

tions and the U.N. How much have you worked that up in detail, and what would it actually involve? I mean, is it a fully—a several-page plan, or what?

*Prime Minister Major.* It's developing rather than being developed. We agreed last year that we needed to look at some of the overlap there was in the Bretton Woods institutions and see how we could look at making the—bringing the United Nations a little more up to date.

If I could just give you a couple of illustrations—if you mean have we yet got a detailed, worked-out position between the United Kingdom and the United States, the answer is no, we haven't. We've both been looking separately, as we agreed we would do at the G-7 summit last year, at the sort of ideas we might bring forward for discussion with partners at Halifax later on this year and the sort of things that we're looking at in—by “we” I now mean the United Kingdom—in terms of the financial institutions. You'll be aware of the idea we've had in the past of selling some IMF gold to help some of the poorer nations. That's still on the agenda as far as we're concerned. Looking at perhaps a greater degree of rationalization of some of the activities of the IMF, OECD, and the World Bank—that's an area we're looking at.

We'd like to look at the way in which poverty is dealt with through the U.N. There seem to us to be a number of overlapping agencies, a certain amount of duplication, which could credibly be looked at. In terms of trade, we'd like to see what can be done to bed down the

World Trade Organization satisfactorily. In terms of environment, I would suggest that there are some areas of overlap as well. The U.N. Environment Program and the Commission for Sustainable Development, there seem to be areas of overlap.

Now, they're just specimen samples of the sort of things we are looking at. I emphasize, we are in the early stages of that examination. We haven't reached any conclusions. But I think those are matters we must examine.

Other things I'd like to see us examine at the summit would be to look more comprehensively at crime, drugs, and money laundering. We had a G-7 task force on money laundering some time ago. That's been successful. I think we should revisit that, given the nature of the problem and given the problem that exists internationally with crime and drugs. And I think we'd like to look a little more carefully at what might be done in terms of conflict prevention.

Those are just broad headlines of some of the areas we're looking at. We shared them in general outline today. We will come to them in detail at the summit.

*The President.* Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 90th news conference began at 2:53 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Saddam Hussein of Iraq; Rolf Ekeus, chairman, United Nations Special Commission (Iraqi Weapons); Gerry Adams, leader of Sinn Féin; and President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt.

## Statement on the Buyout Program for Federal Employees

*April 4, 1995*

More than 2 years ago, I promised to fix the Federal Government. I was firmly convinced that we could do more with less, that we could create a Government that was leaner but not meaner, and that we could make Government our partner rather than a problem.

I established the National Performance Review and put Vice President Gore in charge. He and his team have helped to transform Government, to cut bureaucracy and redtape, and to find ways to give the American people the

service they deserve. At the same time, my economic plan is bringing down the deficit by more than \$600 billion, and we are proposing another \$81 billion in deficit reduction in the budget I recently sent to Congress.

A major element of my strategy was my commitment to streamline and cut the Federal work force. For too long in Washington, we have had too many layers of bureaucracy, too many workers whose main job was to check on the work of other workers rather than to perform useful

work themselves. As the National Performance Review noted, we had good people trapped in bad systems. I promised to cut the work force, and that's what I'm doing. Through our efforts, we have already cut the work force by 102,000 positions and we are on track to cut it by a total of 272,900 positions, bringing it to its smallest size since John Kennedy was President.

While committed to cutting the work force, we want to do it in a humane way. We faced the same dilemma that confronted many private companies; they needed to downsize but wanted to avoid firing large numbers of loyal employees. Many of them have given people an incentive to leave by offering "buyouts." We wanted to do the same.

Early last year, Congress approved my request to allow non-Defense agencies to offer buyouts of up to \$25,000 a person. The Defense Department and a few other agencies already could offer buyouts under existing law. Because normal attrition will help us downsize in the future, we offered buyouts only until March 31, 1995, which was last Friday.

Looking back, I can safely say that our buyout program has been a huge success. It achieved

what we had hoped: to help us cut the work force in a fiscally responsible and humane way.

To reduce the work force by 102,000 positions by the end of fiscal 1994, we offered about 70,000 buyouts. Several non-DOD agencies have offered deferred buyouts that will take place between now and March 1997. Defense will be using buyouts as it continues to downsize through 1999. Counting those, we expect to buy out another 84,000 workers through 1997 as we reduce the work force by a total of 272,900 positions.

The buyouts were not offered in a random fashion, however. We targeted them to reduce the layers of bureaucracy and micro-management that were tying Government in knots. We made sure that departments and agencies tied their buyout strategies to their overall plans to streamline their bureaucracies. As a result, almost 70 percent of our buyouts in the non-Defense agencies have gone to people at higher grade levels, such as managers.

I'm proud that our buyout program was so successful. It shows that we can, in fact, create a Government that works better and costs less.

## Remarks to the National Conference of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO April 5, 1995

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for that wonderful welcome. Thank you, Bob Georgine, for that fine introduction, all the distinguished affiliated presidents up here on the platform, and all of you out there in the audience. And I thank those of you who brought your children. Since most of what we're doing and a lot of what I have to say is about them, I'm glad to see them here.

I forgive the person in the back who shouted, "UCLA." I told the Gridiron Dinner the other night at the Press Club—I said my worst nightmare was a final with Arkansas and UCLA, my worst nightmare, the team I love against a team with 54 electoral votes. *[Laughter]* It was a great tournament, a great game. They won it fair and square, and I congratulate them.

You know, a lot of us here have a lot in common. Bob and I have something in common.

We were both raised by strong mothers who believed in hard work and optimism and practiced what they preached and made sure that we practiced what they preached. It was our first lesson in organized labor. *[Laughter]*

I'm deeply honored to be here with you today. I want to thank you for the support that you have given to our programs to train America's workers for the future. I believe that good, strong unions and collective bargaining can help us to meet the challenges that are just ahead if all of us are willing to embrace those challenges and to do what has to be done to make sure that we compete and win in the global economy.

That's why one of the very first things I did as President was to rescind the anti-union Executive orders of the last 12 years and why last month I also signed an Executive order which