Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, August 15, 1994
Volume 30—Number 32
Pages 1637–1670

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

Crime legislation—1661, 1664
Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee fundraiser—1649
Detroit, MI
Arrival—1642
Democratic reception—1644
Health care legislation—1656
National Association of Police Organizations convention in Minneapolis, MN—1664
Presidential Medals of Freedom, presentation—1646
Radio address—1640
White House Counsel, announcement—1659

Appointments and Nominations

See also Addresses and Remarks
U.S. District Court, judges—1667

Communications to Congress

Arms embargo on Bosnia-Herzegovina, letter—1663
Convention on Pollock Resources in the Central Bering Sea, message transmitting—1655
Iraq, letter—1637

Communications to Federal Agencies

Assistance to nations of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, memorandum—1653
Military assistance to Jamaica, memorandum—1653

Interviews With the New Media

Exchanges with reporters
Briefing Room—1661
Oval Office—1653
Roosevelt Room—1656
Rose Garden—1659

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Armenia, President Ter-Petrosyan—1653

Proclamations

Minority Enterprise Development Week—1655

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations
China, most-favored-nation trading status—1654

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1670
Checklist of White House press releases—1670
Digest of other White House announcements—1667
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1668

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.*

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Iraq

August 5, 1994

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

Consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1), and as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, I am reporting on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council.

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has effectively disbanded the Iraqi nuclear weapons program at least for the near term. The United Nations has destroyed Iraqi missile launchers, support facilities, and a good deal of Iraq's indigenous capability to manufacture prohibited missiles. U.N. Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM) teams have reduced Iraq's ability to produce chemical weapons.

Notably, UNSCOM's Chemical Destruction Group (CDG) concluded its activities on June 14 after establishing an excellent record of destroying Iraq's stocks of chemical munitions, agents, precursor chemicals, and equipment procured for chemical weapons production. With as many as 12 nations participating at any one time, the CDG destroyed over 480,000 liters of chemical warfare agents, over 28,000 chemical munitions, and over 1,040,000 kilograms and 648 barrels of some 45 different precursor chemicals for the production of chemical warfare agents.

Significant gaps in accounting for Iraq's weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs remain, however. This is particularly true in the biological weapons area. Due to Iraq's insistence that the relevant documentation on its past programs has been destroyed, UNSCOM has had to resort to other, more time-consuming procedures to fill in the gaps.

The United Nations is now preparing a long-term monitoring regime for Iraq as required by U.N. Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 715. This program must be carefully designed if it is to be so thorough that Iraq cannot rebuild a covert program, as it did before the Gulf War, when it claimed to be in compliance with the Nonproliferation Treaty. Continued vigilance is necessary because we believe that Saddam Hussein is committed to rebuilding his WMD capability once sanctions are lifted.

It is, therefore, extremely important that this monitoring regime be effective, comprehensive, and sustainable. A program of this magnitude is unprecedented and will require continued, substantial assistance for UNSCOM from supporting nations. Rigorous and extensive trial and field testing will be required before UNSCOM can judge the program's effectiveness. The Secretary General's report of June 24 has detailed those areas where work remains to be done.

Rolf Ekeus, the Chairman of UNSCOM, has told Iraq that it must establish a clear track record of compliance before he can report favorably to the Security Council. Chairman Ekeus has said he expects to be able to report by September on the start-up of the long-term monitoring program. We strongly endorse Chairman Ekeus' approach and reject any attempt to limit UNSCOM's flexibility by the establishment of a timetable for determining whether Iraq has complied with UNSCR 715. We insist on a sustained period of complete and unquestionable compliance with the monitoring and verification plans.

The "no-fly zones" over northern and southern Iraq permit the monitoring of Iraq's compliance with UNSCRs 687 and 688. Over the last 3 years, the northern no-fly zone has deterred Iraq from a major military offensive in the region. Tragically, on April 14, 1994, two American helicopters in the no-fly zone were shot down by U.S. fighter aircraft causing 26 casualties. The Department of Defense has completed and made public the un-

classified portions of the investigation into the circumstances surrounding this incident.

In southern Iraq, the no-fly zone has stopped Iraq's use of aircraft against its population. However, Iraqi forces still wage a land-based campaign in the marshes, and the shelling of marsh villages continues.

In the spring of 1994, the Iraqi military intensified its campaign to destroy the southern marshes, launching a large search-and-destroy operation. The operation has included the razing of villages concentrated in the triangle bounded by An Nasiriya, Al Qurnah, and Basrah. Iraqi government engineers are draining the marshes of the region while the Iraqi Army is systematically burning thousands of dwellings to ensure that the marsh inhabitants are unable to return to their ancestral homes. The population of the region, whose marsh culture has remained essentially unchanged since 3500 B.C., has in the last few years been reduced by an estimated three-quarters.

As a result of the ''browning'' of the marshes, civilian inhabitants continue to flee toward Iran, as well as deeper into the remaining marshes. This campaign is a clear violation of UNSCR 688. In northern Iraq, in the vicinity of Mosul, we continue to watch Iraqi troop movements carefully. Iraq's intentions remain unclear.

Iraq still refuses to recognize Kuwait's sovereignty and the inviolability of the U.N. demarcated border, which was reaffirmed by the Security Council in UNSCRs 773 and 833. Iraq has not met its obligations concerning Kuwaitis and third-country nationals it detained during the war and has taken no substantive steps to cooperate fully with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), as required by UNSCR 687. Indeed, Iraq refused even to attend the ICRC meetings held in July and November 1993 to discuss these issues. While Iraq did attend such a meeting in July 1994, it provided no substantive information on missing individuals. Iraq also has not responded to more than 600 files on missing individuals. We continue to press for Iraqi compliance and regard Iraq's actions on these issues as essential to the resolution of conflict in the region.

The Special Rapporteur of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights (UNHRC), Max van der Stoel, continues to report on the human rights situation in Iraq, particularly the Iraqi military's repression against its civilian populations in the marshes. The Special Rapporteur asserted in this February 1994 report that the Government of Iraq has engaged in war crimes and crimes against humanity, and may have committed violations of the 1948 Genocide Convention. Regarding the Kurds, the Special Rapporteur has judged that the extent and gravity of reported violations place the survival of the Kurds in jeopardy.

The Special Rapporteur has noted that there are essentially no freedoms of opinion, expression, or association in Iraq. Torture is widespread in Iraq and results from a system of state-terror successfully directed at subduing the population. The Special Rapporteur repeated his recommendation for the establishment of human rights monitors strategically located to improve the flow of information and to provide independent verification of reports.

We are pressing for the deployment of human rights monitors and we strongly support their placement. We are gratified that the United Nations recently hired a part-time staffer for the Special Rapporteur. This is an important step, though not the full program of monitors we seek. Van der Stoel's mandate has been extended through February 1995. We will file additional reports to the U.N. General Assembly in the fall and to the UNHRC in early 1995. We are also pursuing efforts to investigate and publicize Iraqi crimes against humanity, war crimes, and other violations of international humanitarian law.

Examples of Iraqi noncooperation and noncompliance continue in other areas. For instance, reliable reports have indicated that the Government of Iraq is offering reward money for terrorist acts against U.N. and humanitarian relief workers in Iraq. And for 3 years there has been a clear pattern of criminal acts linking the Government of Iraq to a series of assassinations and attacks in northern Iraq on relief workers, U.N. guards, and foreign journalists. Ten persons have been injured and two have been killed in such attacks this year. The offering of bounty for such acts, as well as the commission of such

acts, in our view constitute violations of UNSCRs 687 and 688.

The Security Council maintained sanctions at its July 18th regular 60-day review of Iraq's compliance with its obligations under relevant resolutions. Despite ongoing efforts by the Iraqi government to convince Security Council members to lift sanctions, member countries were in agreement that Iraq is not in compliance with resolutions of the Council, and that existing sanctions should remain in force unchanged.

The sanctions regime exempts medicine and, in the case of foodstuffs, requires only that the U.N. Sanctions Committee be notified of food shipments. The Sanctions Committee also continues to consider and, when appropriate, approve requests to send to Iraq materials and supplies for essential civilian needs. The Iraqi government, in contrast, has continued to maintain a full embargo against its northern provinces and has acted to distribute humanitarian supplies throughout the country only to its supporters and to the military.

The Iraqi government has refused to sell $1.6 billion in oil, as previously authorized by the Security Council in UNSCRs 706 and 712, to pay for humanitarian goods. Talks between Iraq and the United Nations on implementing these resolutions ended unsuccessfully in October 1993. Iraq could use proceeds from such sales to purchase foodstuffs, medicines, and materials and supplies for essential civilian needs of its population, subject to U.N. monitoring of sales and the equitable distribution of humanitarian supplies (including to its northern provinces). Iraq's refusal to implement UNSCRs 706 and 712 continues to cause needless suffering.

Proceeds from oil sales also would be used to compensate persons injured by Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait. Of note regarding oil sales, discussions are underway with Turkish officials concerning the possible flushing of Iraqi oil now in the Turkish pipeline that extends from Iraq through Turkey. The flushing is necessary to preserve the pipeline that would then be resealed. The proceeds would be deposited in a U.N. escrow account and used by Turkey to purchase humanitarian goods for Iraq.

The U.N. Compensation Commission (UNCC) has received about 2.4 million claims so far, with another 100,000 expected. The United States Government has now filed a total of 8 sets of individual claims with the Commission, bringing U.S. claims filed to about 3,200 with a total asserted value of over $205 million. One panel of UNCC Commissioners recently submitted its report on the first installment of individual claims for serious personal injury or death. The UNCC Commissioners' report recommended awards for a group of about 670 claimants, of which 11 were U.S. claimants. The Governing Council of the UNCC approved the panel's recommendations at its session in later May. This summer the first U.S. claimants are expected to receive compensation for their losses. The UNCC Commissioners are expected to finish reviewing by the end of the year all claims filed involving death and serious personal injury.

In the fall, the UNCC Commissioners are also expected to issue reports on two other groups of claims. The first group involves persons who were forced to depart suddenly from Kuwait or Iraq during the invasion and occupation. The second group involves claimants who sustained itemized individual losses; e.g., lost salary or personal property. Panels of Commissioners have been meeting this summer to prepare their recommendations on those claims.

With respect to corporate claims, the United States filed two more groups of claims with the UNCC in June. Along with our initial filing in early May, the United States Government has filed a total of approximately $1.4 billion in corporate claims against the Government of Iraq, representing almost 140 business entities. Those claims represented a multitude of enterprises ranging from small family-owned businesses to large multinational corporations.

The United States Government also expects to file five Government claims with the UNCC this August. The five claims are for non-military losses, such as damage to Government property (e.g., the U.S. Embassy compound in Kuwait) and the costs of evacuating U.S. nationals and their families from Kuwait and Iraq. These Government claims have an asserted value of about $17 million.

In the future, the United States Government also intends to file one or more additional Government claim(s) involving the costs of monitoring health risks associated with oil well fires and other environmental damage in the Persian Gulf region.

It is clear that Iraq can rejoin the community of civilized nations only through democratic processes, respect for human rights, equal treatment of its people, and adherence to basic norms of international behavior. The Government of Iraq should represent all of Iraq's people and be committed to the territorial integrity and unity of Iraq. The Iraqi National Congress (INC) espouses these goals, the fulfillment of which would make Iraq a stabilizing force in the Gulf region.

We will continue to press to achieve Iraq's full compliance with all relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions. Until that time, the United States will maintain all the sanctions and other measures designed to achieve full compliance.

The continuing support by the Congress of our efforts is especially gratifying.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

August 6, 1994

Good morning. This week we celebrated the creation of 4 million new jobs in America since I became President on a platform to renew the American dream by restoring our economy, empowering individual Americans to compete and win in it, making Government work for ordinary citizens, and rebuilding our communities. Since we started our national economic strategy, our private sector is creating jobs nearly 8 times faster than it was 4 years ago.

It hasn't been easy to make these changes. We had to make some tough decisions to put our economic house in order. We had to break the bad habits that led to mismanagement of our economy and the explosion of our deficit for more than a decade. And we had to break through all of the partisan barriers and political rhetoric that too often keeps us from doing the right thing for the American people here in Washington, DC.

Today I want to talk with you about two other historic decisions that call on us to break through partisan barriers and political rhetoric again. For very soon, Congress will vote on both health care reform and the crime bill, two issues crucial to our mission of renewing the American dream.

I want to talk to you about two young Americans whose stories are the best arguments I've heard for why we have to fix what's wrong with our health care system and make our country safer again for all Americans.

One of those young people is Amanda Stewart from Keyes, Oklahoma. This week, I gave awards to four young people who have done heroic deeds or performed remarkable public service. Amanda was one of them. She was injured in a car wreck in 1990 and paralyzed from the chest down. This wonderful young lady could have given up on life. Instead of becoming bitter or defeated, she's devoted herself to educating other young people not to drink and drive, not to ride with people who do, and to always use seat belts. She's helping others to avoid what happened to her.

I met Amanda's family. Her father is a hard-working farmer in western Oklahoma. She has a lovely mother and a wonderful younger sister. She hasn't had any significant medical costs since just after her accident 4 years ago. The Stewarts have been paying $3,400 a year for a limited health insurance policy with a high deductible. But recently they were told that this month their insurance premiums were going to be raised to $9,600 a year.

Now, Amanda's father happens to be not only a farmer but a Republican. He's in a different party from me, and he made it clear to me that he doesn't want the National Government to give him anything. But he's got a family to raise, and he has no idea how he's going to keep paying for their health insurance. He said to me that if he couldn't take care of his family, as hard as he was

working, something was wrong in this country.

People like Amanda and her family are the reason we have to guarantee private, not Government, health insurance for every American, insurance that's always there. It's time to do what's right by those people. We're going in the wrong direction now. There are 5 million Americans just like Amanda's family who had insurance 5 years ago who don't have it today. Almost every one of them are working people and their children. We can do better, and we must.

It's also time we do what's right for young people like James Darby, the 9-year-old boy from New Orleans who wrote me last April. He asked me to do something about the crime rate. He asked me to stop the killing, because he was afraid that someone might kill him. And just 9 days later, walking home from a Mother's Day picnic, little James Darby was shot in the head and killed.

Well, 9 days ago, after 6 years of delay, a bipartisan committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives reconciled their differences on the smartest, toughest crime bill in the history of this country and sent the bill back to be voted on for final passage in both Houses of Congress. It took a lot of work. It's a bipartisan effort and has been every step of the way. Both Democrats and Republicans have voted for every part of it: "three strikes and you're out" and tougher punishments for other tough criminals; 100,000 new police officers on our streets—that's a 20 percent increase all across America; a ban on deadly assault weapons; a law that makes it illegal for minors to own and possess handguns; new prisons to keep hardened criminals in; and billions for new, effective prevention programs to give our young people something to say yes to, not just something to say no to.

Nine days ago when the bill was sent to both Houses for final passage, I thought it would pass quickly and be sent to my desk for signing. But it still hasn't happened. Here's the one last hurdle: You see, before the House of Representatives can vote on a bill, it must agree on the rules for debate about the bill. There are 435 Members of the House, and they have to have some rules to limit debate. In shorthand, this is called "the rule." "The rule" is purely a procedural matter, but it must be voted on before the final bill can pass.

Unfortunately, the National Rifle Association, which is opposed to the assault weapons ban in the bill, and some other interests are trying to keep the crime bill from passing by defeating "the rule." They're putting pressure on Members of Congress to kill the crime bill in a trick maneuver, because they know that once the bill itself gets to a vote, it will surely pass.

You know, we had a tough fight with the NRA over the ban on assault weapons. And those of us who think they should be banned won by only two votes. But we won fair and square. No parliamentary trick should reverse that result and put the rest of that important crime bill in peril.

Now, some Members of Congress honestly oppose the crime bill. They're against the assault weapons ban or they're against the capital punishment provisions of the bill or they're against spending money on prevention programs to give our kids a better future. Well, let them vote against the bill. Let them vote their conscience. But the NRA and the others should come out of the shadows. They ought to fight this bill on the merits. If they really want a shootout, we really ought to have it at broad daylight and high noon, not in the shadows of parliamentary maneuvering. No one should play any more political games with our Nation's safety.

Nine days after 9-year-old James Darby wrote me saying he was worrying about his safety and pleading with his President to help, he was shot dead. Nine days ago, the House and the Senate got the crime bill. There are lots of other little James Darbys out there, and they've waited long enough.

For Amanda Stewart and her fine family, for James Darby, for every American child and for all of their families and their futures, let's stop playing games with these two important issues. Let's get the job done.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 4:05 p.m. on August 5 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on August 6.

Remarks Upon Arrival in Detroit, Michigan

August 6, 1994

Hello. Thank you for waiting while I visited with one of your fellow citizens over there and her two children. I want to just get out and shake hands, so I won't make a long speech. But I would like to say, first, be supportive of the new candidate for the United States Senate, Congressman Bob Carr, and our new candidate for Governor, former Congressman Howard Wolpe. I'm glad to be here with Congressman Dingell and Congressman Conyers and Senator Levin and with your State officials and a lot of my friends in Michigan.

I just want to make a comment or two. The lady to my left is Linda Clark. You may have read about her in the Michigan press, she and her two children. In 1993, her husband was killed in his business by five young people with previous criminal records. After he died, she received a $24,000 bill from the hospital for his medical care, even though she didn't have health insurance. Since then, she has become a crusader for health care for all Americans and for a sensible policy on crime and, specifically, a supporter of our crime and health care initiatives. I read her letter again coming in today, and I asked her and her children to come here and be with me today because in Washington, very often what we do gets all caught up in partisan political rhetoric and name-calling and stuff that is very hard for ordinary citizens to understand. And I just want to make two or three points here today.

When I went to Washington as your President, I understood well that there would be forces there who would do anything, anything to fight change, to keep the established order of things, to stop us in our determination to give the American people their Government back again, to make it work for ordinary citizens, and to reawaken the American dream. But I want to ask you to look at the record, not the hype.

When I became President, the deficit was going up, and the economy was going down. By the narrowest of margins, we passed our national economic strategy. It cut $255 billion worth of spending. It raised taxes on the wealthiest 1.2 percent of Americans, and all their money went to pay down the deficit. It gave a tax break to 15 million American working families. In Michigan that means 392,000 families got a tax cut; 41,000 got a tax increase. Ninety-one percent of the American small businesses were made eligible for a tax cut. We shrunk the Federal Government to its smallest size since Kennedy was President, produced 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President, and you've got 4.1 million new jobs in the United States since our administration took office.

And since our administration took office, job growth in Michigan has been 3½ times what it was before. It is no wonder that the other party would rather not talk about economics or crime or health care and instead are interested in other things and division and always saying no. We did not have a single, solitary vote, not one, for that economic strategy from the opposition party. And I have done everything I could to reach out to people without regard to their party and ask for a bipartisan consensus to govern America.

You just remember that, folks, when Bob Carr is up here asking for your vote for the United States Senate. If it hadn't been for him, there would have been no deficit reduction, there would have been no economic recovery fueled by the first sensible economic plan we've had in more than 12 years. They want to go back; we're trying to go forward. And I appreciate your coming out here today saying you don't want to go back, you'd rather go forward, you'd rather create jobs, you'd rather grow the economy, you'd rather keep the American dream alive.

Now, let me just make two other points. There's hardly a family in America that has not been affected by crime. And the Congress has passed the toughest, smartest crime bill in history in each House, but they haven't passed the same bill. There are things in that bill that are controversial. There are people who don't support the capital punishment provisions of the bill. There are people who don't support the fact that the bill bans 19 assault weapons, which are so often used by criminal gangs, even though it protects 650 hunting and sporting weapons from being

banned. There are people who think we should not spend a lot of money on prevention programs to give our young people something to say yes to, instead of something to say no to. There are people who don't think it's important, but that crime bill gives 100,000 police to the streets of this country, a 20 percent increase. It makes our streets safer; it bans handgun ownership by minors; it has programs for safe schools; it has programs that will build more prisons and have "three strikes and you're out" for serious offenders and do more to help kids stay out of trouble. It is a good bill, and it should pass the United States Congress next week. We should stop fooling around with it. There are other families like Linda's family who deserve to have their streets safer and their futures better and brighter, and we ought to quit fooling around with it.

And finally, let me say something about health care. You know, I get tickled at all these people who say that this health care bill is some big Government socialist scheme, that it's some horrible idea to take over a big part of our economy.

Let me ask you something, folks. Here's a few questions, and I'd say the folks that aren't with us owe us some answers. Which country spends the most on health care? The United States. Which advanced country is the only one that doesn't provide health care coverage for everybody? The United States. Which is the only advanced country in the world where we're going in reverse, we're losing ground in health care coverage? The United States. Ten years ago, we had 88 percent of the people with insurance; now it's 83 percent. Today in America, there are 5 million, 5 million Americans, almost all of them working people and their children, who don't have insurance today who had it 5 years ago. Now, until we provide affordable private health insurance for all Americans, we are not going to be able to have a secure, stable family environment, work environment, offer people the chance to grow.

What do they say about this health care plan? They say it's bad for small business. Well, let me ask you this—this is an interesting thing—why, if it's bad for small business, have 600,000 small businesses signed up to support our plan to require everybody to cover their employees and split the difference on the insurance premium? I'll tell you why, because most small businesses do provide health insurance to their employees, and they're getting ripped off today, they're paying too much for it.

I met a farm family from western Oklahoma a couple of days ago when I gave their daughter an award. She's a young teenager who had a car wreck in 1990, paralyzed her from the chest down. She's spent the last 4 years trying to encourage people not to drink and drive, not to ride with drunk drivers, and always to put their seatbelts on—a marvelous girl. But the story this family told me was interesting: a Republican farmer from western Oklahoma, his wife, and their two beautiful daughters, one confined to a wheelchair. They've had almost no medical bills in the last 2 years. But they just got notice that in August, their health insurance premiums are going from $3,400 a year to $9,600 a year. And they are going to have to drop their health insurance.

Now, this is not a partisan political issue. Anybody working that hard with two kids to educate, one of them with a serious illness—injury in the past, deserves affordable health insurance.

The only State that has ever provided health care to all its citizens is Hawaii. For 20 years, employers and employees have had to provide health care. And you know what? Insurance premiums in Hawaii are 30 percent lower than they are in the rest of the country.

We can do this. I am tired of people saying, we cannot do this, we cannot do that, we cannot do the other thing. The violent, extremist interests in this country that are trying to keep health care out of the reach of ordinary American working people are a disgrace to the American dream. Most of them have health care, and most of them have parents on Medicare. Why do they not want you to have the same thing that they have? Why? Why don't they want you to have what they can? Let them give up their health care and see how they like it.

Now, folks, we're going to have to make some tough decisions here. I don't mind being a controversial figure. You didn't invite me to go to Washington to sit in the White

House and warm the chair. We are changing this country. We are rebuilding the economy, we're taking on crime, we're taking on welfare reform, we're taking on health care, we're taking on the tough issues. But I cannot do it alone; you have to help. Support the Members of Congress. Tell them you want them to move on the crime bill. Tell them you want them to move on health care. Tell them a simple message: We are coming to the end of this century; we have got to keep the American dream alive. The only way to do it is to restore the economy, empower individuals to take advantage of it, and rebuild our communities and families.

Let's make Government work for ordinary citizens again. That's what I'm fighting for. Thank you for being here to help me make the fight.

God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5 p.m. at Selfridge Air National Guard Base.

Remarks at a Democratic Reception in Detroit

August 6, 1994

Thank you very much. I'm glad to be back in Michigan and glad to be back in Detroit. I'm glad to be on this stage with all these wonderful Democrats, and I thank them for the work they have done for your State and for your country. I also would like to say a special word of thanks to all the people of Michigan who have been so kind to me and to Hillary and to our administration, for the victory we won here in the primary in 1992 and in the general election, and since then, for all the work that has been done, including the wonderful host we had in Detroit in Mayor Archer, when we had the jobs conference here a few months ago. I thank you for that.

Ladies and gentlemen, I ran for this job because I wanted to change this country. I was worried about the direction in which we were going. I thought the economy was going down, the deficit was going up, the country was coming apart, we were in danger of losing the American dream, and our Government wasn't working for ordinary people. I wanted to change all that. And after a year and a half, I can tell you that the change is well underway.

A lot of people don't like it, and they've fought it every step of the way. When I try to unite people in Washington, there are always people there trying to divide us. When I try to talk in ordinary terms to ordinary people, there are always people there throwing around political hot air and divisive rhetoric. But I can tell you that we are moving forward.

Since this administration took office, we have implemented a national economic strategy. We have launched a full-scale assault on crime. We have made a sweeping proposal on welfare reform. We have got bills to the floor of both Houses of Congress for the first time in the history of the United States to provide affordable health care to all Americans.

And I want to point out, when I came to Michigan in 1992, people told me they wanted something done about this economy. When I offered our national economic plan to the Congress, I was told in a meeting by the congressional leaders of the other party that there would be no votes from the other party for the budget, no votes for the economic plan, that they would not help us to reverse 12 years of exploding deficits, declining investment, and a declining economy. And so, by the narrowest of margins, we passed that economic plan. And they said the sky would fall, the economy would collapse, the deficit would go up, jobs would be lost, the end of the world had come. Chicken Little was on the floor of the Senate and the House with an elephant pin on. [*Laughter*]

What happened? We produced for the American people $255 billion in spending cuts, tax cuts for 15 million working families, including 392,000 working families in the State of Michigan. We did ask 1.2 percent of the wealthiest people in this country to pay more so we could pay the deficit down, including 41,000 families in Michigan, one-tenth the number who got a tax cut. We made 90 percent of the small businesses in this State and this Nation eligible for tax reductions if they invested more to grow this economy. We made 20 million Americans immediately eligible for lower interest rates

and better repayment terms on their college loans.

And what was the result? We're shrinking the Federal Government to its smallest point since Kennedy was President. We've got 3 years of deficit reduction in a row coming for the first time since Truman was President. We have 4.1 million new jobs, more jobs in a year and a half in Michigan than in the previous 4 years. We have a big drop in the unemployment rate, the largest number of new businesses formed in any single year since World War II. I plead guilty: We did it.

I just want you to remember this: In this United States Senate race, if it had not been for Congressman Carr, the plan would have gone down. We passed it by one vote. His opponent is against what we did. He is still proud of what we did. If you like where the economy is going, elect Bob Carr to the United States Senate.

Now, let me say, we're fighting for some other things. We're going to try to pass a crime bill next week. We have to get it to a vote first. The crime bill has some controversial provisions. And a lot of Americans and some Members of Congress, in good conscience, don't agree with them. But it will put 100,000 police on the street. It will give the police a better chance to compete, because it eliminates assault weapons while protecting over 650 other hunting and sporting weapons from being fooled with, which I know is important. It says minors can't own or possess handguns unless they're under the supervision of an adult, which I think is very important. It provides funds for safe streets. It provides tougher penalties for repeat offenders, money for the States to build prisons, but money for prevention programs to give our children something to say yes to, as well as something to say no to. And we need to pass it because the security of our families and our communities and our workplaces and our schools demand it.

You know, I met a woman from Michigan out at the airport. She came to see me with her two children. Her husband was murdered in his workplace last year. He was taken to the hospital and died. And after he died, she got a $24,000 bill from the emergency room. And because her husband was a small business person who couldn't afford to buy insurance, they didn't have any health insurance. So there she was, a widow with two little kids and a $24,000 bill.

In 1943, Congressman Dingell's father introduced the first bill to provide affordable health care to all Americans. In 1945, '47, and '49, Harry Truman tried to do it. And now, here we are in 1994. We're the only country in the world with an advanced economy that doesn't provide health care to everybody. You've got the automobile industry in Michigan losing jobs and market share because they got $1,000 in every car in health care, and they're paying for the cost of people who won't even pay their own way. There are 5 million working people in America, almost all of them working people and their children, who had health insurance 5 years ago who don't have it today. We're going in reverse.

We have a clear example in the State of Hawaii, where for 20 years the employers and employees have all had to buy health insurance, where small businesses have premiums that are 30 percent below the national average. People are healthier, they're doing better, and the small business community is doing better. And we are determined to see that we do not walk away from this.

Let me tell you, when we started this health care debate, there were two dozen Senators from the other party on a bill that would provide health care to all Americans. Today, there are zero there. Every time we have moved to them, they have run the other way. It is time to stop playing politics with the health care of the people of the United States of America.

Now, I knew we had to make some changes in our plan, and we did. We made it less bureaucratic, more voluntary, gave bigger breaks to small business, and we phase it in over a longer period of time. That's what the bills now before Congress do. But the issue is this: Are we going to keep spending more than everybody else and getting less for it, or are we going to continue to let more and more money go to insurance companies and bureaucracies instead of to keep people healthy, or are we going to run the risk of imperiling this fabulous recovery in the auto industry and this recovery in the economy,

or are we going to keep punishing the small business people who do provide health insurance? Or are we going to do what's right for the American people? That is the issue. It should not be a partisan political issue. In this election year we ought to forget about the election and remember the people who elected us in the first place and take care of their needs.

And let me make one final remark to you about my friend, your nominee for Governor. For 12 years I had the honor of being the Governor of my State. It was an incredible experience. And I learned a few things about doing it. And I'll tell you, if you want to succeed over the long run, you have to recognize, number one, a lot of these problems cannot be solved in Washington. I can put in place good economic policies, good health care policies, good education policies, good anticrime policies, but still, in the statehouses and in the city halls, the shape of the future will be determined by the quality of the people who are elected. The President cannot do it; the Congress cannot do it. It matters.

The second thing I want to tell you is Governors understand that partisan politics doesn't have much to do with whether kids get educated, jobs get created, streets are safer, if you're doing your job right. You need someone who can unify people; someone who believes that we don't have a person to waste, that we cannot afford to be divided; someone who will tell you hard truths but tell you hard truths in a way that will bring us together, not tear us apart; and you also need someone with an eye on the future.

This man I know well. He was the first member of your delegation to endorse my candidacy. I hope that doesn't hurt him here this year. And I can tell you, he will be a Governor you can be proud of. He will unite the people of this State, not divide them. And he will always be thinking about the future. We are living in a time when the average person will change jobs seven times in a lifetime. We cannot afford people to ever, ever, ever forget about the fact that politics can never be about what works in the moment. We have to be thinking about tomorrow. So I say to you: I want you to elect him Governor. I want you to elect Bob Carr Senator. I want you to return these Members of the House delegation, without whom this economic recovery would not be underway.

Every one of them will be attacked by their Republican opponents as being the same old tax-and-spend, blah, blah, blah, blah. [*Laughter*] The truth is, the crowd that was in there before in all the Reagan years and the Bush years, they cut taxes on the rich, raised taxes on the middle class, exploded the deficit, and the economy went downhill, and ignored things like what was happening to the auto industry.

We have an economic strategy. It includes fair taxation, but we're bringing the deficit down, investing in education and training, building the economy, and looking toward the future. I think that's what the American people want us to do. If they know what the record is, these people will all be returned. You make sure they know.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:08 p.m. at the Westin Hotel. In his remarks, the President referred to Mayor Dennis Archer of Detroit.

Remarks on Presenting the Presidential Medals of Freedom

August 8, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the White House. As you might imagine, one of the great pleasures of the Presidency is selecting recipients of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest honor given to civilians by the United States of America.

If I might begin on a very personal and immediate note, last fall this annual ceremony was held on a very happy day for me and for those of us who want a safer and more humane United States. It was the day we made the Brady bill the law of the land. Today as we gather here, Congress is on the verge of voting on the most comprehensive anticrime bill in history. But that bill has been held hostage for 11 days by certain special interest groups. So as we recognize the contributions of civilians to our country's way of life, I'd like to take this opportunity to call on those groups who are blocking the crime bill to let it come to a vote and ask the other citizens of the United States to ask

the Congress for the same thing. Many people we honor here today have given their whole lives to enriching the fabric of the future, and we can do no less.

This afternoon we will present the Presidential Medal of Freedom to nine remarkable individuals whose service to our democracy and to humanity has advanced the common interest of freedom-loving people, not only here at home but throughout the world: Herbert Block, the late Cesar Chavez, Arthur Flemming, Dorothy Height, Barbara Jordan, Lane Kirkland, Robert Michel, and Sargent Shriver.

The medals these Americans receive today has a special history. It was established by President Truman in 1945 at first to reward notable service in the war. In 1963 President Kennedy amended the award for distinguished civilian service in peacetime. The honorees that year included the singer Marian Anderson, Justice Felix Frankfurter, diplomat John McCloy, labor leader George Meany, the writer E.B. White, playwright Thornton Wilder, and the artist Andrew Wyeth. By the time that first ceremony was held here in the White House in December of 1963, President Johnson had added to the roll of names President Kennedy and His Holiness Pope John XXIII.

Listen to this: At that time, Under Secretary of State George Ball said that the President is establishing what we can proudly call an American civil honors list. How many of our greatest citizens, who went on to achieve other things, said that the greatest thing that could ever be said about them was that they were good citizens. That is true in every way of those we honor today.

Herbert Block, or ''Herblock'' as we know him, became an editorial cartoonist with the Chicago Daily News in 1929, not a very good year to begin writing funny cartoons. [*Laughter*] His long and prolific career has spanned the Presidencies of 11 different Presidents. The fact that he gets to choose the targets in cartoons may have something to do with the longevity of his career. His cartoons have appeared in the Washington Post since 1946, the year I was born. [*Laughter*] He educates and persuades public opinion with effectiveness, artistry, warmth, and great good humor. He has a big heart. He sides with the little guy, people of common sense, and all who hold healthy irreverence for any sort of pretensions.

Cesar Chavez, before his death in April of last year, had become a champion of working people everywhere. Born into Depression-era poverty in Arizona in 1927, he served in the United States Navy in the Second World War and rose to become one of our greatest advocates of nonviolent change. He was, for his own people, a Moses figure. The farm workers who labored in the fields and yearned for respect and self-sufficiency pinned their hopes on this remarkable man, who with faith and discipline, with soft-spoken humility and amazing inner strength led a very courageous life and in so doing brought dignity to the lives of so many others and provided for us inspiration for the rest of our Nation's history. We are honored to have his wife, friend, and longtime working partner, Helen Chavez, to be with us today to receive the award.

Arthur Flemming served every President from Franklin Roosevelt to Ronald Reagan as the Republican member of the Civil Service Commission, as a member of the Hoover commission on the executive branch established by President Truman, as Director of Defense Mobilization and a member of President Eisenhower's National Security Council, and as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In addition to being an able administrator, Dr. Flemming is also a respected educator and former journalist. Over the course of his long and eminent career in public service, he contributed to the struggles for Social Security, civil rights, and most recently health care reform, something for which the First Lady and I are particularly in his debt. These three struggles he calls the greatest domestic crusades of his lifetime.

James Grant is the remarkable executive director of the United Nations Children's Fund, UNICEF, where he has tirelessly waged a global crusade on behalf of the world's children. Like his father before him, he was born and raised in China, where he took up his family's tradition of offering assistance abroad and first went to work for the United Nations at the end of World War II. In the fall of 1992 he helped to broker

a brief ceasefire during the siege of Sarajevo and personally directed the safe passage of a convoy carrying winter supplies of clothing, blankets, and food. As the international community's guardian of innocent children in troubled regions, he oversees the delivery of humanitarian assistance that without him might otherwise never reach those in need.

Dorothy Height is one of the world's most tireless and accomplished advocates of civil rights, the rights of women, and the health and stability of family and community life. From the days when she helped Eleanor Roosevelt to organize the World Youth Conference in 1938, she has remained engaged in the public arena for 60 years and more. As a leader of the National Council of Negro Women and the Young Women's Christian Association, she's been a powerful voice for equal opportunity here and in developing nations around the world. In recent years, her Black Family Reunion celebrations have reminded our society that self help and self reliance within loving extended families are the dominant cultural traditions of the African-American community.

For 20 years Barbara Jordan has been the most outspoken moral voice of the American political system, a position she reached soon after becoming the first black Congresswoman elected from the deep South from her native Texas in 1972. From national platforms she has captured the Nation's attention and awakened its conscience in defense of our Constitution, the American dream, and the commonality we share as American citizens. As professor of ethics and public policy at the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, she ensures that the next generation of our public servants will be worthy of the legacy she has done so much to build.

Lane Kirkland has been at the center of the American labor movement for almost 50 years. After serving in the merchant marine during the Second World War and his subsequent graduation from the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, he became a researcher for organized labor in the same year that he worked as a 26-year-old speechwriter in the 1948 campaign of Harry Truman and his running mate, Alben Barkley. Throughout the cold war, when some leaders saw only the threats to our freedom overseas and neglected the barriers to freedom and inequality within our own land, Kirkland showed America that you can stand up to communism abroad just as forcefully as you can stand up for working men and women here at home. As president of the AFL–CIO for the last 15 years, he has helped to teach us that solidarity is a powerful word in any language and that a vibrant labor movement is essential to every free society.

Robert Michel has served in the United States House of Representatives since 1957. That is the second longest tenure of any Republican in American history. As minority leader in the House for the last 13 years, he has served his party well, but he has also served our Nation well, choosing the pragmatic but harder course of conciliation more often than the divisive but easier course of confrontation. In the best sense he is a gentleman legislator who, in spite of the great swings in public opinion from year to year, has remained always true to the midwestern values he represents so faithfully in the House. He retires at the end of this year, generally regarded by Democrats and Republicans alike as one of the most decent and respected leaders with which any President has had the privilege to work.

Sargent Shriver is the man who launched the Peace Corps 33 years ago. Because of his creativity, his idealism, his brilliance, the Peace Corps remains one of the most popular Government initiatives ever undertaken. From the time he and his wife, Eunice, helped to organize a conference on juvenile delinquency for the Attorney General in 1947 to his efforts for public education in Chicago in the 1950's, to his leadership of Head Start and legal services and now the Special Olympics, Sargent Shriver has awakened millions of Americans, including many in this administration, to the responsibilities of service, the possibilities of change, and the sheer joy of making the effort.

These recipients of the Presidential Medal of Freedom represent different political parties, different ideologies, different professions, indeed, even different ages. Their different eras, different races, different generations in American history cannot be permitted to obscure the fact of what they share in common: an unusually profound sense of

responsibility to improve the lives of their fellow men and women, to improve the future for our children, to embody the best of what we mean by the term "American citizen." By their remarkable records of service and by their incredible spirit, we have all been enriched.

And now I would ask the military aide to read the citations as I present the Medal of Freedom.

[*At this point, Major Leo Mercado, Jr., USMC, Marine Corps aide to the President, read the citations, and the President presented the medals.*]

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, in closing let me say that I couldn't help thinking, as the citations were read and I looked into the faces of our honorees and their families, friends, and admirers here, that we too often reserve our greatest accolades for our citizens when they are gone. I wish that Cesar Chavez could be here today. I am grateful that his wife is here, and I am so grateful that all these others are here.

Let us remember today that the greatest gift any of us can give the Founders of this Constitution and this Republic is to emulate the work of these citizens whom we honor today, every day, each in our own way.

Thank you for being here. God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:40 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Remarks at a Fundraiser for the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee

August 8, 1994

Thank you. Thank you very much, Senator Graham. Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you'll forgive me. I have my annual August ragweed voice. If you don't have allergies and you can't tell whether ragweed has come out in Washington, DC, you just wait for me to get my sort of, you know, raspy—surely there's a role for me in the movies when I talk like this. I could be the guy that delivers the bad news, and that wouldn't be any role change I would have to take. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank many people. I thank the incumbent Senators who are here, Senator Graham and the others who have worked so hard. I also want to congratulate the nominees who are here. We have an exceptionally outstanding group of people: Bob Carr, Alan Wheat, Tom Andrews, Sam Coppersmith, Jim Cooper, all from the House of Representatives, and former Congressman Jim Jontz, all of whom have real records of fighting for the interests of ordinary Americans in trying to build this country and all of whom have a real chance to be elected to the United States Senate if we work hard for them.

Joel Hyatt from Ohio is not here tonight, but he and I were in law school together. He's younger than I am. Most people are these days. [*Laughter*] And those who aren't look younger now. Joel Hyatt began a program when we were in law school for undergraduates to tutor inner-city kids and then went on to become famous by making legal representation available to ordinary middle class folks. The program he started when we were in law school is still operating there, a real tribute to his capacity to innovate.

Richard Fisher from Texas is also not here tonight, but he is another longtime friend of mine who worked with me in the Democratic Leadership Council and tried to bring new ideas into the party. And believe it or not, in Texas, no matter how much the Republicans crow, he's got an excellent chance to win there, and we're going to work hard for him.

The attorney general of Delaware is here, Charles Oberly, who—now, that's the job I used to have. That's the best job I ever had. I don't know why he wants to be in the Senate. When you're attorney general, you don't have to hire people or fire them, except your own staff; you don't have to raise taxes or cut spending; and when you do things that are unpopular, you can blame it on the Constitution. [*Laughter*] Nonetheless, he wants to leave that wonderful institution. And we were together in Delaware a few months ago. It was apparent to me, not only from what I read in the Delaware papers but from what I saw of him on the stump and the reaction of the people of Delaware, that he had an excellent chance to win that race.

I also want to note the presence here of Jack Mudd from Montana who, like me, was a law professor. But unlike me, he became the youngest law school dean in America. And it hasn't seemed to do him much harm; he's here running for the Senate. Everybody I know in Montana believes that he has a great chance to win. That State went Democratic in the last election. And it's a very tightly fought State, a very closely contested one, but I think he's got an excellent chance to win.

I'd like to mention three other folks who are here, two from the State legislature, Linda Kushner of Rhode Island and Ken Harper of Mississippi, and Pat Shea of Utah who used to be counsel for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, a committee that I worked for when I was trying to work myself through college here in the 1960's. I have had the occasion to meet and be with all three of them over the years, and I highly recommend them to all of you.

Most of you have heard me speak before. The last thing you need to hear is me give another speech, except when I'm hoarse. But I want to make a couple of points. I ran for President as an underdog, as a challenger. I was buried two or three times before the final vote came in. One of the things that I know is that you can't win a race unless you want to win for something bigger than yourself and that if you do want to win for something bigger than yourself, you have always got a chance to win. I know that you can't win in a tough time if you don't fight, but if you do fight, you're always in the race. And I know that the American people are basically ambivalent about most things in their politics today. I think it is largely because of the time in which we live. And I think it is an enormous opportunity for us to show conviction and direction.

And I might say—I don't want to single out just one of the Senators here, but I am very, very proud of the conviction, direction, and strength that Chuck Robb is showing in his heroic fight to be reelected to the United States Senate from Virginia. And I want to begin with a story from one of his debates, and then I'll end with another one to illustrate what this election is all about.

When I entered the race for President in late 1991, when President Bush was at 70 percent approval in the polls and most people, aside from my mother, thought I had lost my mind, I did it because I was very worried that this National Government had become more about words than deeds and that we had become addicted to seeing the Presidents always worried about how they were positioned, rather than what they were doing, and that we were moving toward the 21st century at a breathtaking pace with the economy going down, the deficit going up, the middle class being squeezed—genuinely in danger of losing our position of energy and leadership and direction in the world. It seemed to me that to keep the American dream alive, we had to do some simple things that were not being done. We had to restore the economy, empower individuals to compete and win in it, rebuild our communities and support our families, and make Government work for ordinary people again.

When I started running for President—I was looking out there—Jerry McEntee came out for me fairly early, and a lot of people thought he had lost his mind because some people said, "Well, Clinton's not enough of a Democrat; he's always working with Republicans and trying to get things done." I plead guilty: I did that. I was even popular with the previous administration until I filed. [*Laughter*] I believed, you know, that we had all these problems that did not fit very neatly within the categories that the Democrats and the Republicans had used in the past, and I still believe that.

But I want to tell you what the problem is and why these races are so important with two stories. I'll begin and end with one. The one I'll begin with was from Senator Robb's first debate on the Larry King show. The other three guys were just pounding, you know, and Marshall Coleman looked at him and said, "You come from conservative Virginia, and you pretend to be a conservative, but you are one of the top 10 Democrats supporting Bill Clinton in the United States Senate." Chuck Robb looked at Marshall Coleman and smiled, and he said, "Yep, and I was one of the top 10 Democrats supporting George Bush in the United States Senate. I do not believe the purpose of politics is

to destroy the President, and I've finally got somebody who is trying to get the deficit down instead of just talk about it, and so I supported him.'' And I never will forget that.

Now, what's that got to do with anything? You have to decide what the purpose of your public life is. Is it to do things that genuinely respond to the needs of people, or is it to posture? You remember one of the Republican House Members that's leaving the House, Fred Grandy, said the other day that his colleagues had been told not to work with us on health care. Senator Dole was quoted a few weeks ago as saying, well, he understood that some of the Republican Senators wanted to work with us on health care and work something out, but ''I've got a party to think of.''

Now, all I know is, when we showed up here, the deficit was going up and the economy was going down. And with no help from them, we passed an economic program that cut spending by $255 billion, cut taxes on 15 million working Americans, made 90 percent of the small businesses eligible for tax cuts, raised taxes on 1.2 percent of the people but devoted all the money to paying the deficit down, made 20 million Americans eligible to refinance their college loans at a lower interest rate. And not a one of them helped us. They said the sky would fall. They said the deficit would go up and the economy would go down. I never heard so much Chicken Little talk in my life as we heard a year ago this month.

And they all talked about how we were the tax-and-spend party and they were against big government. You just remember this: The Democrats alone, with not a single, solitary vote from the opposition party, adopted a budget which will shrink the Federal Government to fewer than 2 million people for the first time since John Kennedy was President—something they say they're for but couldn't or wouldn't do—that will give us 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President—something they said they were for but couldn't or wouldn't do—and has produced 4.1 million new jobs in 18 months.

Now, that's why I want these people to win, not because I am an abject partisan—my whole record shows that I'm always willing to work with people from the other side—but because the voters have to send a message to all of us that they expect problems to be solved. If the message they send is they'd rather have hot air than firm action to advance the cause of middle class people, then the Democrats will start behaving the same way.

We must keep our eyes on doing things, and then we need to stand up and do them. Today I had the pleasure of presenting the Presidential Medal of Freedom to nine distinguished Americans, one of whom was Barbara Jordan from Texas, and I wish she were here tonight. She said, ''I just don't get it.'' You can just imagine. She said, ''The Democrats have a wonderful record; what they need is to fight for it.'' Barbara Jordan said that.

We need this crime bill. It's being held up by people who know if it comes to a vote, it'll pass overwhelmingly. So they think they can beat it on a technicality—and the American people won't understand it—called a rule. It's the House equivalent of the filibuster: Beat it, but act like you're not.

The Democrats have put together a bill the Republicans said they were for for 6 years but couldn't produce, that every one of us can be proud of: 100,000 more police, a 20 percent increase; tougher penalties; a ban on assault weapons; a ban on ownership of handguns by children; and billions of dollars in prevention programs to give our kids something to say yes to. We cannot walk away from it.

In the health care debate, we have on the floor of both Houses of Congress, for the first time in the history of the Republic, bills that would provide health care to all Americans—never been done before, never even got on the floor before. And yes, there's a lot of controversy about it. There's a lot of information and a lot of misinformation, some genuine difference of opinion. But we do know some things about which there is no dispute. And the burden should be, therefore, on those who have no plan.

We know we spend more on health care than anybody else, 40 percent more of our income. We know that even though we do that, we're the only country in the world with an advanced economy that hasn't figured out

how to cover everybody. We know that we're the only country going in reverse. There are 5 million Americans today, almost all of them working Americans and their children, who don't have insurance who did have insurance just 5 years ago. That's not happening anywhere else in the world, only here.

So by what reasoning is it that we say, "This is good that we spend 40 percent more than anybody else, do less"? We're the only ones losing ground, and we spend billions and billions on paperwork, bureaucracy, and administrative costs that no one else spends. We say we are a pragmatic people. But we know that in Hawaii, small business insurance rates are 30 percent lower than the rest of the country because everybody's covered and everybody bears some of the burden.

Should we try something else? I'm willing to try something else for 4 or 5 years. I think it ought to be phased in. I think we ought to be careful. I think we ought to give the market a chance to work. But I think we also should not walk away from what we know works.

The main thing I want to tell you is this: When we enter this debate, what I hope it will be about is the health care of the American people, their pocketbooks, the pocketbook of the Federal Government, the quality of care, the ability to choose your doctors, and the ability to meet the legitimate needs of middle class working people, and not politics.

Last week—and this is the story I want to end with—last week I had the honor of doing something that Presidents have done for 44 years: that is to present awards every year, with the Attorney General, to four young Americans who have either shown great heroism or great public service. One of the public service winners was a young woman from Keyes, Oklahoma, who was paralyzed in 1990 from the chest down in a car accident and since then has spent her time trying to organize children not to drink and drive, not to ride with people who drink and drive, and always to wear their seatbelts. In other words, instead of being bitter, this beautiful child is trying to make sure other people don't have the experience she did.

And so there I was, just totally captivated with this young woman and her little sister and her fine father and mother. And her daddy was a farmer from Keyes, Oklahoma, way out in western Oklahoma. And we just got to talking about health care. And he said, "You know, I was paying $3,400 a year for a limited policy. And my daughter's bills, they were all over 2 years ago. We hadn't had any bills in 2 years. But they told me I had used up my wellness quotient, and my premium is going to $9,600 in 2 weeks. So in 2 weeks, we'll be out of insurance." And he said—he tickled me—he said, "It's not a political deal." He said, "I'm a Republican, Mr. President." But he said, "If somebody's working as hard as I'm working and can't even have health insurance for their kids, something is wrong somewhere."

And so as we begin this debate, there are legitimate differences of approach. I welcome them. Nobody's smart enough to know everything about this issue. But let us remember that farmer from Keyes, Oklahoma, and his fine wife and his two beautiful daughters and ask ourselves, how will he send them to college if he can't even pay their health insurance? And when we go into these fall elections, let us proudly say, "Yes, we're Democrats." And when they attack us for being tax-and-spend, say, "We cut taxes on 10 times as many people as we raised them on. You guys had a bigger Government than we're having. We're just trying to solve the problems of the people of the country. We put 100,000 police on the street without a tax increase by shrinking the Federal bureaucracy."

We can win the partisan debates if we'll fight. But the main thing we need to do is to remember that this is a difficult and confusing time for our people. The cold war is over. We're moving to a new era. It has not been defined. Every time this happens, the American people become vulnerable. At the end of World War I, we were vulnerable to the first Red scare and to the Ku Klux Klan. At the end of World War II, the same thing happened all over again. The only difference was Harry Truman gladly let his popularity drop from 80 percent to 36 percent to keep our eye on the ball, to rebuild the country and recapture the rest of the world. And in the end, the American people worked through their confusion and came back to

their better nature. And they will now if we can make this election about them, not about an argument between Republicans and Democrats, not about all these rhetorical hard balls. Let's just stand up and defend what we've done, defend what we believe in, and fight for the American people. If we do, the crowd we've got in this room can win these elections in November.

Thank you, and God bless you.

Note: The President spoke at 7:54 p.m. at the Hyatt Regency Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Gerald W. McEntee, international president, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees.

Memorandum on Assistance to Nations of Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union

August 8, 1994

Presidential Determination No. 94–40

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Transfer of $1 Million in FY 1994 Foreign Military Financing Funds to the International Military Education and Training Account to Increase Programs for Countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 610(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (the "Act"), I hereby determine that it is necessary for the purposes of the Act that $1 million of funds made available for the purposes of section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, be transferred to, and consolidated with, funds made available for Chapter 5 of Part II of the Act.

I hereby authorize the use of the aforesaid $1 million in funds made available under Chapter 5 of Part II of the Act to increase programs for countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

You are hereby authorized and directed to report this determination immediately to the Congress and to publish it in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on August 9.

Memorandum on Military Assistance to Jamaica

August 8, 1994

Presidential Determination No. 94–41

Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense, The Secretary of State

Subject: Determination to Authorize the Furnishing of Emergency Military Assistance to Jamaica Under Section 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 506(a)(1) the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2318(a)(1) (the "Act"), I hereby determine that:

(1) an unforeseen emergency exists, which requires immediate military assistance to Jamaica; and

(2) the emergency requirement cannot be met under the authority of the Arms Export Control Act or any other law except section 506 of the Act.

Therefore, I hereby authorize the furnishing of up to $1,500,000 in defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense, defense services of the Department of Defense, and military education and training to Jamaica.

The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to report this determination to the Congress and to arrange for its publication in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on August 9.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Levon Ter-Petrosyan of Armenia

August 9, 1994

Crime Legislation

Q. Mr. President, on the crime bill, the Republicans have written a letter to you asking for a last-minute compromise to eliminate the money for crime prevention and then they would go ahead with the 100,000 new police officers. Is it too late to do anything like that? Are you inclined to go ahead with the compromise?

President Clinton. Republicans in the House or the Senate?

Q. In the House.

President Clinton. Well, the House voted a great amount of money for crime prevention, and all of the law enforcement groups asked for it. The people who are out there on the front lines of law enforcement want to give these kids something to say yes to, as well as something to say no to. We provide tougher penalties, more money for jails. Surely we can also provide some money in these areas that have been devastated economically, devastated by the breakdown of family and community, to give these kids a future.

And somebody's always got a reason not to do this. As Leon said earlier today, there's something wrong when the Congress takes 6 years to pass a crime bill and the average violent criminal is out of prison in 4 years. We have debated all this. Let's vote on it, vote the bill, and not take any more time getting it implemented.

Q. What are you telling House Members in your phone calls to them, sir? And do you think you've got it nailed down? Do you think you have the vote nailed down tomorrow?

President Clinton. I don't know; we're working hard. You know, we've got the NRA against us, and we've got a lot of other issues out there. But we're doing our best to win. And the American people are with us. The future of the country clearly would be better if we passed this crime bill.

Nagorno-Karabakh

Q. Mr. President, how do you feel about—[*inaudible*]—Russian peacekeeping troops in Nagorno-Karabakh——

President Clinton. It depends on what they want. If the parties agree to it, and there were clear CSCE safeguards so that we had the right sort of oversight in the process, and the parties agreed to it, then the United States would not object.

Q. What do you think about that, President Ter-Petrosyan? Would you favor Russian peacekeeping troops in Nagorno-Karabakh?

President Ter-Petrosyan. We are interested in the soonest establishment of peace. And I think that the most important in this issue is the establishment of peace itself and not who will do that.

[*At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.*]

Q. Are you happy with the Russian role as mediators in Nagorno-Karabakh? Are you happy with the American role, or anything you would like to be changed?

President Clinton. Well, what I'm happy about is that the parties have agreed to a cease-fire and they're talking directly. And if they agree among themselves to a peace arrangement, if it involves the Russians, if it involves the CSCE, the United States would be inclined to support the ultimate agreement if the parties agree. What we want is to have a peace, and we want to then help to rebuild Armenia and to support the development of the entire area.

Aid to Armenia

Q. President Clinton, will you be continuing humanitarian aid to Armenia?

President Clinton. Yes, The United States will have a very significant aid package this year.

NOTE: The exchange began at 5:45 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, the President referred to Chief of Staff Leon Panetta. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Statement on Most-Favored-Nation Trading Status for China

August 9, 1994

I am committed to pursuing a sensible policy towards China that vigorously promotes the full range of U.S. interests in China, including improved human rights. We look forward to working with Congress toward these ends in the future.

NOTE: This statement was included in a statement by the Press Secretary on House of Representatives action to continue most-favored-nation trading status for China.

Proclamation 6713—Minority Enterprise Development Week, 1994

August 9, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Growth and development in the minority business community are crucial to the social fabric, as well as to the overall economy, of this Nation. While racial and ethnic minorities constitute over 26 percent of the total U.S. population—a proportion that is constantly growing—minority citizens continue to be underrepresented in commerce and industry.

This lack of representation results in losses of opportunities and in losses to the American economy. This can and must be rectified. Every individual has a contribution to make and deserves to participate fully in the public and private sectors of the United States, without regard to racial or ethnic origin.

Minority business development is an essential element in helping to enable every American to become a full participant in the economic life of our country. Minority entrepreneurs often face tremendous odds on the road to success. However, the assistance and encouragement of our Government is available to all of our citizens. This includes up-to-date information regarding market opportunities, increased capital for business expansion, advice and experience in business management, and recognition of the quality goods and services minority-owned firms can provide.

Commerce in America is at a watershed: to achieve economic security, we must eliminate old ways of doing business and initiate practices that are inclusive. Discriminatory and exclusionary practices have no place in our Nation. Ours has always been a society comprised of minorities; diversity is our strength. And everyone must be included in this country's economic team.

We are definitely on the right track, as the economic policies of this Administration have already resulted in renewed economic growth that has generated 3.5 million new private-sector jobs for our citizens. And with the unemployment rates of our minority citizens showing improvement as well, this means we are producing more jobs for those Americans who have too often been excluded from the mainstream of our society. But more remains to be done, and we will need to look to minority businesspeople to become a cornerstone of an urban renaissance, creating even more jobs where we most need them. Minority business development is one place where a small investment can yield tremendous dividends.

Minority Enterprise Development Week highlights the benefits of commercial and economic expansion for minorities and offers us an opportunity to acknowledge the growing number of successful minority entrepreneurs and to pledge support for continued growth.

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 the week of October 9 through October 15, 1994, as "Minority Enterprise Development Week." I call on the people of the United States to recognize the contributions that minority-owned businesses make to the well-being of this Nation and to observe this occasion with appropriate ceremonies.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this ninth day of August, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-four, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:19 a.m., August 10, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on August 11.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Convention on Pollock Resources in the Central Bering Sea

August 9, 1994

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I trans-

mit herewith the Convention on the Conservation and Management of Pollock Resources in the Central Bering Sea, with Annex, done at Washington on June 16, 1994. The Convention was signed on that date by the People's Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, and the United States. Japan and the Republic of Poland, the other participating countries in the negotiation of the Convention, are expected to sign the Convention in the near future. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, a report of the Secretary of State concerning the Convention.

This Convention is a state-of-the-art fishing agreement that will aid in ensuring the long-term health of pollock stocks in the central Bering Sea on which the U.S. pollock industry in the Pacific Northwest in part depends. Its strong conservation and management measures will be backed up with effective enforcement provisions. The agreement will require that each vessel fishing for pollock in the central Bering Sea carry scientific observers and use real-time satellite position-fixing transmitters. All vessels of the Parties fishing in the central Bering Sea must consent to boarding and inspection by authorized officials of other States Parties for compliance with the provisions of the Convention.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Convention and provide its advice and consent to ratification.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
August 9, 1994.

Remarks on Health Care Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

August 10, 1994

The President. I'd like to make a brief statement and then ask Governor Waihee and Mr. Bowles to say a thing or two.

This is a very important week for our country. You know, it's the first time in our history that we've ever had a debate on the floor of either House of the Congress on the question of health care coverage for all Americans. Something that in other advanced nations people take for granted, we've never even been able to debate on the floor of our Congress. And I'm very hopeful that in both Houses they'll be able to work out enough of a consensus to pass a bill that will enable us to go to conference and come out and ultimately have legislation that does provide universal coverage.

We wanted to ask you here today to talk about Hawaii for a couple of reasons, first of all because so much of this debate—I think way too much—has turned on the question of the requirement that employers share the cost of buying private insurance with their employees. And a lot of very dramatic claims, dire claims have been made about that. Hawaii has been doing it for 20 years. It works. Businesses have thrived. Jobs have not been lost. And the most important thing is that you can see that in addition to having lower costs for small business premiums, the closer you get to full coverage, the closer you get to the other goals of health care: cost control, better health care outcomes. These are the things, it seems to me, that cannot be refuted by the people on the other side of this argument.

What it ultimately boils down to is they're saying, "Well, we have this evidence in Hawaii," or "We have evidence in Germany, but we don't want to deal with it. We still don't want to pay." And it just seems to me that—there's another issue I want to bring up that I keep talking about that's very important. Health coverage for people under 65 has dropped from 88 to 83 percent in the last 10 years. There are 5 million Americans today who had coverage 5 years ago who don't have it today. Almost all of them are working people and their children. I do not think that Congress ought to send a message to the country that it is fine with us if this deplorable development continues, if we just see a continuing erosion of the health care system in America, more and more people without coverage.

So I'm looking forward to the week and next week and the months ahead in the hopes that we can really get something done. And I think that this example of Hawaii is important because it is not refutable; it actually happened. And it's not like Germany; they

can't say, ''Well, it didn't happen here.'' It actually happened in the United States.

[*At this point, the President called on Governor John Waihee of Hawaii and Small Business Administrator Erskine Bowles, and each made brief remarks.*]

Health Care Legislation

Q. Mr. President, the employer mandate aside, there seems to be an increasing frustration among some members of the business community about the way the health care reform bills are shaping up on Capitol Hill. Specifically, there are concerns that employers may lose control of ability to negotiate with insurance companies and, therefore, control their costs. This is directed specifically at the Mitchell bill, although they have problems with the Gephardt bill as well. Are there some changes that you would be willing to accept to meet some of the concerns being expressed now by the business community?

The President. I hope they'll get in there and make these concerns known in the whole debate.

My bottom line is what it has always been. I think we have to have a system that, over a period of time, will lead to universal coverage, because I do not believe, number one, that you can do right by the American people without it, and number two, that you can achieve the other goals we have, which are cost control—cost containment, maybe, is a better word—and better health care. Those are my principal goals.

There are a lot of members of the business community that I would urge to get into this debate with both feet. One of the reasons that the bills are in the position that they're in today is that the people who were against this from the beginning and wanted to wreck it over the mandate were out there focused like a laser beam on beating it. I think one of them was quoted in the press today talking about how great they were getting votes against things. Whereas all the people who were for it and knew it had to be done took a more wait-and-see attitude, hoping that this little change or that little change might make it a better bill. Now that it's actually on the floor, I think it's incumbent on everybody to get in there and participate in the debate.

I do believe that the more you move to universal coverage, the more all the objectives of these employers who do cover their employees will be met, because it will stop cost shifting; they won't have to bear the burden of anybody else's cost. And it will have more employers, even the small business groups, in there negotiating to keep health care costs down, which I think will help them very much.

Q. Mr. President, how do you feel the debate is going so far? And do you have any feeling on when you think it will come to a vote in the Senate?

The President. I think it's going pretty well. It may take a few more days to start having critical votes, depending on what happens in the House on the crime bill. I just don't know enough about the timing of the bodies to be sure, but we're going to try to resolve the crime bill in the House this week and move it over there, and so they may take a little longer. I think they still want to go on their August break at the end of the following week. So I hope we'll have some action before then.

Q. Are you disappointed that more members of the business community who you feel favor your ideas and proposals have not gotten involved in this debate and come to your defense, because as you know, the Washington Post reported this morning that several large business groups are now coming together to jointly oppose the Mitchell bill, the Gephardt bill? Are you disappointed that these people haven't spoken out?

The President. I met yesterday with a dozen or more business leaders who went outside the White House and once again reaffirmed their support for universal coverage. And if you read between the lines in the—at least my reading, to go back to Donna's [Donna Smith, Reuters] question, my reading of the Washington Post story today is that a lot of those people disagree with the NFIB, think they're dead wrong, want a requirement that employers and employees provide for health care through private insurance. And they're worried that the necessary changes that Senator Mitchell has made to try to get the bill through the Senate may not meet their needs.

Well, the answer for them is to come in and try to fix the bill and stay with universal coverage. That would be my counsel. The business leaders—I met with several yesterday—told me they were terribly worried that if we passed up this opportunity to have universal coverage, we would continue to see what has happened so dramatically in the last 5 years where you've lost—you know, 5 million people don't have coverage who had it 5 years ago. More and more businesses are dropping their coverage. All those costs are being shifted on to the employers who are taking care of their employees, which makes the small businesses even more vulnerable and the big businesses even less competitive in the global economy, which will mean further aggravation.

That's one thing that I think that Congress has got to come to grips with. We just can't allow the kind of disinformation that Mr. Bowles talked about and the intense, almost hysterical fear that's been bred in some of the small business community, and has been therefore felt by the Congress, to ignore the fact that we have a system that is breaking up. We're losing ground on the coverage. We've got millions more people without coverage and millions more at risk of losing it than we had just a few years ago. So, we're going in reverse.

That, it seems to me, is a great argument for the Hawaii system. You've got something you know will work, you know won't hurt business, and you know won't go in reverse. And we can build on it and move to full coverage.

Q. Have you been disappointed with the lack of support in the business community to date——

Q. But you're asking them now to come forward at this critical time. Where were they before, and aren't you disappointed?

The President. First of all, we had a press conference here and announced 600,000 small businesses had joined our coalition. That's more members than NFIB has. We put this coalition together around health care. Therefore, unlike the NFIB, they don't have the mailing lists, the political action committees, the way of putting pressure on people at the local level. But we've shown business strength.

We've also had very large numbers of large businesses supporting our position. Do I wish they had come out stronger earlier? Of course I do. But this is nothing new. The AARP has now come out strongly in favor of what we're doing, but they ran ads for a long time which said, ''Don't support a health care plan that doesn't have prescription drugs and long-term care.'' Our plan did, but somebody—not we but somebody else did research which showed that people thought, ''Well, why didn't Bill Clinton's plan have prescription drugs and long-term care?''

So this is what always happens. Some of you may have heard me quote this before. Machiavelli said 500 years ago that there is nothing so difficult in all of human affairs than to change the established order of things, because people who are afraid they're going to lose fight you like crazy and people who will win are always uncertain of the result until the very end. And in that vacuum the antis, even if they're less numerous than the pros, can acquire a strategic advantage. That's plainly what happened in the last 4 months, 5 months in the House and in the Senate where there was just this ''kill it, kill it, kill it, kill it, kill it'' drumbeat coming out of the ones who were negative. But there are more American citizens, more American businesses who know we ought to have universal coverage and who support it. It's not too late to rescue that. That's why we have a debate.

And I would remind you, in spite of all that, this is the first time in history we ever even got bills to the floor of both Houses of Congress. Truman couldn't do it. President Nixon couldn't do it. Nobody who's tried to do it has ever been able to do it. So I feel good about where we are, and I think now the public voices of reason from the business community and elsewhere have a chance to be heard.

Administrator Bowles. The Governor and I will stay for questions. The President is going to have one more question and then he has to leave.

Q. We're getting very close to a vote on a bill that would restructure 15 percent of the national economy, yet Wall Street seems to be completely ignoring the debate right now. Why do you think that is?

The President. You would have to ask them. I think partly because they know it wouldn't fully restructure 15 percent of the economy. It would simply build on what we have. The things the Government's doing wouldn't change, except we would be more efficient in the management of the Medicare and Medicaid programs. But that would stay there. We would still fund Medicare. We would still fund Medicaid. Almost all the people in the country today who are providing health insurance would have the decision, the freedom just to keep doing what they're doing now.

Only the most limited and inadequate plans would have to be substantially changed, so they could go into a different plan or stay in the one they've got. That's why this plan shouldn't bother Wall Street very much because under all the scenarios we've been discussing, what we're basically trying to do is to close that gap of people who work but don't have coverage and people who don't work but are above the poverty line and don't have coverage. That's basically what we're trying to do. The whole rest of the system will stay intact. And a lot of the structural changes which are occurring for the better, enabling a better cost control for some, will now be available for all.

I think it's important to point out—Erskine pointed out that the small business rates went up 14 percent last year; health care costs went up 4.8 percent last year. So what we're trying to do is to make this available for all, the cost containment as well as the coverage.

Q. Your wife yesterday seemed to suggest that she thought the Gephardt bill might have a better chance of producing the results you want. Do you have a similar feeling of that?

The President. I don't know. I haven't talked to her about it. And I read a couple of stories, and one seemed to suggest that, and one didn't. I can't comment on it. All I can tell you is the device for achieving universal coverage in both bills meets the criteria that I have. And I think it's quite interesting that the CBO thinks that Senator Mitchell could get to 95 percent by 1997, which is a very rapid uptake and would indicate that we could go on then and cover everybody.

Whitewater Independent Counsel

Q. Mr. President, what do you think of about the Starr nomination——

The President. Everybody else has talked about that. I'll cooperate with whoever's picked. I just want to get it done.

Health Care Legislation

Q. Mr. President, which of the two plans, the Mitchell or the Gephardt plan, most closely resembles the Hawaiian model?

The President. Ask Governor Waihee, he's an expert on that.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. They both resemble it in different ways, that's my read. They're both different, and they both have things in common.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:45 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Remarks Announcing Abner Mikva as White House Counsel and an Exchange With Reporters

August 11, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. I am delighted to announce that Chief Judge Abner Mikva of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia will become the new White House Counsel, effective October 1st.

I am very pleased to have a man of Judge Mikva's stature, integrity, judgment, and experience join us in our efforts. He's had a long and distinguished career in public service, and he will make a vital contribution to the operations of this White House. A World War II veteran, and a member of the Illinois legislature for 10 years, Judge Mikva was elected to the Congress in 1968. He served with distinction on the House Judiciary and Ways and Means Committees and built a reputation as a remarkably thoughtful, fair, and progressive public servant. In 1979, Judge Mikva went to the Federal bench on the highly regarded Court of Appeals here in Washington, where he has served as Chief Judge for the last 2 years. During the time that he served on this court, he's come to

be regarded, justifiably, as one of our Nation's leading jurists.

With his new post Judge Mikva will have served his country now in all three branches of our National Government. I expect that his broad experience, his deep understanding of our country, our people, and our institutions will make him an extremely valuable member of the White House team.

He is a man of great decency who loves his country very much. And I am very grateful that he's willing to give up his lifetime appointment to the Federal bench to serve the White House as Counsel.

The White House Counsel advises the President on matters of law and justice, ranging from the appointment of judges to the application of law throughout our society. He must ensure that the White House meets the highest standards of ethics and trust. Judge Mikva, a man of uncompromising integrity and judgment, is the right person for this job.

Let me also say a special word about the man whom Judge Mikva will replace. Lloyd Cutler came to the White House 5 months ago for the second time in his distinguished career to serve for a limited time as my Special Counsel. Once again, he has served his Nation magnificently. Mr. Cutler is a wise counselor, and I and all of us have benefited immensely from his contributions here at the White House. I thank him for all he has done here, and I look forward to his continuing good advice in the years to come.

It's a measure of the seriousness with which we view this office that we have turned to Abner Mikva as Lloyd Cutler's successor. And so I want to say to Judge Mikva, welcome to the White House.

Before I call Judge Mikva up, I'd like to make a special note of the debate now underway in the House of Representatives on the crime bill. As you know, this has been very hard fought. And there are many interest groups arguing that the Members of Congress should vote against the so-called rule to keep the crime bill from coming to a vote in the first place so that they can kill the crime bill without getting credit for killing the crime bill.

The choice is still the same: Are we going to put another 100,000 police officers on the street? Are we going to ban assault weapons? Are we going to ban ownership of handguns by minors? Are we going to make our schools safer? Are we going to give our young people something to say yes to, even as we make punishment stiffer and build more prisons?

The average violent criminal goes free in 4 years. This crime bill has been taking shape and has been up to the gate and thwarted for 6 years. There is something wrong with out national institutions when we can't do that. And I want to urge the House to pass the rule and the bill and do it today.

Judge Mikva, the microphone is yours.

[*At this point, Judge Mikva thanked the President and made brief remarks.*]

Baseball Strike

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us about the baseball strike which is about to start? As a fan, is there any reason why these negotiators should not be sitting down and at least trying to resolve this? They're not even meeting. Would you call upon them to at least sit down and have some talks?

Q. And don't go away, Mr. President. [*Laughter*]

The President. I've got to go away, because I've got to get back on the phone. If I don't—I'll have lots to talk to you about if we pass the rule today, but if I don't make some more calls, then I'll always wonder.

Let me make one comment about the baseball strike. First of all, I think that you should know that since the Secretary of Labor first contacted both sides, we have been in continuous contact with both sides and have done what we could to make some constructive suggestions about how to avoid the strike. It appears that both parties are determined to let the strike proceed. We will do what we can to be of help and to get things back on track if there is anything we can do.

Today I would like to speak on behalf of the country because this is an unusual situation. You know, when a company goes on strike, the right to strike is protected and the workers go on strike because they and the management can't reach agreement. But they always have to consider in the end their customers and what will happen if they lose their customers. In a great event like the baseball strike, I think there's an assumption

that the customers are always there. But the only thing I'd like to say to both sides is that there are a lot of little kids out there who don't want to see this season come to a close. And there are a lot of not-so-little kids out there who know it's the most exciting baseball season in 40 years.

And I hope that in the days ahead they will search for a way to get back together, finish this season, extend it by a few days so that all the games can be played, and the feelings of the American people that this could be one of those seasons that occurs once every four or five decades could be vindicated. I think the people really ought to be taken into consideration here, and I hope they will be.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Remarks on Crime Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

August 11, 1994

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, under any circumstances I would be disappointed if the House of Representatives turned its back on the toughest and largest attack on crime in the history of our country, at a time when the American people say it is the most important issue to them. But it is especially disheartening to see 225 Members of the House participate in a procedural trick orchestrated by the National Rifle Association, then heavily, heavily pushed by the Republican leadership in the House, and designed with only one thing in mind, to put the protection of particular interests over the protection of ordinary Americans.

I don't know how many people in the run up to this vote—of both parties, unfortunately—told me, "I'll vote for that bill, but I just have to vote against this procedural bill." "Oh, I'll vote for it if it ever gets to the floor, but I just have to vote against this rule," because of the assault weapons ban or because they had decided, many of them after the fact, that there was too much money in here for preventing crime and to give our children something to say yes to instead of something just to say no to, even though two-thirds of this money is for police and prisons and punishment.

Well, tonight a majority of the House attempted to take the easy way out. But they have failed the American people. And now I say to them, the easy way out is not an option. Fear and violence, especially among our children, will still be there tonight when they go home to bed. So I want them to come back tomorrow and the day after that and the day after that and to keep coming back until we give the American people the essential elements of this crime bill, until we put 100,000 police on the street and take our children and the guns off the street with the assault weapons ban and with the ban on ownership of handguns by juveniles, until we make "three strikes and you're out" the law of the land.

We have got to do these things. And yes, we have to both build more prisons and give our kids something to say yes to, not just something to say no to. The amazing thing is that this prevention money was supported by every major law enforcement organization in the United States, representing over a half a million police officers who know something about fighting crime and putting their lives on the line.

Today's vote is a vote against all of them, those people in law enforcement who stand out day-in and day-out and try to make our streets safer. It's a vote against their organizations who pleaded for this bill, the sheriffs, the police chiefs, the prosecutors, the attorneys general, a vote against the teachers and the others who work to keep our kids safe and secure, a vote against the Democratic mayor of Chicago and the Republican mayors of New York and Los Angeles. It's a vote against the families of children like James Darby and Polly Klaas who have been killed.

Now, we can do better than this. And I want the Congress and the House to go back to work tomorrow and figure out how to save the elements of this crime bill. This is about the American people. It is their number one concern. And the American people are not foolish enough to be conned into believing that people are really for doing something about crime, but they had to pull a political trick to keep the bill from being voted on.

Crime Legislation

Q. Mr. President, where do you go from here? Some of the main supporters of the bill say it's dead.

The President. Oh, I don't think so. But of course, that's what we were all worried about. We were afraid that this would be like Humpty Dumpty, you know. And of course, that's what they want, the people that are fighting against it. But they're going to be given a chance.

You know, for the last few days, all they heard from were the special interests and people that had been stirred up by a lot of the disinformation that had been put out. But tonight I think they've got a lot of explaining to do, because we know—you all know—that there were a majority of votes in the House for this, and the bill still went down on the rule because they thought they could pull a political trick and satisfy particular pressures on them without aggravating the rank-and-file citizens of this country. I think they're wrong. I think the people will figure it out.

Q. But there were 58 Democrats, Mr. President——

Q. Mr. President, are you saying that you will keep the Congress in session until this is done? Are you going to keep the Congress in session?

The President. I don't think they ought to go home. You know, the people who are committing these crimes are not going to take a vacation. They're going to be out there working overtime.

Q. Mr. President, there were 58 Democrats, including 10 members of the Black Caucus, one Republican member of the Black Caucus. What do you say to them? They went against you on this issue.

The President. Well, I say first of all let's look at the whole thing. There were 20 fewer Democrats voting against the rule than those who voted against the assault weapons ban. So there were 20 Democrats, probably 30, who said, "Okay, I lost that fight. But the safety of the people in my district is more important than my view on this particular issue and certainly more important than my killing this bill on a procedural vote." They were very brave. They stood up and took a lot of heat.

Now, there were 10 members of the Black Caucus whose opposition to the death penalty was so strong that they could not overcome their personal opposition. At least they had a principled position. But almost 3 times that many, including many who were disappointed because they didn't get what they wanted in that bill, still voted for it.

There were 11 brave Republicans who weathered enormous pressure. But there were 38 who voted against the assault weapons ban, and there were 65—65—who voted for the crime bill with about the same amount of prevention money in it when it passed as it has today. Now I hear them say, "Well, there's just too much prevention money here. We're doing too much in these programs to help these kids who are in trouble." Well, all I know is when it passed the first time at about this same dollar amount, there were 65 Republican votes for it. But I can tell you, they were put under a lot of pressure.

Now, they can figure out how to do this. I'm not in the Congress; I'm not a part of it. But they can figure out how to get this done. They know what the elements are. There is a majority now in both Houses for all of the elements of this crime bill. To let special interests use parliamentary maneuvers to undermine what is clearly the will of the majority of the American people and a majority of the Congress on each discreet element is a bad mistake, and I don't think the people will forget about it.

Q. Mr. President——

Q. Mr. President——

The President. One at a time. One at a time. Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network].

Q. Mr. President, on the issue of the specific complaints that the opposition made, that there was too much money—pork if you will—they claim on crime prevention and that the ban on 19 kinds of assault weapons, are you prepared to compromise on those two points, the crime prevention programs and the gun control, in order to get the more prisons, the 100,000 police, and everything else you want?

The President. First of all, I believe that all of these elements can pass, and I believe that they will. Let's wait and see what they

have to say. There were—let me say again—there were 11 votes, Republican votes, for this rule today. There were 38 Republican votes for the assault weapons ban. There were 65 Republican votes for the crime bill with about the same dollars' worth of prevention programs we had. So I don't see how, when we're spending two-thirds of the money in this bill on prisons, police, and punishment, we can possibly walk away when we've got the toughest punishment that any Federal bill ever had—"three strikes and you're out," tougher penalties for serious offenders, tougher penalties for serious juvenile offenders—how we can walk away from the prevention programs when the police have told us that that's what we have to do?

Q. What's your response to those who will say that this is an enormous personal defeat for you?

The President. I can say that I worked my heart out on it, and I did everything I could. And on this day, the NRA and the Republican leadership had their way. The American people have to decide whether they think this is about which politicians are winning and losing in Washington or about kids like James Darby and Polly Klaas who are still alive.

I believe the American people will not like viewing this as some sort of political circus up here. I'm on their side, and I think we better see who's on what side. That is the only thing that matters, what happens to the American people.

Did I lose tonight? You bet I did in the sense that I wanted it to pass. But what happens to me is not important. If everybody in America had the security I had, we wouldn't need a crime bill.

Look at—what happens to me is not it. What matters is all these kids that are going to be out on the street tonight that could just get shot. That's what's important. And I think that in the end if that is felt in the heart of the Members of the House, we'll still get this crime bill.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:15 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Letter to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services on the Arms Embargo on Bosnia-Herzegovina

August 11, 1994

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am writing to reaffirm my Administration's support for lifting the international arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina imposed by United Nations Security Council Resolution 713 of September 25, 1991. It has been my long-held view that the arms embargo has unfairly and unintentionally penalized the victim in this conflict and that the Security Council should act to remedy this injustice.

At the same time, I believe lifting the embargo unilaterally would have serious implications going well beyond the conflict in Bosnia itself. It could end the current negotiating process, which is bringing new pressure to bear on the Bosnian Serbs. Our relations with our Western European allies would be seriously strained and the cohesiveness of NATO threatened. Our efforts to build a mature and cooperative relationship with Russia would be damaged. It would also greatly increase American responsibility for the outcome of the conflict. The likelihood of greater U.S. military involvement in Bosnia would be increased, not decreased.

The July 30 Contact Group ministerial was an important step in our strategy of giving negotiations a chance and, at the same time, building an international consensus in support of multilateral action on the arms embargo, should the Bosnian Serbs continue to reject the Contact Group's proposal.

Contact Group unity has been key to the effectiveness of our approach to date, which has brought new pressure to bear on the Bosnian Serbs. This unity will be especially critical as we approach the Contact Group's final option of lifting the arms embargo. As Secretary Christopher made clear in Geneva, we will not allow the process leading to a Security Council decision on the arms embargo to be delayed indefinitely.

In this regard, if by October 15 the Bosnian Serbs have not accepted the Contact Group's proposal, of July 6, 1994, it would be my intention within two weeks to intro-

duce formally and support a resolution at the United Nations Security Council to terminate the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina. Further, as my Administration has indicated previously, if the Security Council for some reason fails to pass such a resolution within a reasonable period of time, it would be my intention to consult with the Congress thereafter regarding unilateral termination of the arms embargo.

I hope this clarification of my Administration's policy and intentions is helpful. I would consult promptly with the Congress should unforeseen circumstances arise. I also want to express my gratitude for your leadership and support on this important issue which affects our national security.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

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

Remarks on Crime Legislation on Departure for Minneapolis, Minnesota

August 12, 1994

Ladies and gentleman, last night when 225 Members of Congress voted with the NRA and the Republican congressional leadership, under enormous pressure, they decided that their political security was more important than the personal security of the American people. They said no to 100,000 police on the street, no to getting guns and kids off the street, no to protecting our police forces and our citizens against gangs with assault weapons, no to giving our kids some things to say yes to as well as something to say no to, no to "three strikes and you're out" and the toughest punishment laws ever passed by the United States Congress.

We are going out now, the Cabinet, mayors of both parties, citizens of both parties all across this country, to say that this crime bill cannot die. Congress has an obligation to the American people that goes way beyond politics and way beyond party. The American people have said over and over this is their first concern. If we can't meet this concern, there is something badly wrong in Washington. And we are going today, starting now, to the National Association of Police Officers conference to carry this battle back. We are going to fight and fight and fight until we win this battle for the American people.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:12 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Remarks to the Convention of the National Association of Police Organizations in Minneapolis

August 12, 1994

Thank you. Thank you very much, Sergeant Ganley, for your introduction and for your life of commitment. I'm glad to be here again with Mayor Sayles Belton and Mayor Coleman in the Twin Cities area. I want to thank Senator Wellstone and Congressman Vento for flying home with me. And I want to thank Congressman Vento, along with Tim Penny, David Minge, Martin Sabo, Jim Oberstar, and Jim Ramstad for voting for safer streets and a brighter future last night in the United States House. I want to thank Tom Scott and my longtime friend Bob Scully and the other members of NAPO, Dennis Flaherty and others, for their support for all the elements of this crime bill. And I'd like to thank especially the two mayors who flew here with me today, one a Republican, one a Democrat, both former prosecutors, people who believe in the promise of our country and our future and understand that unless we do something about crime we're never going to fulfill it. Ed Rendell and Rudolph Giuliani represent what this country ought to be about, people belonging to the political party of their choice but when the time comes putting party aside and putting people first. And I thank them, and I wish we had more like them, in the United States Congress.

Now folks, you all know what happened last night. The House of Representatives tried to take the easy way out, tried to walk away from the crime bill. Because of organized, intense, and highly political pressure, a majority walked away, away from the police patrolling our streets, away from the children and the senior citizens afraid to walk on those

streets, away from all the hard-working middle class Americans who were not organized into any group but who had told us over and over again that crime is their first concern and pleaded with us to do something about it.

The people of Minneapolis know that taking the easy way out is no longer an option. Two years ago next month, Officer Jerry Haaf was shot in the back in a restaurant by gang members. Today his wife, Marilyn, their two children, and their two grandchildren and one son-in-law came to be with me and to meet with me. I'd like to ask them to stand up and be recognized. [*Applause*] Their husband, father, grandfather gave everything he had to the Minneapolis police force for 30 years, and he and his family deserve better than what they got from the House of Representatives last night.

You know, we had a wonderful visit in there. It never occurred to me or to Mayor Giuliani or to Mayor Rendell or to Congressman Vento or Senator Wellstone, who were in there visiting with his family, to ask them whether they were Republicans or Democrats or independents. I don't have a clue. And I don't care. They're entitled to better than they got from the House of Representatives last night.

Every day, the police of this country, including those in this wonderful national organization who are convening here, put on uniforms and badges and walk on streets, into problems, risking their lives to serve people they're sworn to protect. They don't run from their responsibilities. They don't hide behind tricks. And they don't walk away from their folks. If they did, think what would happen to the United States.

That's why the walk-away last night in Congress is so disturbing. The first responsibility of government is law and order. Without that, freedom can never really be fully alive. Without that, people can never really pursue the American dream.

The police here know that. That's what their lives are all about. Most ordinary Americans, without regard to their party, know that deep down in their bones. Last night we had a vote on democracy's most fundamental responsibility, and law and order lost, 210 to 225.

Two hundred and twenty-five Members of the Congress participated in a procedural trick orchestrated by the National Rifle Association and intensely promoted by the Republican congressional leadership, a trick designed with one thing in mind, to put the protection of partisan and special interests over the protection of ordinary Americans and still leave what Mr. Scotto called the Jackie Mason trick: "Well, I would have voted for it if only it had been there for me to vote on."

It's the same old Washington game: Just stick it to ordinary Americans because special interests can keep you in Congress forever, and special interests can beat you because they're organized and they have money and they can confuse God-fearing, hard-working, ordinary Americans.

Well, goodness knows, I've seen a lot of that in my time, as your President and even before. But the time has come for those of you to say that the only way for Congress to make their seats safe is to make the rest of America safer.

When I ran for this office and when I went to Washington, I had dreams that many said were naive. I really dreamed that we could govern in Washington the way most mayors and Governors do, that somehow we would be able to go beyond the labels that colored our view of the past, beyond Republican and Democrat and liberal and conservative and whether you were for punishment and prevention in this case.

Those old left-right deals, they make great headlines, but they often don't do anything to solve people's problems. They're great in 30-second ads, throwing those rhetorical bombs over the wall at your opponent, but they don't keep any kids alive or help any families to get through the day. And we're in a whole new era in which everything in the world is changing, and we cannot afford to be bound by the categories of the past.

The thing I like so much about this crime bill—Mayor Giuliani's right, if he sat down alone and wrote it, it wouldn't be just like it is. If I sat down alone and wrote it, it wouldn't be just like it is. But the thing that's so good about it is that it rejects all those false choices that the politics of the past always tries to impose on ordinary people in

our complicated lives. It says, no more false choices; let's do what common sense dictates. And the reason it does is that this bill was largely the handiwork of people in law enforcement. We never had a bill before that was endorsed by every major law enforcement group in the entire United States. So it puts 100,000 police on the street. It says "three strikes and you're out" is the law of the land and makes available more funds for prisons to house serious offenders. It bans handgun ownership for juveniles and bans assault weapons that gangs and thugs use to outgun the police. But it also protects 650 specifically named hunting and sporting weapons, something the American people too often are not told. It imposes tougher penalties for violent crimes, all right. There is a death penalty for killing an officer of the law in the line of duty. But it also has the prevention funds in there. You heard these people in law enforcement talking about it. It makes my blood boil when I hear people talking about pork. Because you see, I have seen the eyes of schoolchildren after the D.A.R.E. officer has talked to them.

I remember when the D.A.R.E. program came into my child's elementary school and how it affected the way she looked at the whole issue of drugs and her personal responsibility and how it affected all those kids who never had a daddy at home to say this is right or this is wrong, who didn't have a job in the home to say, this is the future you can have.

Who are we trying to kid with all of this rhetoric? Talk to people like us, who have been to the funerals of police officers gunned down in the line of duty, and I dare you to find one person who knows anything about this who's not for tougher punishment and more prevention.

Just imagine what would be happening in America today if Congress had yesterday voted to take 100,000 police officers off of the street, to put 19 more kinds of assault weapons on the street, to get rid of prison space for 100,000 criminals. Well, that's what they did: no to 100,000 police, no to the juvenile ownership of handguns ban, no to the assault weapons ban, no to "three strikes and you're out," no to the prisons, no to the prevention.

You know, this is the kind of political mess Congress has been caught in over this crime bill for 6 years. Before I ever showed up, under two previous Presidents' politics, everybody talked about crime, nothing ever got done for 6 years. The average violent criminal only stays in prison 4 years. We let a whole generation go by with nothing getting done.

Now last night, we gave the Congress a chance, a chance to put people ahead of politics, to go with police and punishment and prevention. And until last night, I really thought they would. Until last night, this crime bill was a bipartisan effort to the core.

The first time the bill came up in the House of Representatives, the assault weapons ban wasn't in it, but there was even more prevention money in it, and 65 Republicans voted for the crime bill last April with the prevention money they now attack in the bill.

In May, 38 Republicans voted for the assault weapons ban with the 650 hunting and sporting weapons protected. But when the crime bill came back to the House, it had even more police, more prisons, tougher penalties, and the assault weapons ban they had already adopted.

Then, instead of 65 Republicans, or even 38, only 11 brave Republicans, including Jim Ramstad from Minnesota, stood up and did the right thing. The rest, including 19 Republicans who voted for everything in this bill and more than 50 who voted for the prevention programs they now attack, walked away and turned it into a partisan issue.

Yes, they were joined in voting no by some Democrats, a handful of whom were, on grounds of conscience, opposed to the death penalty, most of whom came from places like my home. They come from small-town, rural America where hunting is important, where the crime rates tend to be lower, where the NRA is very successful; it's scaring people with misinformation.

But you know something, there were a lot of Democrats who voted against the assault weapons ban who came back and voted for the crime bill last night. There were some Democrats who were deeply opposed to capital punishment, and they still voted for the crime bill last night because they put the safety of the people of this country first.

We need more Democrats, and we need more Republicans to follow the lead of those 11 brave Republicans and the Democrats who put aside their differences with certain specific provisions to put the American people first. That is what we must have, more people like that. People who believe in you and your future and will not take the easy way out. The walk-away crowd has got to change.

You know that we didn't get you a crime bill yesterday. But we're going to get you a crime bill. We are going to get you a crime bill.

To all the police officers in this country who walk out there for us every day, Washington cannot walk away from you. And all the ordinary Americans who are just out there watching this unfold, hearing all the rhetorical wars back and forth, who know there's no "American association for ordinary citizens" up there walking the halls of Congress, we're not going to walk away from you either.

Yes, it was a defeat yesterday, and I felt terrible about it. But this morning I woke up feeling good because that's a vote I'd much rather be on the losing side of than the winning side. I am glad I will never have to explain to my wife, my daughter, my grandchildren, and the people who sent me to Washington why I did something like what was done to the American people yesterday. Let us turn it around and put the people of this country first.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 1:30 p.m. at the Marriott City Center. In his remarks, he referred to Sgt. Mick Ganley, president, and Dennis Flaherty, executive director, Minnesota Police and Peace Officers Association; Mayor Sharon Sayles Belton of Minneapolis, MN; Mayor Norm Coleman of St. Paul, MN; Tom Scott, president, and, Robert T. Scully, executive director, National Association of Police Organizations; Mayor Edward Rendell of Philadelphia; and Mayor Rudolph Giuliani of New York. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Nomination for Three District Court Judges

August 12, 1994

The President today nominated three individuals to serve on the U.S. District Court: David A. Katz for the Northern District of Ohio; and Robert J. Cindrich and Sean J. McLaughlin for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

"These nominees will bring exceptional legal talent to the Federal bench," the President said. "I know they will serve our country with distinction."

NOTE: Biographies of the nominees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

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.

August 6

In the afternoon, the President traveled from Camp David, MD, to Detroit, MI, where he attended the "Michigan Salutes the President" dinner. He returned to Camp David in the evening.

August 8

In the morning, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton returned to Washington, DC. Later in the morning, the President met with the Law Enforcement Steering Committee.

The President announced his intention to nominate Vincent Sorrentino to be a member of the Advisory Board of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

August 9

In the morning, the President met with business leaders to discuss health care reform.

The President announced his intention to appoint Jorge Perez to the National Council on the Arts.

The White House announced that the President has directed that the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence conduct an immediate inquiry into the National Reconnaissance Office headquarters construction project and that the project be declassified.

August 10

The President announced his intention to nominate Frederick Pang to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Management.

The President announced his intention to appoint John C. Phillips as a member of the Korean War Veterans Memorial Advisory Board.

The President announced his intention to appoint the following individuals to the President's Board of Advisors on Historically Black Colleges and Universities:

—Lloyd (Vic) Hackley;
—Lucille Ish;
—Robert Albright;
—Oswald P. Bronson;
—Ramona Hoage Edelin;
—Sebetha Jenkins;
—Arthur E. Johnson;
—Adib Akmal Shakir;
—Dolores Spikes;
—Arthur E. Thomas;
—Valora Washington;
—Bernard C. Watson;
—Barbara D. Wills-Duncan.

August 11

In the afternoon, the President met with President Meles Zenawi, head of the transnational government of Ethiopia.

The President announced his intention to nominate Bruce Morrison as Chair of the Federal Housing Finance Board.

The President announced his intention to nominate J. Clifford Hudson as a member and Chair of the Board of Directors of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation.

The President announced his intention to nominate Patricia Hill Williams as a member of the Inter-American Foundation Board of Governors.

The President announced his intention to appoint Kristine Norosz as a member of the International Pacific Halibut Commission.

The President announced his intention to appoint Billie Maxine Glory and A. Michael Neimeyer to the National Advisory Council on Indian Education.

August 12

In the morning, following a breakfast with Cabinet members, the President traveled to Minneapolis, MN.

In the evening, the President returned to Andrews Air Force Base where he was joined by Hillary and Chelsea Clinton. They then went to Camp David, MD.

The President named Jodie R. Torkelson as Deputy Assistant to the President for Management and Administration, effective September 1.

The President announced his intention to nominate Dr. Lori Esposito Murray to be Assistant Director for the Multilateral Affairs Bureau, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted August 8

Kenneth Spencer Yalowitz,
of Virginia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Belarus.

Sheldon C. Bilchik,
of Maryland, to be Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, vice Robert W. Sweet, Jr., resigned.

Luise S. Jordan,
of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Corporation for National and Community Service (new position).

Andrea N. Brown,
of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term of one year (new position).

Thomas Ehrlich,
of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term of 3 years (new position).

Christopher C. Gallagher, Sr.,
of New Hampshire, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term of 4 years (new position).

Reatha Clark King,
of Minnesota, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term of 5 years (new position).

Carol W. Kinsley,
of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term of 5 years (new position).

Leslie Lenkowsky,
of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term of 4 years (new position).

Marlee Matlin,
of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term of 2 years (new position).

Arthur J. Naparstek,
of Ohio, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term of 4 years (new position).

John Rother,
of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term of 2 years (new position).

Walter H. Shorenstein,
of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term of 3 years (new position).

Submitted August 9

Henry J. Cauthen,
of South Carolina, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2000 (reappointment).

Frank Henry Cruz,
of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2000, vice Lloyd Kaiser, term expired.

Submitted August 10

Thomas R. Carper,
of Delaware, to be a member of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of 4 years, vice Tommy G. Thompson, term expired.

Robert L. Gallucci,
of Virginia, a career member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Ambassador at Large.

Eddie J. Jordan, Jr.,
of Louisiana, to be U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana for the term of 4 years, vice Harry A. Rosenberg, resigned.

Submitted August 12

Robert J. Cindrich,
of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, vice Gustave Diamond, retired.

David A. Katz,
of Ohio, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio, vice Alvin I. Krenzler, retired.

Sean J. McLaughlin,
of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, vice Glenn E. Mencer, retired.

Robert Edward Service,
of California, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Paraguay.

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 August 8

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt, Education Secretary Richard Riley, Housing and Urban Development Secretary Henry Cisneros, and Deputy Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services Ken Thorpe on universal health care

Announcement of individuals receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom and the text of the citations

Released August 9

Transcript of an interview with the First Lady by health care reporters

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Joint Statement on Relations Between the United States of America and the Republic of Armenia

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers announcing the President's meeting with President Meles Zenawi, head of the transnational government of Ethiopia on August 11

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the inquiry into the construction costs of the National Reconnaissance Office in Chantilly, VA

Announcement of the nomination of U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana

Released August 10

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Gov. John Waihee of Hawaii and Small Business Administrator Erskine Bowles on health care in the State of Hawaii

Released August 11

Announcement of policy forbidding Presidential appointees from accepting travel services or accommodations from any company regulated by or doing business with the appointees' agency

Released August 12

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on delivery of 3,723 unclassified and declassified documents by the State Department, Defense Department, Central Intelligence Agency, and National Security Council on U.S. policy towards El Salvador to the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee

Remarks by Vice President Gore at the swearing-in ceremony for Supreme Court Justice Stephen G. Breyer

Letter to the Congress from Chief of Staff Leon Panetta on the congressional action on the crime bill

Acts Approved by the President

Approved August 11

H.R. 2457 / Public Law 103–292
Winter Run Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Act of 1993

H.J. Res. 374 / Public Law 103–293
Designating August 2, 1994; as "National Neighborhoods Crime Watch Day"

S.J. Res. 195 / Public Law 103–294
To designate August 1, 1994, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day"

Approved August 12

H.R. 4429 / Public Law 103–295
To authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries