a year ago now—we do the same with Medicare, and the White House called it a gimmick. Now last week, I guess it was, Donna Shalala said, "Well, we'll cut Medicare a hundred billion, and we'll appoint a commission."

It will probably have to be done by a commission. Take it out of politics. I think if I were a senior citizen I'd be a little fed up with all these ads scaring seniors, scaring veterans, and scaring students about education. But when you don't have any ideas, when you don't have any agenda, and all you have is fear, that's all you can use. We have ideas in the Dole-Kemp campaign, and we'll rescue Medicare as we did Social Security.

The President. Their idea was to have the poorest seniors in the country pay $270 more a year this year. Their idea was to budget—

that the American Hospital Association said could close 700 hospitals. Their idea was to charge everybody more out-of-pocket costs in their budget that I vetoed—not in an election year, sir, I told them in early '95.

Senator Dole said 30 years ago he was one of 12 people that voted against Medicare and he was proud of it. A year ago he said, "I was right then; I knew it wouldn't work." American seniors have the highest life expectancy in the world. We need to reform it, not wreck it.

Mr. Lehrer. Next question from here, and it's for Senator Dole. Yes, ma'am, right here.

Q. Me?

Mr. Lehrer. Yes.

Welfare Reform

Q. Senator Dole, my name is Suzanne Gonzalez, and I would like to know what you are—what would be your first step in reforming welfare.

Senator Dole. Well, we've taken the first step. We took it three steps. Twice we sent welfare reform to the President, and he vetoed it. On the third time we sent welfare reform to the President, he signed it but announced he would change it next year. And the Vice President said they were going to do something else through the line-item veto, which I've never understood, but that's sort of inside baseball.

What we need to do is make certain we try to return people to work. And I'm standing here as someone who a long time ago, as the county attorney in Russell, Kansas, one of our jobs every month was to go through all the welfare checks and sign them. And three of those checks were my grandparents'. So I know what it's like to have to look welfare head-on.

Obviously some people are going to need help. This is the United States of America. You're not going to go without food, and you're not going to go without medical care. This is America. But at the same time, if you want to get off Medicare, get back in the mainstream, we're going to provide jobs. We're going to say you have a 5-year limit that you can be on welfare. You've got 2 years to look for a job. We provided more money for day care in the bill that passed the Senate and was vetoed. Then it came back, and the President signed pretty much the same bill.

But this is an important issue. I don't think we ought to be giving welfare payments to illegal immigrants. I mean, it puts a heavy burden on a State like—except for emergencies. It puts a heavy burden on States like California. It costs California taxpayers $3 billion a year.

Mr. Lehrer. President Clinton?

Senator Dole. I'll get out of your way here.

The President. It's illegal right now and has been for years for illegal immigrants to get welfare benefits.

Let me say that this is one of the most important issues in the world to me. I started working on welfare reform in 1980 because I was sick of seeing people trapped in a system that was increasingly physically isolating them and making their kids more vulnerable to get in trouble. So I've been working on it when I was a Governor for a long time.

When I became President, I used the authority I had in this law to get out from under certain Federal rules to help States move people to work. We've reduced the welfare rolls by 2 million already. Now I've got a plan with this new welfare reform law to work with the private sector to give employers specific tax incentives to hire people off welfare and to do some other things which will create more jobs in the private sector, at least a million, to move more people from welfare to work. It's very important. And I hope we get a chance to talk about this more. There is not a more important issue.

I still remember a woman that I met 10 years ago who said she wanted to get off welfare so her kids could tell—give an answer when they say, "What does your mother do for a job?" I met that woman again. She's got four kids. One's got a good job; one's studying to be a doctor; one's in technical school; one's an honor student in high school. I want to make more people like that woman, Lillie Harden. So I've got a plan to do it. And it's just beginning.

Senator Dole. Well, another thing we can do—we talk about growth—we've got a great economic package which I hope we'll discuss later: across the board tax cut; child credits, $500 per child under 18; reduce the capital

gains rate; create more jobs and opportunities for people on and off welfare.

And we have other provisions: less litigation. The trial lawyers—big supporters of the President—the trial lawyers, of course they like lawsuits, so every time they have a bill that they want vetoed, the President vetoes it for them.

We've got to understand in America that we've got to have growth, create more jobs and more opportunities in the private sector. The President takes credit for all of these people off welfare—the Governors did that. Federal Government doesn't do that. And the Government doesn't create jobs, they're created in the private sector.

Mr. Lehrer. This section, question? Yes, ma'am, on the back row. This is for the President.

Capital Gains Tax

Q. Mr. President, my name is Pamela Johnson, and I'm a landlord. My question is, does your party have any future plans to reduce the capital gains tax, especially for retired Americans?

The President. First of all, we have a big plan to reduce the capital gains tax when people sell their homes. Part of my tax package, which is paid for in my balanced budget plan, would exempt up to half a million dollars in gains for people when they sell their home, which I think is the biggest capital gains benefit we could give to most ordinary Americans.

We also have a capital gains now for people that invest in new small businesses and hold the investment for 5 years. It was part of our other economic plan. And these are things I think that will go a long way toward helping America build a stronger economy and a better tax system.

I think the most important thing to emphasize, though, is that we also have to help people in other ways to build a stronger economy. And we can't have any tax cut that's not paid for. One of the big differences between Senator Dole and myself is that I told you how I'm going to pay for every penny of the tax cuts I recommend. We've worked hard to bring this deficit down, and that's helped people in the real estate business, because the interest rates are lower. We've got home ownership at a 15-year high. We've got this country going in the right direction.

So we can have a tax cut, but my priority would be to help the families who need it with childrearing and education and buying a first-time home and helping for health care costs. So from your business, helping in buying the first-time home, exempting the capital gains on the sale of the home would be the most important things that you asked about. Thank you, Pamela.

Mr. Lehrer. Senator Dole.

Senator Dole. Well, Pamela, what the President didn't tell you is that all his tax cuts expire at the year 2000, but all his increases go on forever. That's the liberal approach. You know, give you a little tax cut, give you a couple of years, then make the tax increases go on forever. So the net tax increase in his plan is somewhere between $60 billion and $80 billion.

We have in the Dole-Kemp economic plan, unless your home is worth over $500,000—and if it is, I appreciate it, congratulate you—but in any event, no tax. And it's a good idea. They saw it, and they picked it up and put in theirs, but it's only temporary. Ours is permanent.

Ours is a good plan: create jobs and opportunities; capital gains rate, cut it in half, cut it from 28 percent to 14 percent. There are $7 trillion in assets locked up in America. If we cut the capital gains rate—I'm told every day, I got a letter from a former constituent in Kansas saying, "I want to sell property in California, put it in my business in Kansas. I can't because the capital gains rate is too high."

We need to get the economy going. That will help Social Security. That will create more jobs. That will help people who want to get off welfare. It's the American way.

The President. Before Senator Dole left the Senate, he and Mr. Gingrich also were recommending that we pass these tax cuts only insofar as we could pay for them. And we all assume that the tax cuts will be permanent, but we have to prove we can pay for them.

After he left the Senate, we abandoned that. That's why most experts say that this tax scheme will blow a huge hole in the deficit, raise interest rates, and weaken the econ-

omy. And that will take away all the benefits of the tax cut with a weaker economy. That's why we have to balance the budget. And I'll tell you how I'm going to pay for anything I promise you line-by-line. You should expect that from both of us.

Mr. Lehrer. All right. The next question is for Senator Dole. Yes, ma'am, right there.

Responding to American Youth

Q. My name is Melissa Lydeana, and I'm a third-year student out at UC-San Diego. And I just want to say that it's a great honor representing the voices of America. My question is concerning you, Mr. Dole, all the controversy regarding your age. How do you feel you can respond to young voices of America today and tomorrow?

Senator Dole. Well, I think age is very—you know, wisdom comes from age, experience, and intelligence. And if you have some of each—and I have some age, some experience, some intelligence—[*laughter*]—that adds up to wisdom.

I think it also is a strength; it's an advantage. And I have a lot of young people work in my office, work in my campaign. This is about America. This is about—somebody said earlier, one of the first questions, we're together. It's one America, one nation.

I'm looking at our economic plan because I'm concerned about the future for young people. I'm looking about drugs. The President's been AWOL for 4 years. I'm looking about crime. He'll claim credit now for crime going down, but it happened because mayors and Governors and others have brought crime down. Rudy Giuliani, the mayor of New York, brought crime down 25 percent just in New York City, but of course the President will take credit for that.

My view is we want to find jobs and opportunities and education. This year the Republican Congress, as far as student loans, went from 24 billion to 36 billion over the next 6 years—a 50 percent increase; the highest appropriation ever, $6 billion for Pell grants. Very, very important. And we also raised the amount of each Pell grant.

In our economic plan, the $500 child credit can be used for young people. Rolled over and over and over—of course, not this age, but if you have a child 2 years old, 7 percent interest, it would be worth about $18,000 by the time that child was ready for college.

The President. I can only tell you that I don't think Senator Dole is too old to be President. It's the age of his ideas that I question.

You're almost not old enough to remember this, but we've tried this before, promising people an election-year tax cut that's not paid for——

Senator Dole. We tried it last time you ran.

The President. ——telling you you can have everything you got—and let me just say this. Did you hear him say the Congress just voted to increase student loans and scholarships? They did, after he left. The last budget he led cut Pell grants, cut student loans. I vetoed it when they shut the Government down.

My plan would give students a dollar-for-dollar reduction for the cost of the typical community college tuition, a $10,000 deduction a year for the cost of college tuition, would let families save in an IRA and withdraw tax-free to pay for the cost of education. And it's all paid for.

My whole administration is about your future, it's about what the 21st century is going to be like for you. And I hope you'll look at the ideas in it.

Thank you.

Senator Dole. Well, when you don't have any ideas, I guess you say the other person's ideas are old. As I said earlier, they don't have any ideas. Their idea is to raise taxes and spend more money. That's the liberal philosophy. If that's what you like, you've got a perfect candidate.

President Clinton came to California in 1992 and said, "The centerpiece in my first 4 years is going to be a middle class tax cut." Now, to all you who got that tax cut, congratulations, because you got a big tax increase. You got a $265 billion tax increase. And he stands here and says politicians who make promises like that ought to be ignored. Well, he made the promise.

I keep my word, and you'll have a tax cut. It will help you in whatever you're going to do in the next few years. Thank you.

Mr. Lehrer. Next question is for President Clinton, and it's from—yes, ma'am? Yes?

Affirmative Action

Q. Hello. My name is Chessie Sanders, and my question is do you feel that America has grown enough and has educated itself enough to totally cut out affirmative action?

The President. No, ma'am, I don't. I am against quotas; I'm against giving anybody any kind of preference for something they're not qualified for, but because I still believe that there is some discrimination and that not everybody has an opportunity to prove they are qualified, I favor the right kind of affirmative action.

I've done more to eliminate programs—affirmative action programs that I didn't think were fair and to tighten others up than my predecessors have since affirmative action has been around, but I have also worked hard to give people a chance to prove that they are qualified.

Let me just give you some examples. We've doubled the number of loans from the Small Business Administration, tripled the number of loans to women business people, no one unqualified. Everybody had to meet the standards. We've opened 260,000 new jobs in the military to women since I've been President, but the Joint Chiefs say we're stronger and more competent and solid than ever.

Let me give you another example of what I mean. To me, affirmative action is making that extra effort. It's sort of like what Senator Dole did when he sponsored the Americans with Disabilities Act that said to certain stores, ''Okay, you've got to make it accessible to people with wheelchairs.'' We weren't guaranteeing anything—anybody anything except the chance to prove they were qualified, the chance to prove that they could do it.

And that's why I must say I agree with General Colin Powell that we're not there yet. We ought to keep making those extra-effort affirmative action programs the law and the policy of the land.

Mr. Lehrer. Senator Dole.

Senator Dole. Well, we may not be there yet, but we're not going to get there by giving preferences and quotas. I supported that route for some time, and again, I think it gets back to experience—a little experience, a little age, a little intelligence. And I noticed that nobody was really benefiting except a very small group at the top. The average person wasn't benefiting. People who had the money were benefiting. People who got all the jobs were benefiting.

It seems to me that we ought to support the California civil rights initiative. It ought to be not based on gender or ethnicity or color or disability. I'm disabled. I shouldn't have a preference. I would like to have one in this race, come to think of it. But I don't get one. Maybe we can work that out. I get a 10-point spot. [*Laughter*]

This is America. No discrimination. Discrimination ought to be punished, but there ought to be equal opportunity. We ought to reach out and make certain everybody has a chance to participate. Equal opportunity, but we cannot guarantee equal results in America. That's not how America became the greatest country on the face of the Earth.

The President. I have never supported quotas. I've always been against them. They don't favor equal results. But I do favor making sure everybody has a chance to prove they're competent. The reason I have opposed that initiative is because I'm afraid it will end those extra-effort programs.

Again I say think of the American with Disabilities Act. Make an effort to put a ramp up there so someone in a wheelchair can get up. You don't guarantee that they get the job; you guarantee they have a chance to prove they're competent.

And as I've said, this is not a partisan thing with me. General Powell, Colin Powell said the same thing. He fears that the initiative would take away the extra-effort programs. No preferences to unqualified people, no quotas, but don't give up on making an extra effort till you're sure everybody has a chance to prove they're qualified.

Mr. Lehrer. All right, the next question is for Senator Dole, and it comes from this section right here. The back row, there, in the blue shirt. Yes, sir.

Senator Dole's Tax Cut Proposal

Q. My name's Tim David. I'm a mechanical engineer. Senator Dole, how do you reduce taxes and balance the budget?

Senator Dole. Oh, I'm glad you asked.

The President. So am I. I am too.

Senator Dole. What's your first name? Tim?

I first want to say the President didn't quite give you all the stuff on quotas, because the Justice Department entered what we call the Piscataway case up in New Jersey. It's pretty clear that was a quota case. And just because one teacher was white and one teacher was black and they had the same qualification, you know, they decided who would stay there. It shouldn't be that way.

Now, the President can say, well, he wants to mend it, not end it. There are 168 Federal programs that allow quotas. He ended one.

Now this economic package, Tim, I'm glad you asked because you look like the type that might be able to benefit from the 15 percent, across-the-board tax cut and $500-per-child tax credit for, you know, State tax relief, which you're not interested in right now, but capital gains rate reduction—if you're taking care of an elderly parent, you get a $1,000 deduction. We think that's very important because a lot of people take care of their parents.

How do we pay for it? We're going to have a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, which the President opposed and defeated. He twisted arms, got six Democrats to vote with him. We lost by one vote. We're going to balance the budget by the year 2002.

The President wants to spend 20 percent more over the next 6 years; I want to spend 14 percent more and give that 6 percent back to the people. Remember, it's your money. It's not his money, and it's not my money. It's your money, and you shouldn't have to apologize for wanting to keep all you can of it, but he ought to apologize for wanting to take more and more. He wants to give you sort of a Government tax cut which really doesn't mean anything.

The President. You know, one of the responsibilities of growing older, it seems to me, is being able to tell people something they may not want to hear just because it's truth. When they had a $250 billion tax scheme—that is half the size of this one, this one is 550—they passed a budget that had $270 billion in Medicare cuts, the first education cuts in history, cut environmental enforcement by 25 percent, took away the guarantee of quality standards in nursing homes, took away the guarantee of health care to folks with disabilities.

Don't take my word for this. The Economist magazine polled lots of economists. Seven Nobel Prize winners have said, if this tax scheme passes, it will require huge cuts—40 percent—in the environment, in law enforcement, in education. It will require bigger cuts in Medicare than I vetoed last time. My targeted tax cut gives tax cuts for education, childrearing, buying a first-time home, paying for health care costs, and it's paid for. And I've told you how I'll pay for it. He won't tell you because he can't.

Senator Dole. Your targeted tax cut, Mr. President, never hits anybody. That's the problem with it. Nobody ever gets it.

But I must say I'm a little offended by this word "scheme." You talked about—last time you talked about a risky scheme, and then Vice President Gore repeated it about 10 times in St. Petersburg. If I have anything in politics, it's my word. My colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, will tell you that Bob Dole kept his word. I'm going to keep my word to you. I'm going to keep my word to the American people.

We're going to cut taxes and balance the budget. We're not going to touch Medicare. It's going to grow 39 percent, and Social Security is going to grow 34 percent.

Now, the President doesn't have any ideas so he's out trashing ours. This isn't going to blow a hole in the deficit. He promised you a tax cut in 1992, and if you got one, you ought to vote for him.

Mr. Lehrer. Sir.

The next question is for the President.

Yes, sir, right there—white shirt.

Family and Medical Leave Act

Q. My name is Dwayne Burns. I'm a martial arts instructor and a father. Mr. President, could you outline any plans you have to expand the family leave act?

The President. Thank you.

Well, first let me say that I signed the family leave act. It was my very first bill, and I'm very proud of it because it symbolizes what I think we ought to be doing.

I don't take credit for all the good things that have happened in America, but I take

credit for what I've tried to do to work with others to make good things happen.

The most important good things that happen in America happen in families. Just about every family I know, the main concern is how am I going to succeed at work and still do right by my children? Family and medical leave has let 12 million families take a little time off for the birth of a child or a family illness without losing their job. I'd like to see it expanded in two ways: I'd like to say you can also take a little time off without losing your job to go to a regular parent-teacher conference or to go to a regular doctor's appointment with a family member; I'd also like to see the overtime laws change so that we could have some more flextime so that at the discretion of the worker—the worker—if you earn overtime you could decide whether you want that time to be taken in cash or in time with your family if you've got a family problem.

I never go anywhere, it seems like, where I don't meet somebody who's benefited from the family leave law. In Longview, Texas, the other day, I met a woman who was almost in tears because she had been able to keep her job while spending time with her husband who had cancer. One of the people who's here with me today met a woman in the airport saying that her son just was able to be present at the birth of his child because of the family leave law.

So yes, I think it should be expanded. We have to help people succeed at home and at work.

Senator Dole. Well, 88 percent of the people the President claims, or 11 million, are already covered. And only 5 percent—keep in mind, only 5 percent of the employers were even affected by the family leave act.

We had a better idea. We didn't win, but we had a better idea. Now we have a majority; we need to get a President. That was a tax credit to the employer. Instead of the Federal Government reaching out, we had a tax credit to pick up some of the cost, because if you have to hire a replacement worker, that's a cost. This is the way it ought to work. Give more power back to the States and back to the people, back to the taxpayers, not always the long arm of the Federal Government.

But keep in mind this bill covers 5 percent of the employers; 95 percent of the employers and all those employees they employ are not covered in this act. And according to Investors Daily, which I read just a couple of days ago, 88 percent of the people he claims credit for were already covered in collective bargaining agreements or other agreements.

We had family leave in our office. I'm certain—I see my friend Senator Mitchell. He had family leave. I work every day with people. I spent a lot of time in hospitals. I know what it's like to be in a hospital. Sure, we want family leave, but there's a better way to do it.

The President. I only have 30 seconds. I can't fix the statistics. It covers the majority of the work force. Employers of under 50 are exempted. The bill originally covered employers of 25 and more, but because of opposition, we went up to 50. Senator Dole led the opposition to it. He filibustered it. He said it was a mistake. He said it would hurt the economy. We've had record numbers of new small businesses and 10½ million jobs. It didn't hurt the economy. He still believes it's a mistake. I believe it was right. You can decide which of us you think are right. It's up to you.

Mr. Lehrer. Next question for Senator Dole.

This side. Yes, ma'am.

Domestic Manufacturing

Q. Hi. My name is Bridget Gianotti, and I'm a wife and mother of two sons from Carlsbad. And my question for you, Senator Dole, is as the wife of a San Diego business owner, I see one of our biggest problems is the U.S. does not manufacture enough of our own products. How would you help this problem out?

Senator Dole. Well, right, we've lost 357,000 manufacturing jobs. And the Bureau of Labor Statistics said today that they made a mistake, it's probably going to be a much, much higher figure. So we're talking about all these new jobs, we'd better wait and see what the results are.

We're going to do that with a more aggressive trade policy. We're going to do that with

an economic package. We're going to do that with regulatory reform. You know, regulations cost the average family—right here, Democrat or Republican, about $7,000 a year—7,000—it's like a tax. Put a lot of people out of business.

I met a lady in Colorado Springs about 7 weeks ago, now. She had a small business with 63 employees. She finally gave it up. Why? Because of paperwork and regulation. Congress passed the Paperwork Reduction Act. The President exempts the IRS, which creates three-fourths of the paperwork.

We're going to have regulatory—we're going to have litigation reform.

You know, I fell off a platform out in California, in Chico, a while back. Before I hit the ground, my cell phone rang, and this trial lawyer says, ''I think we've got a case here.'' [*Laughter*] You know, we've got to stop some of these frivolous lawsuits. They're putting people out of business, men and women. Get the economy going, cut the capital gains rate, create more jobs and opportunities for everybody in America—that's what we will do, and my word is good. I keep my promises. I don't break my promises after the election, and I don't make new promises on an election year.

We're going to get it done; we're going to grow some of these jobs in America because we need to get it. They're going the wrong way.

The President. Let's look at the facts. We lost a lot of manufacturing jobs in the 12 years before I became President. We've gained manufacturing jobs since I've been President. We've negotiated over 200 separate trade agreements.

Let's just take California. In California, we made $37 billion worth of telecommunications equipment eligible for exports for the first time. We're selling everything from telephones to CD's to rice in Japan. We're selling American automobiles in Japan now. I visited a Chrysler dealership in Japan. We're number one in automobile manufacturing, production, and sales around the world again for the first time since the 1970's. Why? Because we've had tough, aggressive trade policies, and because we got interest rates down, and we had a good, stable economic policy, because we've reduced the deficit 4 years in a row for the first time in the 20th century that a President's done that in all 4 years.

And that's why I don't want to see us blow a big hole in the deficit with a tax program we can't pay for so your interest rates will go up and you'll have to pay back in higher interest rates what you allegedly will get in a tax cut.

So I say keep working on expanding the markets. More than half of these 10½ million new jobs were in higher wage areas, and we'll have more manufacturing and more sales at home and around the world.

Senator Dole. Well, you may think the biggest employer in America is General Motors, but I've got news for you. It's Manpower Services, hiring people temporarily who've lost their jobs and they go to work for 30 days or 60 days. That's a good economy? I don't think so. They're setting new records this year.

We have the worst economy in a century. We have the slowest growth, about 2.5 percent. The President inherited a growth of over 5 percent. We don't have the S&L crisis anymore. Republicans have cut $53 billion in spending. That's why the budget can look good. It didn't look too good the first 2 years when we had a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress.

Mr. Lehrer. The next question is for President Clinton. Yes, sir?

Gay Rights

Q. I'm Bob Goldfarb. I'm a travel agent. And can you please explain your policy on the Employment Non-Discrimination Act that would have prohibited discrimination, would have prohibited people from being fired from their jobs simply for being gay or lesbian?

The President. I'm for it. That's my policy. I'm for it. I believe that any law-abiding taxpaying citizen who shows up in the morning and doesn't break the law and doesn't interfere with his or her neighbors ought to have the ability to work in our country and shouldn't be subject to unfair discrimination. I'm for it.

Now, I have a little time left, so let me just say that I get attacked so many times on these questions it's hard to answer all those things. In February—Senator Dole just

said we had the worst economy in a century. In February he said we had the best economy in 30 years—just February. And I don't want to respond in kind to all these things. I could; I could answer a lot of these things tit for tat. But I hope we can talk about what we're going to do in the future. No attack ever created a job or educated a child or helped a family make ends meet. No insult ever cleaned up a toxic waste dump or helped an elderly person. Now, for 4 years that's what I've worked on. If you'll give me 4 years more, I'll work on it some more.

And I'll try to answer these charges, but I prefer to emphasize direct answers to the future, and I gave you a direct answer.

Mr. Lehrer. Senator Dole?

Senator Dole. Well, I'm opposed to discrimination in any form, but I'm—but I don't favor creating special rights for any group. That would be my answer to this question. And I'm—you know, there'd be special rights for different groups in America, but I'm totally opposed to discrimination, don't have any policy against hiring anyone—whether it's lifestyle or whatever, we don't have any policy of that kind, never have had in my office, nor will we have in the future.

But as far as special rights, I'm opposed to same-sex marriages, which the President signed well after midnight one morning, in the dark of night—he opposed it.

But I'll get back to the economic package because I—again, I think this is very important. If there is anything that's going to change America, it's get the economy to grow. The President inherited a good economy—sure. The S&L crisis ended, we were selling assets, we had a Republican Congress cutting spending finally, and he says we've had the best 4 years ever. That's not true. We had over 1.2 million bankruptcies—set a new record. Credit card debt has never been higher. I just told you about this manufacturing job loss which is going to increase.

We need a good, strong economic package. Let the private sector create the jobs. And they can do it.

Mr. Lehrer. Mr. President?

The President. If you believe that the California economy was better in 1992 than it is today, you should vote for Bob Dole. I have worked so hard out here to help turn this economy around.

Let me just give you one tiny example. In San Diego, where we had some defense cutbacks, we funded a project with the University of California, San Diego to use airplane composite materials to build lighter, stronger bridges—a little project, and a program that Senator Dole opposed—and that composite now is going to be built around the bridges on the Santa Monica freeway to help minimize the impact of earthquakes and create more jobs. That's just one tiny example. Maybe we'll talk about some more before it's over.

Mr. Lehrer. The next question is for Senator Dole and it's from this section.

Yes, ma'am? Yes?

Health Care

Q. Senator Dole, I am Verda Stratigus and I work in health care. And it's truly an honor to be here tonight to address both of you.

Senator Dole. Thank you.

Q. Being in health care, we have talked a little bit about health care tonight, but mainly MediCal and Medicare have been mentioned, but the private sector is a problem. Managed care is taking over, especially in California, and because of that, the quality of care is going downhill. There are many, many people who cannot get the tests that they need when they need them. And because of that, they are dying needlessly. There are many, many more lawsuits being presented against the managed care industry because of this. And I think it's a real problem that needs to be addressed. What would you do if you were President?

Senator Dole. Well, one thing I did was to oppose the Government takeover of health care that President Clinton offered in 1993, which created 17 new taxes and 50 new bureaucracies and price controls, because we were afraid the very thing you mentioned would have happened. Everybody would have been forced into managed care. You couldn't have chosen your own doctor. And that would have been the end.

And I think right now we've got to go back—I know they've appointed a commission to take a look at managed care. Maybe that's part of the answer. But it seems to me,

if we start to take choices away from people and if we drive them into one type care, if we eliminate fee-for-service altogether or eliminate the fact you can go to your own doctor, you've got to go somewhere else, then I think we've taken a giant step backward in the United States of America.

We have the best health care delivery system in the world, and we want to keep it that way. That's why we opposed the Government takeover health care plan that President Clinton tried and tried and tried to get through Congress.

Didn't get it done. When it ended up we had more votes than he had, then they decided to pull the plug. It was a big, big mistake. Now, whether or not he'll do that again, I've heard some of the people say, ''Well, that's the model we ought to use.'' And if he's reelected, maybe he'll come back and try it again. I hope not. I hope not in both cases. But it does seem to me that you've raised a very important point that needs to be addressed. We're going to have watch it, going to have to take a look at all the managed care going on in California, or we're going to end up losing our best care that we have in the world.

The President. I'm just curious. How many of you are under managed care plans? Raise your hand if you're in managed care.

Senator Dole. Probably the young people here.

The President. How many of you like it? Well——

Senator Dole. Two.

The President. ——one of the things that I tried to do was to make sure that everybody in the country who was under a managed care plan should at least have three choices of plans and would have the right to get out without penalty every year. Now that's not a Government takeover, that's like the family and medical leave law. It just tries to set the rules of the game.

I'm strongly in favor of a Federal bill to repeal the—any gag rules on providers. In other words, I believe that doctors should not be able to be kicked out of managed care plans just because they tell the patients what they need and what more expensive care options might be.

If we're saving money and managing resources better, that's a good thing. If we're saving money and depriving people of care, that's a bad thing. A good place to start is to say no managed care provider can gag a doctor and kick the doctor out of the managed care plan for the doctor telling the patient, ''You need a more expensive test, you need a more expensive procedure. Your health requires it.''

Mr. Lehrer. Senator Dole?

Senator Dole. Well, I don't have any quarrel with that. I think that would help. But I think what we want to avoid is falling back into this nationalized health care system that President Clinton wanted to give us in 1993. If that isn't a liberal idea, I've never heard one: 17 new taxes; price controls; 50 new bureaucracies. We'd have that trouble all over America.

We need to deal with managed care. It not only happened in California, it's happening in other States that we visit too. It's a national problem, not just a State problem.

Mr. Lehrer. The next question is for President Clinton, and in this section. Yes, ma'am. Yes.

Participation in Electoral Process

Q. All right, I'd sort of like to—Coleen O'Connor. I teach history and political science at San Diego Mesa College right up the road here. And I'd like to tee off from the original question by another teacher and speak for those people that aren't here tonight. Sixty-three percent of the American people are not participating, that are eligible to vote, not even participating in the process. Several parties can't even get into the debate: the Green Party, the Reform Party, the Natural Law Party. All of these people have basically opted out of what we're still participating in.

And if we in fact are going to bring the country back together and be all faces around the table, the new American family, what do you see as something the President can do to begin that process to bring them back in?

The President. First of all, I think it's important to make voting more accessible. That's why I strongly supported the motor voter law. There was a big story, I think, in

USA Today about the millions of people who've now registered because of it.

Secondly, I think we need to look at making the elections more accessible. You know, several States now are letting people vote over 3 weeks. A lot of people are busy, and it's hard for them to just get there and vote.

The third thing I think we need is more forums like this, which is one of the reasons I have so strongly supported campaign finance reform, because if you want to cut the cost of campaigns, you have to open the airwaves, because what drives the cost of a campaign are the costs of advertising on television, radio, newspaper, mass mailing. And if you open the airwaves to more things like this—you see, it's not just you that are participating here. For every one of you who stood up here and asked a question tonight, I promise you, there's 100,000 Americans that said, ''I wish I could have asked that question.''

So I think we have to change the nature of politics. The last thing I think we should do is something I've been trying to do since I've been President, is every time I do something in a public way, I try to have a real American citizen there who is directly affected by it so that people can see the connection of what happens way across the country in Washington with more police on the street in San Diego, clean up the sewage here in San Diego, doubling the border guards here in southern California, that there is a connection between what we do way back there and what we do here.

Those are my best ideas about it.

Senator Dole. Well, I don't know of any perfect solution. I've been in politics for some time, and I worry about people who don't vote. And I wonder if it's our fault, the candidates' fault. People say ''I don't care. One vote doesn't make a difference.'' I can give you hundreds of cases—you can probably give me 200 cases where one vote made a difference. I know it made a lot of difference many times in the Congress. Campaign finance might help, might help contributions coming in from Indonesia or other foreign countries, rich people in those countries, and then being sent back after the L.A. Times discovers it—$250,000.

But maybe there ought to be more debates. I'd be willing to have another debate this year where we'd invite all of the candidates and talk about the economy. If we don't get the economy to grow, if we don't cut taxes, and give people child credits, and cut the capital gains rate, and get this economy growing, we're going to limp into the next century. If we grow the economy, it's going to help Social Security, it's going to help jobs, it's going to help everything.

The President. Let me make one other suggestion. As you're a teacher, you can have an impact on that.

One of the things I think that really frustrates people is that so often, political campaign seem to be more about the politicians that are running than the people. Now, there is a connection, and I think what we have to do is convince people there's a big difference. If you vote one way, you will have a Department of Education in the 21st century; if you vote the other way, you won't. If you vote one way, you'll have an expansion of family leave; if you vote the other way, you'll be lucky to save it.

But these are important questions, and people have to decide. I think that the American people also need to be a little more responsible and think about whether there's a connection in their lives and what we do in Washington.

Mr. Lehrer. For Senator Dole, in this section. On the back row, yes, ma'am.

Social Security and Alternatives

Q. I'm Iris Seiffert, and I'm unemployed.

Senator Dole. Iris?

Q. Iris. Senator Dole, we talked about Social Security for us Baby Boomers, but shouldn't we be saving and investing for our own retirement as well? Are you planning any incentives to encourage us to take care of ourselves rather than to rely on the Government and on Social Security when we retire?

Senator Dole. Well, we have in our economic pack, individual retirement accounts where we think it'll encourage savings. You could also use those accounts for health care or education or a first home. We're doing that precisely. And I think one thing sooner or later we're going to have to consider is

to take a look at the Social Security system, because we've got a lot of people advocating that, well, we don't want to put our money into Social Security. Now, you've got to be very careful about that, because you have to protect the people who are already in the pipeline. But it's something you might consider. I'm not suggesting it will be done, but at least we ought to look at it.

It's been looked—when I was chairman of the Finance Committee, which handles Social Security, we looked at all these options, and one thing we've got to make certain—when I used to go home, my mother would tell me, ''All I've got is my Social Security; don't touch it.'' And we didn't touch it. We preserved it.

And I'm an optimist. Your Social Security is going to be there when you retire. We'll fix it. It will probably happen in the year 2012 or 2015. In 1983, we thought we had a 75-year fix. It didn't work—much, much less. But at least we fixed it for some time, and 37 to 40 million people get their checks on time.

So we need to preserve the system, and we need to make it stronger. But we also need to look at some options whether or not we—it would depend on what the options are. In fact, they've got a commission right now in Congress, a bipartisan commission, looking at all the different options they're going to present to the next Congress. So I think we'll wait and see what they present, take a look at it.

The President. Our—this is one where we have some agreement, I think. Only about half the people in this country have pension plans, and Social Security is not enough for a lot of people to live on, or at least it's not enough for them to maintain anything like their previous lifestyle. So we've got to figure out how we're going to have more people with pension plans. And pension coverage has been declining as more and more people work for small businesses and fewer people work for big businesses.

So what is in my plan—and I think it's almost identical to what's in Senator Dole's plan—is we make more people than are now eligible to save in an IRA, and we'd let couples—married couples save more, and then they could withdraw from it tax-free if they needed to for medical emergencies or to buy a home or for an education, but they could also save to supplement their retirement.

In addition to that, we just passed a sweeping small business reform that makes it easier for small-business people to take out 401(k) plans for themselves and their employees and then much easier for employees to carry it from job to job. My best friend from grade school is a computer software salesman, and he told me last time he changed employers it took him 9 months to figure out how to transfer his 401(k) plan. Now, none of that will happen anymore. And so I hope that over the next 10 years you'll see a big increase in the percentage of people that have pension plans plus a secure Social Security System.

Senator Dole. Did you say you're unemployed? The first thing we ought to do is get you a job. And that's the economic package again: Create jobs and opportunities, reduce the capital gains rate, reduce regulatory reform, stop some of this senseless litigation, and let people work in America. And I think that's the thrust we will make.

Obviously, Social Security is a very important program. It should—it'll be preserved, Democrats or Republicans. It'll be preserved. We want to make certain we protect those in the pipeline, just as we did back in 1983. And we did it on a bipartisan basis. We took it out of politics. People get so tired of politics. And we ought to do the same with Medicare. Maybe we could make a deal here tonight.

Mr. Lehrer. All right, the question is for President Clinton. Does anybody have a foreign affairs question in this section? Yes, sir.

Trade With Japan

Q. Good evening. I'm Michael Smith. I'm an electronics technician in the Navy. My question was how you plan to deal with the trade deficit with Japan?

The President. Let me tell you what we have done. We have concluded with Japan 21, about to be 22 trade agreements now. And since we did that, in the areas where we concluded trade agreements, our exports to Japan have gone up by 85 percent in the last 4 years, and our trade deficit with Japan has gone down. Until about 5 months ago, the Japanese economy was in a deep reces-

sion. It's coming back now, so they can buy even more American products, and I think it'll go down more.

But I'm very—that's one of the real success stories here of the work we've done. We're selling Japanese rice from California for the first time. I visited a Chrysler dealership in Tokyo. I visited a Jeep plant, the oldest auto plant in America, in Toledo, Ohio, where they're going to export 41,000 right-hand-drive Jeeps this year, and they've got 700 new jobs because of it.

There is no easy way to do this. When you're dealing with an economy that's traditionally been more closed and one that's traditionally been more open, you just have to gut it out issue by issue by issue. We just—but we agreed in principle on our insurance agreement, and we're working on three or four other areas now. But the way you have to do it make sure you're competitive—we're the most competitive country in the world now—and then just fight to open those markets and go try to make the sale. And that's what our Trade Ambassador, our Commerce Secretary, and all the other people in our administration have tried to do.

Mr. Lehrer. Senator?

Senator Dole. Well, the bottom line is we've got to stop exporting jobs. We need to keep jobs here. I said there are 357,000 good jobs, manufacturing jobs, which were lost. And I assume some of those because of our trading partners; we didn't have access to their markets. We ought to insist on access. If we don't have access to their markets the same way they have access to our markets, we ought to say, ''Wait, that's enough. Time out. When you give us access, we'll give you access.''

It's very hard to get into the Japanese market, as everybody knows. They want to get into our market. They sell a lot of automobiles here, create a lot of jobs—those who sell exports. And it's very important to the economy. But I think we want to make certain.

I supported the President's trade policy, but we've got to be more aggressive. Once you have a policy, then you've got to go out and be aggressive and enforce that policy. There are American jobs that are being lost. This is what Ross Perot complains about. And I'd say to the Reform Party, take a look at the Republican Party. We're the reform party, and we're going to make things better. And one of the things we're going to do is stop exporting jobs in America.

The President. Let me say again, we've had over 200 separate trade agreements in the last 4 years, by far the largest number in American history, not just the big ones you've read about but a lot of smaller ones. And now what we have to do is to focus on those things we're real good at and make sure we're getting a fair deal.

We just had a pretty serious dispute with China because they were copying our CD's and costing thousands of jobs in places like California. But we said, ''You know, if you want to keep doing business and selling your products over here, you're going to have to quit pirating our CD's.'' And they agreed to do a number of things and to let us verify that they'd done it. But I think they're going to make the problem much better.

But there is not a simple, easy answer. You just have to work on this day-in and day-out, every month, every year, every issue to make sure that we have not only free trade but fair trade. I'm proud that we're better off on that than we were 4 years ago.

Mr. Lehrer. All right, the next question is for Senator Dole, and it's in this section. Yes, sir.

President as Role Model

Q. Ron Kite, minister.

Senator Dole. Hi, Ron.

Q. This great Nation has been established by the Founding Fathers, who possessed very strong Christian beliefs and godly principles. If elected President of the United States, what could you do to return this Nation to these basic principles? And also, do you feel that the office of the President has the responsibility to set the role example to inspire our young people?

Senator Dole. Well, no doubt about it, our Founding Fathers had a great deal of wisdom. And in addition to what you mentioned, they also were concerned about this all-powerful central Government in Washington, DC, that would in effect confiscate your property. So I carry around in my pocket—I can't pull it out, I'd violate the rules—

a copy of the 10th amendment, which says that we ought to return power to the States and power to the people—people here. You ought to make more decisions.

Honor, duty, and country: that's what America is all about. Certainly the President of the United States, in the highest office in the world, the most important office in the world, has a responsibility to young people, as we talked about earlier—to everyone, by example. And when it comes to public ethics, he has a responsibility. When you have 30-some in your administration who've either left or are being investigated or in jail or whatever, then you've got an ethical problem. It's public ethics—I'm not talking about private, we're talking about public ethics—when you have 900 files gathered up by some guy who was a bouncer in a bar and hired as a security officer to collect files. In Watergate, I know a person who went to jail for looking at one file, one FBI file. There are 900 sequestered in the White House—900—people like you. Why should they be rifling through your files?

So the President has a great responsibility. And it's one that I understand and would certainly carry out.

The President. This is the most religious great country in history, and yet, interestingly enough, we have the most religious freedom of any country in the world, including the freedom not to believe. And now we have all these people—just up the road in Los Angeles County we've got people from 150 different racial and ethnic groups, and they've got tons of different religions. But the fundamental tenets of virtually every religion are the same. And what I've tried to do is to support policies that would respect religion, and then help parents inculcate those values to their children. Let me very briefly give you some examples.

One of my proudest moments was signing the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which says the Government's got to bend over backwards before we interfere with religious practice. So I changed a Justice Department effort to get a church to pay back a man's tithe because he was bankrupt when he gave it.

I've supported character education programs in our schools, drug-free schools programs. I've supported giving parents a V-chip on their television so if they don't want their young kids to watch things they shouldn't watch, they wouldn't have to. That's the kind of thing we need to do, give people like you and our families the power to give those values to our children.

Senator Dole. Well, I think it's—you know, before I came in tonight, my wife and daughter and I had a prayer because if it's God's will, whatever happens—if it's God's will, it will happen.

A constitutional amendment for voluntary prayer in school in my view would be a great idea. I support it, and the President opposes it. I mean, it seems to me the President, whoever the President may be, this is one of his highest responsibilities. People look to the President of the United States more than any other person in America. And that's the way it's always been, and that's the way it always will be.

Mr. Lehrer. All right, this is our last question. It goes to President Clinton, and it's from this section.

Yes, ma'am?

"Special Rights"

Q. My name is Evette Duby, and I too am a minister; I'm with the Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches.

President Clinton, perhaps you can help me with something tonight. I've heard Mr. Dole say several times, "all of us together." And when he was asked if he would support equal rights in employment for gay and lesbian people, you said that you favored that, and he said that he did not believe in special rights. And I thought the question was equal rights for all people, and I don't understand why people are using the term "special rights" when the question is equal rights. Could you help me in understanding that?

The President. I want to answer your question, but let me say one other thing. We don't need a constitutional amendment for kids to pray. And what I did was to have the Justice Department and the Education Department for the first time every issue a set of guidelines that we gave to every school in America saying that children could not be interfered with in religious advocacy, when they were praying, when they were doing

whatever they could do under the Constitution just because they were on a public school grounds. And I think anyone who has experienced this would tell you that our administration has done more than any in 30 years to clarify the freedom of religion in the public square, including in the public schools.

Now I think I have to let Senator Dole speak for himself. It wouldn't be fair for me to do that. I would wind up—I mean, it's the last question, and I'd mischaracterize it to try to make you happy.

Let me tell you what I feel. We have a lot of differences in our country, and some of us believe that other people's decisions are wrong, even immoral. But under our Constitution, if you show up tomorrow and obey the law, and you work hard, and you do what you are supposed to do, you're entitled to equal treatment. That's the way the system works.

All over the world, people are being torn apart—Bosnia, the Middle East, Northern Ireland, Rwanda, Burundi, you name it—because of all their differences. We still have some of that hatred inside us; you see it in the church burnings. And one of the things I've tried hardest to do is to tell the American people that we have to get beyond that, we have to understand that we're stronger when we unite around shared values instead of being divided by our differences.

Mr. Lehrer. Senator Dole?

Senator Dole. Well, I hope I made my answer clear. I said I'm opposed to discrimination. You know, we've suffered discrimination in the disability community. There are 43 million of us. And I can recall cases where people would cross the street rather than meet somebody in a wheelchair.

So we want to end discrimination. I think that answers itself. No discrimination in America. We've made that clear. And I would just say that it seems to me that that's the way it ought to be. We shouldn't discriminate—race, color, whatever, lifestyle, disability. This is America, and we're all proud of it. But we're not there yet. What we need is good, strong leadership going into the next century.

I'm sorry we didn't have a foreign policy question, because just this week Secretary Christopher said, "Well, we really didn't know much the first couple of years about foreign policy." Now, that was quite an admission. It underscores what I had to say in the Hartford debate, that there is really no foreign policy in this administration. It's sort of ad hoc: "Whatever comes up, we'll deal with it." Unfortunately, we didn't have more questions on that.

The President. Let me say again, there is no more important responsibility for the President than to say if you believe in the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Declaration of Independence, that's all we need to know. And you can be part of our America, and you can walk across that bridge to the 21st century with us.

And we are not well served when we attack each other in a kind of an ad hominem way. It doesn't create jobs. It doesn't educate children. It doesn't solve problems. We need to be disagreeing on ideas honestly and talking about the future. The future will be the greatest time in this country's history if we can beat this division that is bedeviling the whole rest of the world.

Mr. Lehrer. All right. Now we go to the closing statements. Senator Dole, you're first. Two minutes, sir.

Closing Statements

Senator Dole. Well, let me thank everybody here at the university, and Jim, thank you, all the people who may still be watching or viewing. This is what it's all about. It's not about me. It's not about President Clinton. It's about the process. It's about selecting a President of the United States.

So we have our differences. We should have our differences. I mentioned other parties. They have their differences. If we all agreed, it'd be a pretty dull place. We should have more debates. Maybe we'll have another debate on the economy.

But I would just say this: This is the highest honor that I have ever had in my life to think that somebody from Russell, Kansas, somebody who grew up living in a basement apartment, somebody whose parents didn't finish high school, somebody who spent about 39 months in hospitals after World War II, somebody who uses a buttonhook every day to get dressed, somebody who understands that there are real Americans out

there with real problems, whether soccer moms or the single parents or families working or seniors or people with disabilities, whoever it may be.

But there are some very fundamental differences in this campaign. President Clinton opposes term limits. President Clinton opposes a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. President Clinton opposes a voluntary prayer amendment. He opposes an amendment to protect the flag of the United States of America. People give their lives—a couple of servicemen here—they sacrifice, they give everything for America. We ought to protect the American flag with a constitutional amendment.

But beyond that, we need to address the economy. And I would just say, with my time running out here, it's a very proud moment for me. And what I want the voters to do is to make a decision. And I want them to be proud of their vote in the years ahead, proud that they voted for the right candidate, proud that they voted, hopefully, for me.

And I'll just make you one promise. My word is good. Democrats and Republicans have said Bob Dole's word is good. I keep my word. I promise you, the economy is going to get better, we're going to have a good economic package, and we're going into the next century a better America.

Thank you.

Mr. Lehrer. Mr. President.

The President. Thank you, Jim. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, and all the people who are watching.

One thing I'd like to say is I agree with what Senator Dole said. It's a remarkable thing in a country like ours that a man who grew up in Russell, Kansas, and one who was born to a widowed mother in Hope, Arkansas, could wind up running for President, could have a chance to serve as President. So the first thing I want to say is thank you for giving me the chance to be President.

This election is about two different visions about how we should go into the 21st century. Would we be better off—as I believe—working together to give each other the tools we need to make the most of our God-given potential, or are we better off saying, "You're on your own"? Would we be better off building that bridge to the future together so we can all walk across it, or saying, "You can get across yourself"?

If you don't leave this room with anything else tonight and if the people watching us don't leave with anything else, I hope you'll leave with this: This is a real important election. The world is changing dramatically in how we work and how we live, how we relate to each other—huge changes—and the decisions we make will have enormous practical consequences.

So we've talked about our responsibilities tonight. I want to talk about your responsibility and your responsibility. Your responsibility is to show up on November 5th, because you're going to decide whether we're going to balance the budget now but protect Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment. You'll decide whether we're going to keep fighting crime with the Brady bill, the assault weapons, and finish putting those 100,000 police; whether we're going to move a million people from welfare to work; whether we're going to give our families more protection for their kids against drugs and tobacco and gangs and guns; whether we're going to give our children world-class education where every 8-year-old can read, every 12-year-old can log in on the Internet, every 18-year-old can go to college.

If we do those things, we'll build that bridge to the 21st century, and the greatest country in history will be even greater.

Thank you.

Mr. Lehrer. Thank you, Senator. Thank you, Mr. President.

This concludes—this is the last of the three 1996 Presidential and Vice Presidential debates.

NOTE: The debate began at 6 p.m. at the Shiley Theatre at the University of San Diego. In their remarks, the debaters referred to Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority and Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel.

Remarks to the Community in San Diego, California

October 16, 1996

Thank you, San Diego. Thank you for being here tonight. Thank you for your support and your concern for our country. You

had a pretty good seat at the debate, didn't you?

The first thing I want to say is, I hope you were proud of your fellow Californians who were the citizens on that debate. They did a good job. They asked good questions and it made me feel good about it.

I want to thank the people who are here with us tonight. Thank you, Deputy Mayor Valerie Stallings, for your comments and for being here. Thank you, Lieutenant Governor Gray Davis. Thank you, Congressman Bob Filner, the best advocate this county ever had. If you had any idea how much time Bob Filner spends burning my ear about something for this area, you would double his pay and cut his hours. It's amazing what he does. I also want to say a special word of appreciation to Peter Navarro, who is also running for Congress, and I want you to help him get elected. Stand up, Peter.

We have some other congressional candidates in the audience. I know Dan Farrell, Rita Tamerius, Darity Wesley. Are they here still? Good for you. Thank you for running. Thank you, Howard Wayne, for running for the Assembly. I know you're here. Thank you, Representative Richard Katz, for being here. And Susan Davis, thank you for being here. Thank you, State senator and the leader of the State senate, Senator Lockyer. Thank you for being here. And thank you, Kathleen Connell, for your leadership in the State controller's office.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want you to join me in thanking the people who provided our music—the Lincoln High School Gospel Choir. Where are they? The Scripps Ranch High School Marching Band. That's how we build a crowd, you know. You bring a band and all their relatives come and their friends. It's great. And Little Feat, weren't they great? Give Little Feat a hand. [*Applause*] They were terrific.

Folks, I'm so glad to see you here tonight. I'm so glad to see so many young people here tonight. It's your future we're fighting for.

You know, I have had a lot of good and some very moving days in California since I have been President. I've had a lot of great days in this county since I first started coming here as a candidate. And I was thinking tonight—hoping that I would get some questions about it—but I want to say to you, the people of this county have worked with our administration, and that's why we've been able to double the border guards here, why we've been able to invest in cleaning up the environment here, why we've been able to help put more police on the street here, why we've been able to guarantee that there will be more contracts with that shipyard here, so that those folks who asked me not to forget them will have jobs into the 21st century. And I thank all of you who had anything to do with that.

You know, tonight you heard two very different visions of our future. And what you also heard was what I think is the last debate I'll ever be in as a candidate—unless I run for the school board some day. [*Laughter*] But while it was my last debate, I hope it was the beginning of a lot of conversations that all of you will have about what our country is going to be like in the 21st century. There are enormous tactical consequences to the ideas that we have—whether you really believe that we're better off on our own or whether we're better off when we work together to give each other the tools to make the most of our lives and our families and our communities.

There's a lot of significance to whether you believe we should build a bridge to the future we can all walk across, or just show people the valley and say, "I hope you can find some way to get over it;" whether you believe that we're out there on our own because the Government is intrinsically our enemy or whether you think that the Government is just another part of this great partnership we call America. And Hillary was right: it does take a village to raise a child and build a community and build a future.

I want all of you to know, especially the young people that—I want you to know that, as someone who is not so young anymore, I am more idealistic today about the promise of this country than I was the day I took the oath of office as President. I have more confidence today in our ability to work together to make good things happen for America than I did the day I took the oath of office. I have more conviction today that our best days are still ahead. And I know that 20 days from now, if we decide that together we're

going to build that bridge, that our best days are still ahead, and your best days are still ahead and America will still be the greatest country in human history in the 21st century. Will you help me build that bridge? Will you help me do it for 20 more days? [*Applause*]

Thank you, and God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:47 p.m. in the Organ Pavilion at Balboa Park. In his remarks, he referred to Peter Navarro, candidate for California's 49th Congressional District; Dan Farrell, candidate for California's 48th Congressional District; Rita Tamerius, candidate for California's 51st Congressional District; Darity Wesley, candidate for California's 52d Congressional District; and Susan Davis, candidate for California State Assembly. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Notice—Continuation of Emergency With Respect to Significant Narcotics Traffickers Centered in Colombia

October 16, 1996

On October 21, 1995, by Executive Order 12978, I declared a national emergency to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States constituted by the actions of significant foreign narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia, and the unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm that they cause in the United States and abroad. The order blocks all property and interests in property of foreign persons listed in an Annex to the order, as well as foreign persons determined to play a significant role in international narcotics trafficking centered in Colombia, to materially assist in, or provide financial or technological support for or goods or services in support of, the narcotics trafficking activities of persons designated in or pursuant to the order, or to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, persons designated in or pursuant to the order. The order also prohibits any transaction or dealing by United States persons or within the United States in such property or interests in property. Because the activities of significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia continue to threaten the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States and to cause unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm in the United States and abroad, the national emergency declared on October 21, 1995, and the measures adopted pursuant thereto to deal with that emergency, must continue in effect beyond October 21, 1996. Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), I am continuing the national emergency for 1 year with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia.

This notice shall be published in the *Federal Register* and transmitted to the Congress.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
October 16, 1996.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:15 a.m., October 17, 1996]

NOTE: This notice was published in the *Federal Register* on October 18.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Notice on Colombian Narcotics Traffickers

October 16, 1996

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the emergency declared with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia is to continue in effect for 1 year beyond October 21, 1996.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on October 21, 1995, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The actions of significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia continue to pose an unusual and

extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and the economy of the United States and to cause unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm in the United States and abroad. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to maintain economic pressure on significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia by blocking their property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and by depriving them of access to the U.S. market and financial system.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 17.

Remarks in Santa Ana, California

October 17, 1996

Thank you. Good morning. What a crowd. Thank you for being here. Thank you. Mayor Pulido, thank you for that wonderful welcome. Thank you for your leadership of this great city. And let me say that the mayor was a little too modest. I want to brag on him a little more. We have had a great partnership with this city. Among other things, our program to put 100,000 police on our street has brought 54 here, and the crime rate has gone down by 50 percent in Santa Ana. Thank you, Mayor, for your leadership and your work here. I'd like to thank Lieutenant Governor Gray Davis for being here. Senator Chris Dodd is here, all the way from Connecticut, the chairman of the Democratic Party. Thank you, sir, for being here. Thank you, Art Torres, our Democratic Party chair, for being here.

I'd like to say a special word of thanks to the mayor of Tustin, Tracy Worley, for being here. She spoke earlier. Thank you, Mayor. God bless you, and thank you so much. I'd like to thank the other congressional candidates who are here, Sally Alexander, Tina Louise Laine, Dan Farrell. I thank Steven Weber for speaking earlier. And I want to thank the Santa Ana High School Marching Band, the Saddleback High School Road Runners. Thank you both for being here. Thank you both. Thank you.

I'd like to thank all the young AmeriCorps volunteers who are here for the work you're doing to make our country a better place. Thank you, Lou Correa, for your speech and for what you're doing. Give him a hand, folks. He did a good job. [*Applause*] And I was watching Loretta Sanchez give her speech, and I thought, boy, I'm glad she's not running against me. [*Laughter*] Thank you for running for Congress. Thank you for your commitment to give this congressional seat back to all the people of this congressional district. Thank you, Loretta Sanchez.

Ladies and gentlemen, a lot of people have asked me what I thought about the debate last night. And what I thought was that everybody in California should be very proud of those 123 citizens from San Diego and the surrounding area. They did a fine job, and they spoke for all of America, and I was very proud of them. I know you were, too.

When I came to Orange County in 1992, many people said, ''Why are you going there? It's the most Republican county in the country.'' And I said, ''Because I'm trying to change our country, and Orange County has got to be a big part of America's future.'' I came because I was tired of the politics of blame and division and name calling that had dominated Washington for far too long, because people being put into little boxes and labeled gave everyone an excuse not to work together to solve our problems and move this country forward. I did it because I believed that you could go beyond the tired rhetoric of yesterday's politics, that the real issue was how you could be both good for business and good for working people, how you could both grow the economy and protect the environment. I believe that you could be a fiscal conservative and still be progressive enough to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow for all these young people in the audience. That's what I believed then; that's what I believe now.

And so, in 1992, I came to California and Orange County saying that I wanted to create a country in which there's opportunity for all, responsibility from all, and an American community in which everyone has a place.

Do you feel that we're better off than we were 4 years ago? [*Applause*] You know 4 years ago, the people of California had to take me on faith, but now there is a record. There has never been a partnership between the National Government and the people of any State like the one we have forged over the last 4 years. A lot of it was born of necessity, of earthquakes and fires and floods, of the economic dislocation caused by defense cutbacks, of the terrible recession you were facing when I came here. But little by little, day by day, month by month, we worked together to meet the challenges the people of California faced. And look at the difference 4 years can make.

Four years ago, we had high unemployment and rising frustration. We still have a lot of challenges, but compared to 4 years ago, we have lower unemployment, 10½ million new jobs, a 15-year high in homeownership, the biggest drop in childhood poverty in 20 years, the biggest drop in inequality among working Americans in 27 years, the lowest rates combined of unemployment, inflation, and home mortgage interest rates in 27 years. We are on the right track to the 21st century.

After inflation the typical family's income is up over $1,600. Nearly 2 million people have moved from welfare to work. The crime rates have gone down for 4 years in a row. And we have invested more money in education and research and in environmental protection while holding Government spending to slower growth than my two Republican predecessors did. And we brought the deficit down every year for 4 years, the first time in the 20th century any administration has done that.

Our friends on the other side, they complain about Government all the time. They set it up as the enemy; it's Government versus the people. The last time I checked, the Constitution said, ''of the people, by the people and for the people.'' That's what the Declaration of Independence says. That's why, even though we have abolished more regulations, ended more programs, and reduced the size of the Government more than our predecessors did, we have also done more to create opportunity, to reinforce responsibility, and to bring the American people into a community together instead of always dividing us. I am tired of that. I want us to go forward together, and I think you do, too.

Let me say, I was just looking at this magnificent new courthouse that's coming up up here, and I want to give special credit to one citizen of Orange County, a Republican, Roger Johnson, who worked in our administration and had a lot to do with the progress of the last 4 years. He's not here today, but I want to thank him for what he did.

Ladies and gentlemen, the FBI reported last week that our crime rate is at a 10-year low. In California it's dropped to a 25-year low. We can change this country. You don't have to wonder anymore about whether what we do and you do together can make a difference to make life better. Four years ago, it was simply a matter of faith. Today you have a record.

Now, I'm glad we've got some of our friends in the opposition over there, and I understand why they have to try to shout us down every now and then, because for them the evidence hurts. But let's talk about the evidence and welcome them here.

But the question is not what have we done, but what will we do? Last night, I was so moved by the questions, because repeatedly what people wanted to know was, what are you going to do about this, that, or the other thing; how does what you do affect how I live; how does what you do, Mr. President, affect the world my children will live in.

And I was so impressed because the people who asked questions were not just concerned about what's going to happen next week or next month, they were also worried about what the world would be like in 20 years, in 30 years. And I tell you what I try to think about every day—and I recommend this to all of you, before you vote on November the 5th, you ought to try this: Every day I ask myself, can I say in 30 seconds or a minute what my vision is for America in the 21st century? Can I say in a minute what I want my country to look like when my daughter is my age, when our children are our age? What do you want to be able to say about America and be absolutely sure it's true when we go roaring into this new century?

The young people in this audience today, many of them will be doing jobs that have not been invented yet. Some of them will be doing work that has not even been imagined yet. And what we have to do is to create a world that will enable all of them to live up to the fullest of their God-given potential, a world in which all citizens take responsibility not only for themselves and their own families but for bringing us together and moving us forward.

As I said, I think you saw two very different visions of the future last night, two honestly different visions. We need not say bad things about our opponents to say we just have different views. We just have different views.

I believe the most important things in all of our lives are the personal things—that your individual life, your family life is clearly the most important thing. I believe many things have to be done at the grassroots level by people in the private sector, by religious and community organizations and civic organizations, by local government. But I believe the National Government is not your enemy; it is your servant, your partner. I believe it does take a village to raise our children and build our future.

And let me say to you, what does that mean in practical terms? It means I'm proud of the fact that we lowered the deficit for 4 years in a row, but I want to finish the job of balancing the budget, to keep interest rates down and the economy growing. California has not come all the way back. Not everybody who wants a good job has one. We've got to balance the budget, but we do not have to wreck Medicare or Medicaid or cut education or environmental protection or research and turn our back on our future to do it. And we should not blow a hole in it with his $550 billion tax scheme. We should keep going.

I believe we have to help our families. I go all over the country talking to people, and whenever I go home, I also spend a fair amount of time talking to people I grew up with. Most of them are just solid middle class citizens leading the lives that we all assumed we would lead when we were children. And everybody I talk to, when they talk about their real concerns, somehow or another it always gets around to: Can I succeed at home and at work? Can I raise a successful family and have a good career? Will I be able to do well enough financially to take care of my family, but will I have enough time with my family so that the money means something to me? I hear it everywhere in different ways. That's why I'm proud the first bill I signed was the Family and Medical Leave Act, an honest difference between my opponent and me.

So what are we going to do about it? First of all, we ought to have a tax cut, but it ought to be one we can afford and still balance the budget, one targeted to childrearing, to education, to buying a home, to dealing with medical costs.

Secondly, we ought to keep working to protect our children from the dangers of crime and guns and gangs and drugs and tobacco. We need to finish the job. We have only funded about half of those 100,000 police. The opposition believes we're making a mistake putting these police on the street. The mayor knows better. I say let's finish the job of putting 100,000 police on the street. Will you help me do that? [*Applause*]

The second thing we ought to do, we passed the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban and this country is safer because of it. But our police officers are not as safe as they ought to be, and we ought to ban bullets whose only purpose is to pierce the bulletproof vests that police officers wear and protect them.

We ought to continue to expand the safe and drug-free schools program so that in every grade school in this country there's a D.A.R.E. officer, there's somebody in a uniform telling our kids that drugs are wrong, drugs can kill you, giving them somebody to look up to. We shouldn't cut that program back for 23 million kids, as our adversaries tried to do. I say let's stay with the safe and drug-free schools program. Will you help me do that? [*Applause*]

We ought to continue until we have finally put into effect a set of legally binding rules that will stop tobacco companies from advertising and distributing tobacco to children. Three thousand kids a day start smoking illegally; 1,000 will die sooner because of it. It is illegal. It is wrong. We should not reverse course. That's another difference between

me and our friends on the other side. Will you help us prevail in that fight? Will you stick up for our future? [*Applause*]

We ought to expand the family and medical leave law so parents can take a little time off from work without losing their jobs to take their children to regular doctors' appointments and to go to parent-teacher conferences at the schools. That's important, too, and our economy will be stronger if our parents are happier at work because they know their kids are doing better. Will you help me do that? [*Applause*]

We passed health care reform to say you can't have your health insurance taken away just because you changed jobs or someone in your family gets sick. Twenty-five million Americans could be helped by it. We stopped insurance companies from forcing hospitals to kick mothers and newborn babies out of the hospital after just a day. They can't do that anymore.

But we have more to do. Our balanced budget plan will provide coverage to families when they're between jobs for up to 6 months, will add another million children to the ranks of health-insured instead of uninsured, will provide mammograms for women on Medicare, and will help families who are caring for a member with Alzheimer's. And it's all paid for in the balanced budget. Will you help me do that? [*Applause*]

We've worked with States all over the country, without regard to party, including California, to move nearly 2 million people from welfare to work. I signed a welfare reform bill that says, we'll still guarantee to poor families health care and nutrition, but the money that the Federal Government used to send to the States for a welfare check now has to be turned into a paycheck within 2 years for able-bodied people. That's a good thing to say, but you have to have the jobs there if you're going to make people take them. I have a plan to say that this is the beginning, not the end of welfare reform. We have to create at least another million jobs in the private sector with tax incentives and other support. Will you help me do that? [*Applause*]

We have made the air and the water cleaner. We have made our food safer. We have cleaned up more toxic waste sites in 3 years than the previous administrations did in 12. But 10 million American children still live within 4 miles of a toxic waste dump, and that is wrong. We have a plan, paid for in our balanced budget plan, to clean up the 500 worst sites in this country so that we can say by the 21st century the children of America, rich, poor, or middle class, are going to grow up next to parks, not poison. Will you help us do that? [*Applause*]

And finally, and most important of all, we have got to guarantee that every child in this country has access to the finest educational opportunities in the entire world in part—in part, because we are more than ever a nation of immigrants, 40 percent of our children cannot read independently by the third grade. That means that everything they try to learn later on in life, they are handicapped in learning. It is wrong for us to permit children to leave the third grade not being able to read on their own.

I have a plan to mobilize 30,000 trained reading tutors, including AmeriCorps volunteers, to enlist a million volunteers across America so that we can go into the schools of America and teach our children. We did this in a rural county in Kentucky, and within a year the average child had increased their reading level by 3 years—3 years. We can do this.

So I ask you, will you help me put a million people out there so that every 8-year-old can say, "This is a book, and I can read it all by myself"? Will you help me? Will you help us to hook up every classroom and library in every school in the United States, free access to the Internet, to the World Wide Web, so that every child in America can be part of this new technology age? [*Applause*] And to grownups here who aren't as expert in computers as a lot of the kids are, let me tell you what that means. That means, if we can say that every 12-year-old in America can log on to the Internet, let me tell you what that means in practical terms. It means for the first time in the entire history of the United States, for the very first time, we can say that every child in America, rich, poor, or middle class, in every community in America, now has access to the same learning at the same level of quality at the same time. It

will revolutionize education in America. Will you help me do it? [*Applause*]

And finally, we must open the doors of college education to all Americans of any age who need further education. I want to give every family the ability to save for an IRA but withdraw tax-free if the money's used to pay for college or health care or buying a first home. I want to make 2 years of education after high school just as universal as a high school diploma is today. And we can do it in only 4 years if we'll simply say we're going to let you deduct from your tax bill dollar for dollar the cost of a typical community college tuition. Will you help me do that? [*Applause*] And we should make any college cost, any college tuition tax deductible up to $10,000 a year for any Americans of any age, including older people who need to go back and get school. Will you help us do that? [*Applause*]

Now, this election is 19 days away. And they always tell you when you're 19 days away, just come in like this, give a whoop-dee-doo speech, talk 3 minutes, leave—no more issues. But I'm telling you, the big question is 19 days is, who's going to show up. Are you going to show up? Are you going to show up? [*Applause*]

And example, after example, after example—some of which I was able to cite last night—the people of the State of California can say, "There is a direct consequences between the vote I cast, the person who is in charge in Washington, and the decisions made here on the streets of Santa Ana and every other city in this State that affect my life."

So I ask you—I talk a lot about our responsibilities—it is your responsibility to go vote, your responsibility as a citizen, your responsibility to be there, your responsibility to build that bridge to the 21st century. In 19 days let's do it.

Thank you and God bless you. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:26 a.m. at the Old Orange County Courthouse. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Miguel Pulido of Santa Ana; actor Steven Weber; State Assembly candidate Lou Correa; and former Administrator of General Services Roger Johnson. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Proclamation 6942—To Amend the Generalized System of Preferences

October 17, 1996

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

1. Sections 501(1) and (4) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended ("Trade Act") (19 U.S.C. 2461(1) and (4)), provide that, in affording duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), the President shall have due regard for, among other factors, the effect such action will have on furthering the economic development of a beneficiary developing country and the extent of the beneficiary developing country's competitiveness with respect to eligible articles. Section 502(c)(2) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(c)(2)) provides that, in determining whether to designate any country as a beneficiary developing country for purposes of the GSP, the President shall take into account various factors, including the country's level of economic development, the country's per capita gross national product, the living standards of its inhabitants, and any other economic factors he deems appropriate. Section 502(d) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(d)) authorizes the President to withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment under the GSP with respect to any country after considering the factors set forth in sections 501 and 502(c) of the Trade Act. Section 502(f)(2) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(f)(2)) requires the President to notify the Congress and the affected country, at least 60 days before termination, of the President's intention to terminate the affected country's designation as a beneficiary developing country for purposes of the GSP.

2. Section 502(e) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(e)) provides that the President shall terminate the designation of a country as a beneficiary developing country if the President determines that such country has become a "high income" country as defined by the official statistics of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Termination is effective on January 1 of the

second year following the year in which such determination is made.

3. Section 502(c)(7) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(c)(7)) provides that, in determining whether to designate any country a beneficiary developing country under this section, the President shall take into account whether the country has taken or is taking steps to afford internationally recognized worker rights to workers in the country.

4. Section 502(a)(1) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(a)(1)) authorizes the President to designate countries as beneficiary developing countries for purposes of the GSP. Section 503(c)(2)(F) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2463(c)(2)(F)) authorizes the President to disregard the limitations provided in section 503(c)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2463(c)(2)(A)(i)(II)) with respect to any eligible article if the aggregate appraised value of the imports of such article into the United States during the preceding calendar year is *de minimis.*

5. Section 502(a)(2) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(a)(2)) authorizes the President to designate any beneficiary developing country as a least-developed beneficiary developing country for purposes of the GSP based on the considerations in sections 501 and 502(c) of the Trade Act.

6. Pursuant to section 502(d) of the Trade Act, and having considered the factors set forth in sections 501 and 502(c)(2), I have determined that Malaysia is sufficiently advanced in economic development and improved in trade competitiveness that continued preferential treatment under the GSP is not warranted, and that it is appropriate to terminate the designation of Malaysia as a beneficiary developing country for purposes of the GSP effective January 1, 1997. In order to take into account the termination of benefits under the GSP for articles imported from Malaysia, I have determined that it is appropriate to: (i) terminate the designation of Malaysia for GSP purposes as a member of the Association of South East Asian Nations (''ASEAN'') and to modify general note 4(a) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTS'') to reflect such termination, (ii) delete from general note 4(d) of the HTS and from pertinent HTS subheadings all references to particular products of Malaysia which are currently excluded from preferential tariff treatment under the GSP, and (iii) to terminate any waivers of the competitive need limits granted to Malaysia pursuant to section 503(d) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2463(d)).

7. Pursuant to section 502(e) of the Trade Act, I have determined that Cyprus, Aruba, Macau, the Netherlands Antilles, Greenland, and the Cayman Islands meet the definition of a ''high income'' country as defined by the official statistics of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. As a result and pursuant to section 502(e) of the Trade Act, I am terminating the preferential treatment under the GSP for articles that are currently eligible for such treatment and that are imported from Cyprus, Aruba, Macau, the Netherlands Antilles, Greenland, and the Cayman Islands effective January 1, 1998.

8. Pursuant to section 502(d) of the Trade Act, and having considered the factors set forth in sections 501 and 502(c)(7), I have determined that it is appropriate to suspend some of Pakistan's GSP benefits because of insufficient progress on affording workers in that country internationally recognized worker rights. In order to reflect the suspension of benefits under the GSP for certain articles imported from Pakistan, I have determined that it is appropriate to modify general note 4(d) of the HTS and pertinent HTS subheadings so that Pakistan will no longer receive preferential tariff treatment under the GSP with respect to certain eligible articles effective July 1, 1996.

9. Pursuant to section 502(a)(1) of the Trade Act, I am acting to correct the name of Guinea-Bissau and the Republic of Yemen in the HTS, beneficiary developing countries previously proclaimed. In addition, I have determined that it is appropriate to disregard section 503(c)(2)(A)(i)(II) of the Trade Act with respect to certain eligible articles from certain beneficiary developing countries based on imports for calendar year 1994 and to restore preferential treatment under the GSP to imports of such articles from such countries.

10. Pursuant to sections 502(a)(2) and 502(d) of the Trade Act, and having considered the factors set forth in sections 501 and 502(c), I have determined that Botswana and

Western Samoa should be deleted from the list of least-developed beneficiary developing countries and Angola, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Zaire, and Zambia should be added.

11. Section 604 of the Trade Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2483), authorizes the President to embody in the HTS the substance of the relevant provisions of that Act, and of other Acts affecting import treatment, and actions thereunder.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, acting under the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, including but not limited to section 301 of Title 3, United States Code, and Title V and section 604 of the Trade Act, do proclaim that:

(1) In order to terminate the designation of Malaysia as a beneficiary developing country under the GSP and to modify the list of beneficiary developing countries designated as least-developed beneficiary developing countries for purposes of the GSP, the HTS is modified as provided in Annex I to this proclamation.

(2) In order to terminate the designation of Cyprus, Aruba, Macau, the Netherlands Antilles, Greenland, and the Cayman Islands as beneficiary developing countries under the GSP, the HTS is modified as provided in Annex II to this proclamation.

(3) In order to reflect the suspension of benefits under the GSP for certain articles imported from Pakistan, the HTS is modified as provided in Annex III to this proclamation.

(4) In order to correct the name of Guinea-Bissau and Republic of Yemen and to restore preferential treatment to certain eligible articles from certain beneficiary developing countries as a result of granting of *de minimis* waivers to such articles, the HTS is modified as provided in Annex IV to this proclamation.

(5) I delegate to the United States Trade Representative the powers granted to me in section 502(f)(2) of the Trade Act to notify a country of my intention to terminate that country's status as a beneficiary developing country for the purposes of the GSP.

(6) Any provisions of previous proclamations and Executive orders inconsistent with the provisions of this proclamation are hereby superseded to the extent of such inconsistency.

(7) The modifications to the HTS made in paragraphs (1) through (4) of this proclamation shall be effective with respect to articles both: (i) imported on or after January 1, 1976, and (ii) entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date specified in the respective Annex.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this seventeenth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-first.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 18, 1996]

NOTE: This proclamation and its annexes were published in the *Federal Register* on October 21.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on the Generalized System of Preferences

October 17, 1996

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

The Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program offers duty-free treatment to specified products that are imported from designated developing countries. The program is authorized by title V of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Pursuant to title V, I have determined that Malaysia should be graduated from the GSP program because it is sufficiently advanced in economic development and improved in trade competitiveness. I have also determined that certain products from Pakistan should be suspended from duty-free treatment under the GSP program because it is not making sufficient progress in protecting basic labor rights. In addition, I have determined that Botswana and Western Samoa should be deleted from the list of least-developed beneficiary developing countries and Angola, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Zaire, and Zambia should be added to that list. Finally, I have determined that Cyprus, Aruba, Macau, the Netherlands Antilles, Greenland, and the Cayman Islands meet the definition

of "high income" country as defined by the statistics of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and are subject to mandatory graduation.

The action regarding Malaysia and designation of least-developed beneficiary developing countries is effective January 1, 1997. The action against Pakistan is retroactive to July 1, 1996. The mandatory graduation of high income countries is effective January 1, 1998.

This notice is submitted in accordance with the requirements of title V of the Trade Act of 1974.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

Proclamation 6943—Honoring the Filipino Veterans of World War II

October 17, 1996

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

During the dark days of World War II, nearly 100,000 soldiers of the Philippine Commonwealth Army provided a ray of hope in the Pacific as they fought alongside United States and Allied forces for 4 long years to defend and reclaim the Philippine Islands from Japanese aggression. Thousands more Filipinos joined U.S. Armed Forces immediately after the war and served in occupational duty throughout the Pacific Theater. For their extraordinary sacrifices in defense of democracy and liberty, we owe them our undying gratitude.

Valiant Filipino soldiers fought, died, and suffered in some of the bloodiest battles of World War II, defending beleaguered Bataan and Corregidor, and thousands of Filipino prisoners of war endured the infamous Bataan Death March and years of captivity. Their many guerrilla actions slowed the Japanese takeover of the Western Pacific region and allowed U.S. forces the time to build and prepare for the allied counterattack on Japan. Filipino troops fought side-by-side with U.S. forces to secure their island nation as the strategic base from which the final effort to defeat Japan was launched.

This month, as we mark the anniversary of General MacArthur's return to the Philippines, we acknowledge the important role Filipino soldiers played in turning back aggression, defending liberty, and preserving democracy, and we extend to them our abiding thanks.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim October 20, 1996, as a day Honoring the Filipino Veterans of World War II. I urge all Americans to recall the courage, sacrifice, and loyalty of Filipino veterans of World War II and honor them for their contributions to our freedom.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this seventeenth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-first.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 21, 1996]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 18, and it will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 22.

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.

October 12

In the morning, the President traveled to Denver and Morrison, CO. In the afternoon, he traveled to Englewood, CO.

October 13

In the afternoon, the President traveled to Albuquerque, NM.

October 15

The President declared a major disaster in Florida and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by storm surge, heavy rains, and wind damage associated with Tropical Storm Josephine on October 7 and continuing.

October 16

In the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to San Diego, CA.

The President announced his intention to appoint Donald J. Barry as U.S. Federal Representative to the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission.

The President announced the following recipients of the 1996 Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Awards: Dana Commercial Credit Corporation of Toledo, OH; ADAC Laboratories of Milpitas, CA; Custom Research, Inc., of Minneapolis, MN; and Trident Precision Manufacturing, Inc., of Webster, NY.

October 17

In the morning, the President traveled to Tustin, CA. In the afternoon, he traveled to Los Angeles, CA. In the evening, the President returned to Washington, DC, arriving early the next morning.

October 18

In the afternoon, the President met with Prime Minister Rafiq al-Hariri of Lebanon.

The President announced the appointment of Donna H. Cunninghame to be the Chief Financial Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service. Ms. Cunninghame will serve as a recess appointee.

The President announced the appointment of Karen Shepherd to be U.S. Executive Director of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Ms. Shepherd will serve as a recess appointee.

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

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

NOTE: No nominations were submitted to the Senate during the period covered by this issue.

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 October 14

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry, Clinton/Gore '96 Press Secretary Joe Lockhart, and White House Director of Political Affairs Doug Sosnik

Released October 15

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry, Clinton/Gore '96 Press Secretary Joe Lockhart, and White House Director of Political Affairs Doug Sosnik

Released October 17

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry, Clinton/Gore '96 Press Secretary Joe Lockhart, and White House Director of Political Affairs Doug Sosnik

Released October 18

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the upcoming Friends of Leb-

anon conference in Washington on December 16.

Acts Approved by the President

Approved October 11[1]

H.R. 543 / Public Law 104–283
National Marine Sanctuaries Preservation Act

H.R. 1514 / Public Law 104–284
Propane Education and Research Act of 1996

H.R. 1734 / Public Law 104–285
To reauthorize the National Film Preservation Board, and for other purposes

H.R. 1823 / Public Law 104–286
To amend the Central Utah Project Completion Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow for prepayment of repayment contracts between the United States and the Central Utah Water Conservancy District dated December 28, 1965, and November 26, 1985, and for other purposes

H.R. 2297 / Public Law 104–287
To codify without substantive change laws related to transportation and to improve the United States Code

H.R. 2579 / Public Law 104–288
United States National Tourism Organization Act of 1996

H.R. 2779 / Public Law 104–289
Savings in Construction Act of 1996

H.R. 3005 / Public Law 104–290
National Securities Markets Improvement Act of 1996

H.R. 3159 / Public Law 104–291
To amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1997, 1998, and 1999 for the National Transportation Safety Board, and for other purposes

H.R. 3166 / Public Law 104–292
False Statements Accountability Act of 1996

H.R. 3259 / Public Law 104–293
Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997

H.R. 3723 / Public Law 104–294
Economic Espionage Act of 1996

H.R. 3815 / Public Law 104–295
Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 1996

H.J. Res. 198 / Public Law 104–296
Appointing the day for the convening of the first session of the One Hundred Fifth Congress and the day for the counting in Congress of the electoral votes for President and Vice President cast in December 1996

S. 39 / Public Law 104–297
Sustainable Fisheries Act

S. 811 / Public Law 104–298
Water Desalination Act of 1996

S. 1044 / Public Law 104–299
Health Centers Consolidation Act of 1996

S. 1467 / Public Law 104–300
Fort Peck Rural County Water Supply System Act of 1996

S. 1973 / Public Law 104–301
Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute Settlement Act of 1996

S. 2197 / Public Law 104–302
To extend the authorized period of stay within the United States for certain nurses

Approved October 12

S. 640 / Public Law 104–303
Water Resources Development Act of 1996

S. 1505 / Public Law 104–304
Accountable Pipeline Safety and Partnership Act of 1996

Approved October 13

H.R. 4137 / Public Law 104–305
Drug-Induced Rape Prevention and Punishment Act of 1996

[1] These acts were not received in time for inclusion in the appropriate issue.

Approved October 14

H.R. 4083 / Public Law 104–306
To extend certain programs under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act through September 30, 1997

S. 2078 / Public Law 104–307
Wildfire Suppression Aircraft Transfer Act of 1996