


Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, August 8, 1994
Volume 30—Number 31
Pages 1581–1636

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

American Legion Boys Nation—1581
Anniversary of the passage of the economic program—1628
California earthquake assistance, teleconference—1605
Health Security Express participants—1611
Missouri, Health Security Express participants in Independence—1588
New Jersey, health care rally in Jersey City—1597
Ohio
Arrival in Cleveland—1591
Reception for Joel Hyatt in Mayfield Heights—1592
Radio address—1586
U.S. shipbuilding industry initiatives—1603
Young American Medal winners—1625

Appointments and Nominations

Interim National AIDS Policy Coordinator—1611
U.S. District Court, judges—1633
Veterans Affairs Department, Under Secretary for Health—1633

Communications to Congress

Continuation of export control regulations, message—1586
Iraq, message—1608
Rwanda, letter—1602

Communications to Federal Agencies

Civil rights working group, memorandum—1627

Interviews With the News Media

News conference, August 3 (No. 68)—1614

Proclamations

50th Anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising—1600
Helsinki Human Rights Day, 1994—1601
National Neighborhood Crime Watch Day, 1994—1607
National Scleroderma Awareness Month, 1994—1585

Resignations and Retirements

Deputy Assistant to the President and Director of Media Affairs—1611

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations; Resignations and Retirements
Crime legislation—1600
Death of John Britton and James Barrett—1585
Senate action on health care reform legislation—1611

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1635
Checklist of White House press releases—1634
Digest of other White House announcements—1633
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1634

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

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

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

Week Ending Friday, August 5, 1994

**Remarks to the American Legion
Boys Nation**

July 29, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Good afternoon. Welcome to the White House. I want to say a special word of welcome to your president, Thomas Whitehead, and your vice president, Robert Mattivi, and to Jack Mercier, George Blume, and Ron Engel. And to all of you, welcome and congratulations.

I have a special treat for you today. This has been a remarkable week for America, a great week for you to be here. We had the signing of the agreement between the King of Jordan and the Prime Minister of Israel ending the state of war between them, the announcement that Russia would withdraw all of its troops from Central and Eastern Europe, for the first time since the end of World War II, by the end of August. We had the announcement today that our economy grew 3.7 percent in the last quarter, that jobless claims are down, that the robust growth is continuing. It's produced now 3.8 million new jobs in the last year and a half.

And yesterday we had the historic agreement by the Senate and the House on what will be the toughest and smartest crime bill in the history of the country, that will put 100,000 more police officers on the street, ban assault weapons, provide a "three strikes and you're out" law, and provide billions of dollars to young people for activities to give our kids something to say yes to as well as to punish people who do the wrong thing.

And then today we had an historic event just about an hour ago, where a new Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Stephen Breyer, was confirmed. And I thought it would be a nice thing if Mr. Justice Breyer, accompanied by Senator Kennedy and Senator Hatch, would come here and make his first public appearance to you. So I'd like to

ask Justice Breyer and Senator Kennedy and Senator Hatch—[*applause*].

I wanted to say just a word about this, and then I'd like to ask Justice Breyer to come up here and speak to you for a moment or two, and then they'll all have to go back to work.

Let me thank Senator Kennedy and Senator Hatch and Chairman Biden and the other members of the Senate Judiciary Committee who recommended Judge Breyer by a unanimous vote to the Senate as a whole.

This gentleman has set a standard of excellence and fidelity to the law and the Constitution of which every American can be proud. When he came before the Senate, there was a very broad spectrum of praise for his appointment among Democrats and Republicans alike, among people who consider themselves liberals and people who consider themselves conservatives.

I have now had the honor to appoint two people to the United States Supreme Court. Justice Ginsburg and Justice Breyer have now shown that we can have excellence on the Supreme Court that unites the American people, rather than divides them.

Let me say that—we were joking a little out here—the Founding Fathers in their wisdom said that there had to be somebody hanging around to resolve these fundamental constitutional disputes, and so they created the Supreme Court. And they didn't want the Supreme Court to be subject to undue pressure, so they gave the Justices of the Supreme Court a lifetime term, so they could say no to everybody, including the President. And we were laughing on the way out that Senator Kennedy and Senator Hatch are running for reelection, and of course, the President gets a 4-year term. Now Justice Breyer has a lifetime term. You are looking at the only man in America that you've met lately with total job security. [*Laughter*]

There is a reason for it. Someone needs to be free to decide what the Constitution

requires of the rest of us without the pressures of day-to-day politics. But that imposes on the President and on the United States Senate a very heavy responsibility to pick someone with the character and wisdom to use that awesome power and that lifetime guarantee in the interests of our Constitution, our values, and all the American people, without regard to their race, their income, and their background. I believe Justice Breyer will be that kind of person, and it's an honor for me to introduce him to you at this time.

[At this point, Justice Stephen Breyer made brief remarks.]

The President. Well, I am glad we were able to do that, and I hope you enjoyed it.

As all of you know, we share a common bond. I sat where you are 31 years ago, and Senator Kennedy's brother was here as President. Ironically, Senator Kennedy pulled out the record of what President Kennedy said to us when I was here where you are, and on that day he happened to be meeting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. So he brought them out to meet the Boys Nation delegates. And so you'll now always be able to remember this, and I think as Justice Breyer goes on to a long and distinguished career on the Supreme Court, when you read about him or you hear some decision that he's written, I hope you will always remember this day with pride and with some amount of joy.

I was thinking a little today about how different the world is now from what it was like 31 years ago when I was here. We were in the middle of the cold war; Russia was still the Soviet Union; our troops faced each other, divided, in Berlin. We still had huge amounts of legal segregation in large parts of the United States. There were all kinds of problems. But at the same time, we had enormous faith in the capacity of our economy and our people to solve those problems.

Now the cold war is over. We had all those good events I told you about this week. We have been working very, very hard to try to deal with the horrible tragedy in Rwanda. And again, I have been so impressed with and grateful for our military in their capacity to move quickly over there to take a terrible situation—we have delivered 20 million

packets of oral rehydration therapy to try to help the people with cholera. We've gone from zero to 100,000 gallons of water a day to serve the people there almost overnight.

We have all these things going on. And yet we know that there's still a sense of foreboding, of worry in our country because we do have a lot of problems. There's still a lot of people that want jobs that don't have them. There are people who have jobs who are insecure in those jobs. We have people who are growing up in mean streets and tough neighborhoods where there's too much crime and violence. There was a study last week which showed young people between the ages of 12 and 17 are 5 times more likely than people younger than or older than them to be victims of violent crime, that even in cities where the crime rate is going down, often it's going up among young people.

So there is a disturbing as well as a hopeful atmosphere in the country. The thing I always love about Boys Nation is that I can look out and be guaranteed I'll see 96 optimists. And that's a very important thing for our country because a great deal of how we live and whether we go forward depends upon our willingness to view the future with possibility and hope. And a big part of the battle I fight around here as President every day is to try to keep people's spirits up and their eyes on the future and thinking about big things, not little things, and believing that we can make a difference. And I believe that.

I ran for President because I was very concerned about the direction of the country. We had the economy going down and the deficit going up, middle class people being burdened more, while we weren't investing enough in our young people, in our future. The country was coming apart when I thought we ought to be coming together. And my simple mission is to make sure that the American dream is there for you in the 21st century and to do it by restoring the economy, rebuilding our sense of community, empowering individuals to take responsibility for themselves and to do it by putting the power of Government on the side of ordinary Americans.

The first thing I tried to do was to get our economic house in order. We had quadrupled the debt of the United States in 12

years. You were facing a prospect, by the time you were my age, we'd be spending a third or more of all your tax money just paying off our deficit.

Now, we've had the biggest deficit reduction program in history. We have reduced the size of the Federal Government dramatically. By the end of this decade, your National Government will be under 2 million people in size for the first time since I came here when President Kennedy was President—smallest Federal Government in 30 years. We will have 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States. And it's produced 3.8 million jobs and a 1½ percent drop in the unemployment rate. Last year, we had the largest number of new businesses started in the United States since the end of World War II, in any year. So we're moving the economy in the right direction.

What else do we have to do? We've got to make sure young people are ready to compete in it. We need a system of lifetime learning in which a young person, who will change jobs on average seven or eight times in a lifetime, will know that he or she can always, always get the training, the skills, the knowledge that you need if you have to make a change.

You know, when you make changes in life, they can either be very frightening or very exciting. And usually, changes are a little bit of both, aren't they? Usually changes are a little bit of both. And what keeps our country going is knowing that changes always have more hope than fear in them, that there's more excitement than there is reservation. And every time in our country we come to the end of one era and start another, there's almost a mental war that goes on inside the American people: Are we going to be scared, or are we going to be hopeful? Because we've always had problems, and we're always going to have problems. The Scripture says we'll have problems until the end of the Earth. It's part of our human nature, right?

So when we come to the end of one era and we start another, the issue is, will our dominant feeling be fear or hope? In the 20th century, when World War I was over, the American people said, we do not have any more energy for the problems of the

world. We withdrew from the world. We elected a President who said he would take us back to normalcy, whatever that meant, and give everybody a good lettin' alone. And there was this huge uprising of the Ku Klux Klan right after World War I and a huge uprising of a Red scare—you know, there was a Communist under every bush.

At the end of World War II, the same thing happened, but we had a President named Harry Truman who said, "We're not going to walk away from our problems at home; we're not going to walk away from our obligations abroad." He passed the GI bill to give the soldiers coming home housing and education and a way to support their families. He put in motion the system that allowed us to stop communism and win the cold war. He passed the Marshall plan to restore Europe and Japan after World War II so that even our former enemies could become our allies and our trading partners. Today, America has a very close relationship with both Germany and Japan, our bitter enemies in World War II, fighting for democracy, fighting for economic growth.

But all the time, there were people who said, "Oh, I'm more scared than full of hope." There were people who said Harry Truman was radical, incompetent, unfit to be President, too liberal—accused him of being soft on communism. At that time—some of you will read about this when you go to college—not long after that, Senator Joseph McCarthy from Wisconsin started saying every third person he met was a Communist. It's interesting, because Wisconsin has historically been one of the most progressive States in America. But what it shows you is, at the end of one time and the beginning of another, when people are used to looking at the world through this set of glasses, and then they haven't put on another set of glasses yet, anybody can be confused.

And that's what we're seeing today. We've come to the end of the cold war, and I can no longer be President and just tell you that we'll view everything in terms of our competition with the Russians, because it's not true anymore. We're cooperating with the Russians. I just was elated the week before last when the United States Congress passed by overwhelming majorities our continuation

in the international space station project which now is not an American project to put a space station in the sky, it's an American, a European, a Japanese, a Canadian, and now a Russian project. We're going into the future together. And that's good.

But what it means is, when you're trying to get people to build the future and when there's not an obvious enemy and when you have a lot of responsibilities, there's a big question out there in the country. Are we going to be dominated by our hopes or our fears? Are we going to be builders or dividers? When we look at America's problems and promise, is the glass half empty, or is the glass half full? You wouldn't be here if you didn't think the glass was half full, if you didn't believe in yourselves, your communities, and the future of your country.

What I want to say to you goes way beyond any kind of partisan politics or issue. It is that this country has now been around for a very long time, 218 years since the Declaration of Independence, 11 years less than that since the Constitution. We have been around for a very long time. And the way we have survived is by believing in the future and by coming together, not being driven apart. And we've had to redefine over and over and over again what coming together means. Upstairs in the next floor up here, in 1863, Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, in this house, liberating the slaves. Before that, coming together meant what all the white folks decided to do. He redefined that forever. It took us another 100 years and more to figure out how to live together. We haven't quite got it all worked out yet, but we've made a lot of progress.

Now what we have to do is to figure out, how are we going to restore our economy? How are we going to make it work for all Americans? How is all this racial and other diversity we have in our country going to make us stronger and more united? How do we stand up for what we believe in our religion and our politics and still respect people who are totally different from what we are? How can we live together? Los Angeles County alone has 150 different racial and ethnic groups, one county. Can we be an American family?

I can tell you this. If we figure it out, nobody can stop this country because in a world where the global economy gets smaller and smaller and smaller, having somebody in your country who's an American first but who understands every other culture in the world is a huge plus. It is a big deal we should be happy about.

So, can we be a community again? How can we rescue all these kids that are in trouble? How can we drive the crime rate down and the graduation rate up? How can we empower people so that they don't think the Government's doing something for them but the Government is doing something with them to give them the skills to take responsibility for their own lives? These are the great questions. How can we live in a world where we promote peace and prosperity by taking care of the remaining nuclear threats, stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, promoting democracy, and at least trying to limit chaos and human suffering as we are doing in Rwanda?

And it is clear, as we move toward the next century, to me, that a major, a major, major, major factor in what it looks like, whether the American dream is alive for you and your children, is whether we believe we can do these things.

And so, that's what I want to leave you with. Whatever your politics, whatever your philosophy, whatever your party, do not participate in this movement that happens at the end of every great era to be cynical, to be negative, to be divisive, to look down on your friends and neighbors, to see the glass as half empty, not half full. This is America. The glass is half full, and you can fill it up the rest of the way if you are determined to do it.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:08 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Jack Mercier, director of activities, and Dr. George Blume, legislative program director, Boys Nation; and Ronald A. Engel, deputy director for Americanism, American Legion. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Statement on the Death of John Britton and James Barrett

July 29, 1994

I strongly condemn the senseless shootings today which abruptly ended the lives of two men and seriously wounded a third in Pensacola, Florida.

The safety, freedom, and protection of all our citizens is paramount in guaranteeing the health and vitality of our Nation. I am strongly committed to ending this form of domestic terrorism that threatens the fabric of our country. I encourage a quick and thorough investigation into this tragic incident as the local officials work closely with the resources of the Federal law enforcement community.

Hillary and I extend our deepest sympathy to the friends and family of Dr. John Britton and Mr. James Barrett on their tragic loss today, and I speak for all Americans in expressing my hope for a full and complete recovery for Mrs. June Barrett.

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

Proclamation 6710—National Scleroderma Awareness Month, 1994

July 29, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Literally meaning “hard skin,” scleroderma is a chronic disease that thickens and attaches the skin to underlying structures. Its cause is unknown.

Scleroderma strikes individuals of every age, sex, and ethnic background, although women between the ages of 25 and 55 are four times more likely to be afflicted. It is a painful and sometimes progressive disorder of the connective tissue that can cause disability, disfigurement, and even death. Its impact, in terms of both physical and emotional suffering, is enormous.

In patients with scleroderma, there is an excess production of collagen, the main fibrous component of connective tissue. As a result, the formation of dense, compact tissue causes the skin to lose its elasticity.

Scleroderma is also a disease of the vascular and immune systems and can impair internal organs, such as the kidneys, lungs, heart, and gastrointestinal tract.

New biomedical research findings and innovative approaches to diagnosis and treatment are essential in fighting against this multifaceted disorder. The Federal Government and private voluntary organizations are working together to increase both public awareness of and research on scleroderma. Their objective is to discover the cause of this devastating disease and to develop effective ways to prevent, treat, and cure it.

I applaud all those who are working to bring public attention to this disabling illness, those who are aiding its victims, and those who are researching its complex nature.

The Congress, by Public Law 103–92, has designated the month of August 1994 as “National Scleroderma Awareness Month” and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this month.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the month of August 1994 as National Scleroderma Awareness Month. I urge all Government agencies and the people of the United States, as well as educational, philanthropic, scientific, medical, and health care organizations and professionals, to participate in appropriate activities to encourage greater awareness of scleroderma and further research into its cause and cure.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-ninth day of July, 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, 2:14 p.m., August 2, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on August 4. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Message to the Congress Reporting on the Continuation of Export Control Regulations

July 29, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

1. On September 30, 1990, in Executive Order No. 12730, President Bush declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act ("IEEPA") (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) to deal with the threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States resulting from the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et seq.*), and the system of controls maintained under that Act. In that order, the President continued in effect, to the extent permitted by law, the provisions of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, the Export Administration Regulations (15 C.F.R. 768 *et seq.*), and the delegations of authority set forth in Executive Order No. 12002 of July 7, 1977, Executive Order No. 12214 of May 2, 1980, and Executive Order No. 12131 of May 4, 1979, as amended by Executive Order No. 12551 of February 21, 1986.

2. President Bush issued Executive Order No. 12730 pursuant to the authority vested in him as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including IEEPA, the National Emergencies Act ("NEA") (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code. At that time, the President also submitted a report to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of the IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)). On March 27, 1993, the Export Administration Act was extended through June 30, 1994. Subsequently, on September 30, 1993, I issued Executive Order No. 12867, terminating Executive Order No. 12730.

3. Section 401(c) of the NEA additionally requires the submission of a final report on all expenditures incurred during the period of emergency. This report, covering the period from September 30, 1990, to September 30, 1993, is submitted in compliance with this requirement.

4. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 3-year period from September 30, 1990, to September 30, 1993, that

are directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to export controls were largely centered in the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Export Administration. Expenditures by the Department of Commerce are estimated to have been \$117,720,000, most of which represented program operating costs, wage and salary costs for Federal personnel, and overhead expenses.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
July 29, 1994.

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

The President's Radio Address

July 30, 1994

Good morning. This was a good week for America, as we Americans were reminded again not just of our problems but of the immense possibilities of our times and our country.

First, here at the White House, two brave leaders, King Hussein of Jordan and Prime Minister Rabin of Israel, put an end to their state of war and declared their intention to work together to promote lasting peace between their peoples.

Meanwhile, President Boris Yeltsin announced this week that Russian troops would leave Estonia by August 31st. With this withdrawal, all Russian troops will be out of Central and Eastern Europe for the first time since the end of World War II, a major goal of our policy with Russia for the last 18 months.

I'm proud of everything our country has done to further the march of hope over despair around the world. In times of historic change, America has always risen to great challenges at home as well as abroad.

Yesterday it was announced that our economy grew 3.7 percent in the second quarter of this year. Jobless claims were down dramatically again. We've got strong growth with low inflation.

In the last 18 months, we've begun the work of renewing the American dream. Our

national economic strategy, with \$255 billion of budget cuts, tax breaks for small business and 15 million working American families, new investments in education and training and expansion of trade, and a reduction in the Federal bureaucracy to its smallest level in 30 years, has produced 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President, 3.8 million new jobs in our economy, the largest number of new businesses formed in any year since World War II, and a 1½ percent drop in the unemployment rate. We're moving in the right direction.

And this week, after 6 years of delay, congressional leaders finally reached agreement on the toughest, largest, smartest Federal attack on crime in the history of our country.

I sought the Presidency because I was concerned about the direction of our Nation. I was concerned that we were losing the American dream for our children and that we had to restore the economy, rebuild our communities, and empower individuals to assume responsibilities for their future. To do that, we had to have a Government that worked for ordinary Americans. And none of that is possible as long as crime and violence threaten the safety of our streets, the sanctity of our homes and schools, and the innocence of our children. That's why the American people have demanded that we take action against crime.

This crime bill will put 100,000 more police on our street, a 20 percent increase. It will ban assault weapons. It will prohibit possession of handguns by minors. It will put violent career criminals behind bars by making "three strikes and you're out" the law of the land. And it answers the calls of hundreds of thousands of police officers who want big increases in crime prevention programs to give our young people something to say yes to as well as something to say no to.

This month, we have learned that our children are more at risk from crime and violence than any other portion of the population. Children between the ages of 12 and 17 are 5 times more likely than the rest of us to suffer from violent crimes like rape and aggravated assault. This is madness, and we must stop it.

The crime bill is about to reach a final vote in both Houses of the Congress. Unbelievably, there are still those who are trying to kill it with old debates about whether we ought to be going after criminals or guns, whether we ought to be tough or compassionate. Well, the law enforcement community has told us we have to do all these things, and we have to do it now.

Tell your Senators and Representatives to pass the crime bill. I want it on my desk within 2 weeks. I want to sign it before our children go back to school. We owe them a future of hope, not fear.

If 6 years is long enough to wait for a crime bill, then 60 years is certainly long enough to wait for health care coverage for every American. Now it's time for us to move forward to yet another historic front, one that seven Presidents of both parties have sought: guaranteeing every American health coverage that can never be taken away.

Soon Congress will deliberate on bills to provide health security, the first time ever that such bills have even been voted out of congressional committees. We know from our experience only one way that really works, the way that works for the great majority of our families already, getting health insurance on the job.

It's a way that's worked in Hawaii for 20 years, where health insurance is cheaper than it is in the rest of the country. It's the way that relies on the private sector, not government; that rewards work, not welfare; that builds on shared responsibilities between employers and employees.

Many other partial reforms sound good and aren't as controversial to implement and have been tried elsewhere. But the experience is that often these more limited reforms actually reduce the number of people with health insurance and increase rates. In Hawaii, where everyone contributed so that everyone could be covered, insurance rates went down and coverage went up.

Some in Congress are trying to kill health care reform altogether. If we don't act this year, 3 million more working Americans will lose their health coverage next year. Five million more Americans are uninsured now than were insured 5 years ago. The American people don't need more hemming and hawing.

They need health care they can count on so they can get on with building their lives.

Later today I'll be in Independence, Missouri, the home of President Harry Truman, to talk about health care. President Truman believed in the common sense and the common decency of the American people, and he tried very hard to get health care security for all Americans. It's time for us to fulfill Harry Truman's mission, to act with his vision and courage, to do what he always believed we should do: guarantee health security for all Americans.

Let's continue to build a land of limitless hope and to remain an inspiration to the world.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 11:47 a.m. on July 29 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on July 30.

Remarks to Health Security Express Participants in Independence, Missouri

July 30, 1994

Thank you, Governor Carnahan. Thank you, Mr. Vice President and Tipper and Hillary. And ladies and gentlemen, thank you all for coming. And let me especially thank those two fine women, mother and daughter, that stood up here and spoke for the nearly 40 million Americans who deserve health care.

I have to tell you, a lot of things have been said here today; maybe everything that needs to be said has been said. But I would like to offer one mildly dissenting view. I believe that most of the people here who disagree with me today about national health reform do admire Harry Truman. They probably think he ought to be on Mt. Rushmore. And it must be surprising to them to know that they had the same arguments that are being made against us made against him 50 years ago. That is always the case when you try to change things and why it's so important to use the Presidency to fight to help the ordinary American to live a better life.

You've already heard it. You've heard it in what the other people have said. Harry Truman had to say, "No, this is not socialized

medicine, this is private insurance. No, this is not a Government takeover, we're preserving the choice and the private medical system. No, we're not going to waste more money covering everybody, we'll actually save money." And what did they say? "Harry Truman's a radical liberal. He's for socialized medicine. He's for big Government. He's going to take this country down."

Well, the truth is Harry Truman had Independence, Missouri, values. He had this old-fashioned notion that we value work and family and faith. And people who work hard and play by the rules ought to help one another when they need it, ought to join together to help themselves and to help their children have a better life.

And that is really what is at stake here. All this screaming and yelling, what's really hurting America today is that we're shouting too much and listening too little and speaking in a respectful tone too little.

Two years ago, on Labor Day when we all came here to kick off our general election campaign, what a wet day it was. Do you remember how wet it was? And we stood here in the rain because we believed we were on a mission to restore the American dream. We were tired of the screaming, yelling, anti-Government crowd that told us one thing and did another, that exploded the deficit, reduced investment in the American people, drove our economy into the ground. We were tired of seeing our country come apart and be divided by this rhetoric of hatred and division when we need to be coming together, to pull together for the 21st century. And we knew that at the end of the cold war we had a great test before us: Would we move into the next century with confidence, hope, united, so that we can compete and win and every one of our children can live up to the fullest of their God given abilities, or would we give into the same old dark fears and divisions that have been dredged up over and over and over again in this country's history?

My fellow Americans, that is the real truth of what your President, Harry Truman, had to face. At the end of World War II, when he was the victor in the war, 80 percent of the people thought he was just great. But then a new world had to be created. And the question was would the President just

tell people what they wanted to hear, or would he set about creating that new world?

And what did we get: the GI bill, a way to educate our families; a way to build houses; a way to build the middle class, bringing down the deficit; stabilizing the economy; rebuilding Europe with the Marshall plan; rebuilding Japan; standing up against Soviet expansionism so we could eventually win the cold war. That's what he did. And every step along the way the American people were subject to the most vicious and brutal attacks. Why? Because when people leave one era, when everybody can look at the future through the same set of glasses and they have to pick up another set of glasses to figure out how to understand things, we are always vulnerable.

You think about your own life. Every time you've been asked to change you may have a mixture of hope and fear. And the real test every time is are your fears going to overtake you, and are you going to give in? Or are you going to live by your hopes and your courage and charge forward and grow and become better? That is the test for the United States today.

This health care fight is far from the first one in which we have been engaged. When I became President, I told the American people I was tired of hearing people say they were conservative and they hated Government and they didn't like the deficit, and presiding over the biggest deficits in history, and I would do something about it. And we passed, against the solid opposition of every member of the other party in the United States Congress, an economic program. And what did it do? Two hundred fifty-five billion dollars worth of spending cuts; tax cuts for 15 million working Americans, including 295,000 Missouri families; a tax increase for the wealthiest 1.5 percent of our people; a reduction in the Federal work force, something the conservatives say they want, a reduction in the Federal work force of 250,000. And what did we produce? Three years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States and 3.8 million new jobs, more than in the previous 4 years put together by far and a 1.5-percent drop in the unemployment rate and the largest number of new

business starts since World War II. They said we would wreck the economy. Instead we brought it back, because we wouldn't give in to this hatred and rhetoric of division and destruction, and we moved forward.

And then we moved on to try to make sure all of you could compete and win in this global economy, expanding trade against opposition, providing for lifetime training, more for Head Start, world-class standards for our public schools for the first time, apprenticeship programs for our young people who do not go to 4-year colleges but need more training and a reduction in interest rates and better repayment terms for student loans, so that 20 million Americans are immediately eligible for lower interest on their student loans.

My fellow Americans, this is not about hot air and hot signs. This is about what we talked about here in the rain, what Al Gore and I wrote about in "Putting People First," and most of all, it's about what counts in your life as you move forward with your families and your hopes. And we are going to continue doing that.

Just look at the last week in America. What a great week America had. Harry Truman recognized the State of Israel. Now, with our strong help, Israel and Jordan have agreed to end the state of war between them and to work for peace and to make us more secure.

Harry Truman set up a system that enabled us to win the cold war. Now, after the cold war, after much hard work by the United States, Russia has announced that by the end of August, for the first time since Harry Truman was President, there will be no Russian soldiers in Central and Eastern Europe, making the world more secure.

After 6 years of tough talk and anticrime rhetoric by previous administrations, at long last, at long last, this week the House and the Senate agreed to send the toughest, smartest crime bill in the history of the United States to a vote on the floor of the United States Congress this coming week.

And as has been said, your majority leader, Dick Gephardt, and the Speaker of the House have, for the first time in American history, voted out a bill to the floor of the Congress that would provide for affordable health care for all of the American people.

It has been a good week for the United States.

But the only way we can go forward is if we go beyond the slogans to the facts, go beyond all the posturing to the people. Look at this crime bill, folks. Children are 5 times more likely to be the victims of violent crime. Violent crime has gone up by 300 percent in the last 30 years, the police forces by only 10 percent. This crime bill will add 100,000 police to our streets. It will make "three strikes and you're out" the law of the land. It will take the assault weapons out of the hands of the gangs that make them better armed than the police forces. It will make handgun possession and ownership by juveniles illegal unless they're under the supervision of an adult. It will make our schools safer. And it ought to pass next week, not because of all the rhetoric against it but because our families deserve a better and a safer and a more secure future.

But if we had to wait 6 long years for a crime bill, isn't 60 years way too long to wait for all the American people to have health care security? That's how long we've been waiting. President Roosevelt wanted it. President Truman proposed it three times. Seven Presidents of both parties have tried to achieve it.

Let me ask you something, and I want you to listen to this, it's so ironic. What is the real big fight here? The big fight is whether employers and employees should be asked to purchase private health insurance and whether the Government saying to the American people, "You must purchase private health insurance" is either socialized medicine, somehow unethical, or bad for the economy. That's what all this boils down to, whether it would be better to keep on doing what we're doing.

Well, let me ask you to consider this. Number one, in 1971, President Richard Nixon and the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee today, the Republican Senator from Oregon, Bob Packwood, proposed that all employers pay for half of the health insurance costs of all their employees and that we do it. If it was such a hot idea in 1971, why are the members of the other party running against it today as if it had the

plague? It was a good idea then, and it's a good idea today.

As you know, I just returned from Germany where I saw the flags of the Berlin Brigade cased because they're coming home, having won the cold war. And I met with hundreds and hundreds of our armed services families. All of them have health care in the military. And do you know, the only thing they wanted to talk to me about was health care. "Mr. President," they said, "when we come home to serve our country out of uniform, we want to know that our children are going to be covered by medical insurance. I hope you can pass health care this year."

It would be different, my fellow Americans, if we didn't have personal experience. Look at the State of Hawaii. In Hawaii, everything is more expensive than it is here on the American mainland, except one thing: health care, because for 20 years in Hawaii, employers and employees have been required to purchase health insurance so that everybody is covered. And guess what? Small business insurance premiums are 30 percent lower, \$400 a year lower for small business people in Hawaii than they are in the United States on the average. We know this works; why are we running away from it? Why don't we run toward it and embrace it and take care of people like that fine young woman that spoke to you here today?

And what happens when we try these half measures? Insurance rates go up, and coverages goes down. Do you know that one of the things I just wish—it's not much I wish for from those who shout and scream, instead of talk and listen and exchange, but I do wish they had some burden to prove that what they're for works.

This is the only country in the world with an advanced economy where we're going backward in health care. Ten years ago, 88 percent of our people were covered. Today, 83 percent of our people are covered. Five years ago there were 5 million Americans who had health insurance then who don't have it today. Five million Americans have lost their health insurance for good, just in the last 5 years, and over 80 percent of them are middle class working people. This is a

broken system, and we ought to fix it without delay.

Folks, 60 years ago this fight started. Fifty years ago Truman tried it three times and failed. Twenty-nine years ago, halfway between the beginning and now, President Johnson came to this city to sign Medicare into law and to give Harry and Bess Truman Medicare cards one and two. I'll bet there are a lot of people in this audience whose parents have been helped by Medicare. I bet there are a lot of people in this audience whose family budgets would have been severely strained if it hadn't been for Medicare.

If you have ever dealt with Medicare, you know that it's the furthest thing in the world from socialized medicine. Senior citizens pick their doctors, and the doctors make the decision. And yet, the arguments we're hearing today against this plan are the same arguments the same crowd made against Medicare 29 years ago, just like they did against Harry Truman 50 years ago and FDR 60 years ago.

Let's do better. Let's finish Harry Truman's fight. We're halfway home, and we can go all the way. And let me say this. I want to be as good as my word to say we should talk about people, not slogans. In this beloved State of yours there are 700,000 Missourians without health care. There are 175,000 children without health care. But there are millions who could lose their health care. They're an injury, a sickness, a job loss, a job change away from losing it. I believe we can do better.

I was raised in a home with a mother who was widowed when I was born, who left me with my grandparents to learn to be a nurse. I grew up around hospitals. And I buried my mother earlier this year, after a long and brave battle with cancer for which, thank God, she received magnificent care because she had health insurance. How can we in good conscience say, when we know every other country's done it, when we know Hawaii has done it and saved money doing it and made people more healthy, how can we say America is not up to it? How can we give in to those who would play to our fear and our fears of the future instead of going forward? Harry Truman would say the buck stops here, the buck stops in Congress and

the buck stops with you. Let's push it over the finish line this year.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:40 p.m. outside the Truman Courthouse in Independence Square. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Mel Carnahan of Missouri and Health Security Express riders Susan and Rachel Crowthers.

Remarks Upon Arrival in Cleveland, Ohio

July 30, 1994

Well, first, let me thank all of you for coming out to see Hillary and me. We are delighted to be back in Ohio and glad to be back in Cleveland. And I know I started the baseball season here, so I know you're all really thrilled at how well the Indians are doing. And I—[inaudible]—hope there won't be a strike.

[At this point, the President's microphone failed.]

Is it working now?

Let me just say a—[inaudible]. It keeps dying. Can you hear it now? All right, we'll try again.

As you know, I'm here on behalf of Joel Hyatt's campaign. I'm proud to be here helping him. I also want to say how delighted I am to be here with Congressmen Louis Stokes, Sherrod Brown, and Eric Fingerhut. And I want to make just a couple of points.

When I came here seeking the Presidency, and Ohio gave me the votes first to be nominated and then to be elected, I knew that this was a State which was really the heartland of America, where people were more or less evenly divided by party but where everybody wanted this country to work again for ordinary Americans. And I made some commitments to you, that I'd work on restoring the economy, bringing the American people together instead of dividing us, making the Government work for ordinary people again, and strengthening our communities and our families at the grassroots.

And let me just say that if you look at what has happened, we have worked very hard, often against bitter, bitter opposition, to make this country work. We adopted a plan

to reduce the deficit, after the other party had the White House for 12 years and quadrupled the debt, without a single solitary vote from the other side. We passed the biggest deficit reduction plan in history, reduced spending by \$255 billion, gave tax cuts to 500,000 working families in the State of Ohio alone, asked 47,000 who can afford it to pay higher taxes to pay the debt down.

Now, what has happened? We, the Democrats alone, without any help unfortunately from Congress from the other party, have reduced the Federal Government to its lowest size since Kennedy was President. We have taken \$700 billion off the national debt that would have been there before we came in and passed our economic plan. And what has been the result: 3.8 million new jobs, a 1.5-percent drop in the unemployment rate, the largest number of new businesses in any year since the end of World War II. This plan is working, and we need to keep Sherrod and Eric and Lou in the Congress and elect Joel Hyatt to keep America's economy going.

The other party, they always talked about how tough they were on crime. But for 6 years, under two administrations, there was no crime bill. Last week, the Members of the Senate and the House voted to put on the floor of this Congress this week the toughest anticrime bill in the history of the United States. So those are two reasons that I ran for President on—restoring the economy, helping to deal with crime.

I just want to say one last thing. This last week was a great week for America. The King of Jordan and the Prime Minister of Israel came to Washington to end their war and to pledge to work for peace. And we've been working hard on that. Peace for our children—[inaudible].

After working hard on it for a year and a half, the President of Russia called me and told me that Russian troops would get out of Central and Eastern Europe for the first time since World War II, making the world more peaceful for these children here.

But I'm telling you, what we owe these kids is not just peace in the world but peace on our streets and peace of mind. That means we need to pass the crime bill. We need to provide health care for all Americans, and we need to do it now.

Let me say to you, I went to Washington hoping against hope and against all the evidence that I could work with people of both parties to make this country a better place. And I have done everything I could to overcome the kind of inertia and opposition we have faced. And I just want you to know, if you like the fact that the American economy's recovering, if you like the fact that we're going to finally do something serious about crime, if you like the fact that after years we voted family leave, we voted for the Brady bill, we voted to make the American people safer, then you ought to keep these people in Congress and send Joel Hyatt to the Senate so we can do things, not stop things. This is a country that's can-do. And we're going to do if you put people in the Congress who believe in making America a better place.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:11 p.m. at Cleveland-Hopkins International Airport. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a Reception for Joel Hyatt in Mayfield Heights, Ohio

July 30, 1994

I'm delighted to be here with Joel and Susan and their two fine sons, who spoke so well and really said it all, and with Joel's mother, who must be so proud of him.

You know, if it hadn't been for my mother, I would never have been elected President, because there were plenty of elections I ran in where she and I were the only two people who thought I had a chance to win. [Laughter] Unfortunately, a time or two they were right, and we were wrong. [Laughter] But we just kept on going.

I'm delighted to be here with Senator and Mrs. Metzenbaum, and with all of you. I want to say a special word of thanks to attorney general Lee Fisher for his leadership on the fight against crime and for his leadership on behalf of the Clinton-Gore ticket. I also want to say a special word of thanks to the three Members of Congress that Joel mentioned, Tom Sawyer, Sherrod Brown, and Eric Fingerhut, without whom our economic program would not have passed and this

country's economic direction would not have turned around. And I thank them so much.

You know, it's funny, I came to the Cleveland Airport—we're a little late because there were 500 people there when I landed, so I went around and shook hands with them—and I thought, what great passionate public issue will they be concerned about. I thought I knew America well enough, and sure enough, the first 15 people I shook hands with said, "Can't you do anything about the baseball strike?" [Laughter]

You know, as a lifelong fanatic baseball fan, I threw out the first pitch here. And I saw the Indians come out of nowhere, and they're doing so well. And in the other part of the State, by the way, the Cincinnati Reds are not doing bad, either. So for Ohio, perhaps more than any other place in America this year, we're really all happy that we're having the best baseball season in 4 years, and we hope we get a chance to see if those records can be broken and all that progress can be made.

But you know, I want to make a point about that. A couple of years ago, David Letterman had a funny top ten list called, "Suggested Slogans of the 1992 Democratic Convention." And one of his allegedly funny slogans was, "We're the Cleveland Indians of politics." [Laughter] Well, we got the last laugh, and now Cleveland might get the last laugh, as well.

I want to say a special word of thanks, too, to Senator Metzenbaum. Al Hunt, in the Wall Street Journal, who is sometimes acerbic, said the other day, and I quote, "Senator Metzenbaum is a persistent pain in the neck." [Laughter] Now, wait, wait, he said, "As a result, thousands of little kids are likely to have a better life." That was an article about Senator Metzenbaum's adoption bill, a bill that I feel very strongly about, one of the few things that anybody in Congress has done besides given a speech to try to give more little kids a chance at a good life. And I really respect it. And I have told people who disagree with us on the issue of choice that if they're really concerned about that issue, they ought to go see Howard Metzenbaum and saddle up and pass his bill in the Congress, so that we can offer real and meaningful adoption to more of our poor children

in this country. I thank him for that, and I know you do, too.

Senator Biden pointed out last week at a big ceremony at the Justice Department, with hundreds and hundreds of police officers from all over the country, as we were celebrating the fact the Senate and the House had agreed to put this crime bill Joel talked about on the floor of the Congress next week, that the final negotiations were snagged in the early hours of the morning and that one man saved the entire bill by being willing to work out a last-minute compromise. And he said, that man was Howard Metzenbaum.

The thing I like about him is that he is always fighting. He doesn't always win, but he always fights. And what we need in this country is not people who are always trying to win, or at least look like they're winning, but people who are willing to fight.

I first knew about old Joel Hyatt back in Yale law school when he had already begun a program for undergraduates to teach inner-city kids. It's still going on. It's kind of like Hyatt Legal Services; it's going to live behind him. Even after he goes to the Senate, I'm sure it will go on. And then when he and Susan started Hyatt Legal Services I thought it was a good idea, which made me sort of an iconoclast among lawyers. But it seemed to me that ordinary people ought to be able to go see a lawyer and get something fairly straightforward done without having to take the shirt off their back or be scared to death.

And he did that. And I think that's important, because it's not just a mechanical service. It makes people think that the system can work for them. And believe me, if we could just make more than half the American people believe that this whole country could work for them again, we would do a very great deal indeed. And that's what Joel did with Legal Services. That's what he can help to do with the United States when you send him to the Senate.

Hillary and I have had a wonderful day today. We went to Independence, Missouri, to Harry Truman's hometown. And we celebrated there the final leg of the effort to get national health reform and guaranteed health insurance for all Americans. We went there for a couple of reasons. First of all, Harry

Truman tried three times, in 1945, 1947, and 1949, to get guaranteed health coverage for all Americans.

And it's very interesting, all the people that were out there holding their signs and demonstrating against us today, they all think Harry Truman ought to be on Mt. Rushmore. [Laughter] But I come from a family who was for him when he was alive. And I know that they're the same folks that tried to kill all of his reform programs back then.

At the end of the Second World War, Harry Truman was at 80 percent in the public opinion polls. By the time he sent the health care reform to Congress for the second time, he had been driven down to 36 percent and was going lower because of all the hatred and venom and misinformation put out about him and his program. They said, "This is socialized Government, socialized medicine, big Government run amok." Do you know what it was? He was asking for private health insurance for all Americans.

And we're going through the same fight today, 50 years later. In the middle, President Johnson came 29 years ago this day—this exact day, President Johnson went to Independence, Missouri, to sign Medicare and to give Harry and Bess Truman Medicare cards numbers one and two. It took that long to guarantee health care to the elderly of this country. And I couldn't help thinking, I wonder how many people out there today, with their right-wing extreme signs and all their harsh slogans, have parents who, thank God, are healthier because of Medicare and who have, therefore, avoided bankrupting their children because of Medicare?

I say that to make this point. There is something about this time that matters, that is far more important even than the specific things we are about, because we have come to the end of one era and we are starting another. And we have to decide again what kind of people we are and what we're going to do.

Every time in this country's history—and I won't go through the whole thing, but I do want to talk about this century, and some of you have seen even a little more of it than I have—every time we have come to the end of one era and started another, we have as

a country been just like people are. When you have to make a big change you are filled with both hope and fear. You want to make the plunge and grow into a bigger, better person, but you have all kinds of reservations. And you wish somehow that you wouldn't have to make these changes.

At the end of World War I, the American people voted for normalcy in a President, whatever that is. It really meant, let's just do nothing. Let's come home, we draw up in the world and do nothing here. We are tired. We paid a lot in this war. We can't think about this stuff anymore. And so we had no direction, and we just sort of flailed around. And what happened? The Ku Klux Klan got a big foothold in America, went on the rise and promoted a lot of hate. And there was the first big Red scare alleging that there were Communists everywhere trying to run down America. And the world came apart at the seams. And we found ourselves thrown into a great depression and, ultimately, another world war.

And then at the end of World War II, we had a different sort of leader, Harry Truman, only 4 months as Vice President when he found himself President. He brought the war to a successful conclusion; passed the G.I. bill so that soldiers could come home and get an education, buy homes for their families; brought the deficit down; got the civilian economy going; established the Marshall plan and rebuilt Japan as well as Europe; and set in motion that whole system that enabled us to stand up to communism and win the cold war. And he was still in terrible trouble when he started running for reelection, because people said he was a radical, he was unfit, he was not good. Why? Because people were afraid. They had to put down one set of glasses through which they had viewed the world, and they hadn't been able to pick up another set. Harry Truman was making that set of glasses, that framework in which we would all understand the world. But the American people did the right thing. They reelected him. And we enshrined those institutions that kept us going for four and a half decades and made us the great country that we are today.

Now we have won the cold war, and we are going into a new era without the great

enemy of the Soviet Union to define our every move and with more competition than we ever thought we'd have for jobs and opportunity and the future. And we know the future can be bright and wonderful and various and exciting. But it's also frightening. And we are, as a people, vulnerable today to the most vicious kind of attacks on our own self-confidence and our best impulses. And you hear it every day. And so we are still unable to escape the almost biological nature of a great democracy at a time of change.

I ran for President because I believed that the American dream was in danger for my daughter; because I believed that the economy was going downhill, the deficit was going up, jobs were going down, investment was going down; because I believed that the country was coming apart, being divided by race, by religion, and in other ways, when we ought to be coming together and taking great joy in all the diversity of America; because I believed that Government no longer worked for ordinary people. And Presidents and other politicians found that they could stay most popular by saying things people wanted to hear and doing absolutely nothing, avoiding the tough problems that inevitably causes the kind of conflict we see today. And I saw nothing ahead for my country but trouble.

And so I asked for the chance to serve, and I want to thank you for it. I have loved every day of it. And the rougher it gets the better I like it because that's what we're here to do.

Now, but what I want to say to you tonight—this is a huge country; there are 250 million plus people here. There are billions of decisions every day. The President cannot do what America needs done alone. We need a Congress working for change, and we need people committed to change at the grassroots level. And we need people who keep their heads on straight and their hearts in line, working for a better and brighter America.

You know, when I offered up that economic program, people in the other party told me for years that they just hated the deficit. I couldn't figure out why their Presidents kept proposing these big deficits, but they talked it down anyway. And I figured,

surely we'll get some help. We got zero votes from the congressional Republicans for the economic plan. They said it would bring the country down. They said it was the ruination of America. They said it was the extension of tax-and-spend.

Here's what it was: It was \$255 billion in spending cuts. It was an income tax cut for half a million Ohio families, and a tax increase for only 47,000 who were asked to pay more to pay down the debt. And you know what it brought us? It brought us a reduction in Federal employment over the next 5 years of a quarter of a million, so that the Democrats, not the Republicans, will give you the smallest Federal Government that has existed in the United States since John Kennedy was President. And it has brought us 3 years in a row of reducing the Federal deficit for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States. That's what it did.

And what were the results of this: 3.8 million new jobs, 1½ percent drop in the unemployment rate, the largest number of new business starts last year of any year since World War II, with no inflation.

That's why Eric Fingerhut, Sherrod Brown, and Tom Sawyer, and everybody else in this congressional district and State who represent you in Congress, who put their necks on the line, deserve to be reelected: because they gave you this economy, they did something about the debt, and they did it in the midst of a vicious attack on their credibility and unbelievable misinformation. Where would we be today if we hadn't done it?

When I travel to other parts of the world, when I go to these meetings of the leaders of the big industrial nations and they say, "Your exports are growing faster than ours, your investments are growing faster than ours, your unemployment rate is lower than ours, your growth rate is higher than ours; how did you do it? How did you do it?"—I think of people like you that put me in and people like Congressman Brown, Congressman Sawyer, Congressman Fingerhut, and the others. We won by the narrowest of margins.

If Joel Hyatt's opponent had defeated Senator Glenn last time, the entire economic

plan would have come crashing down and it would not have passed, because we carried it by a single vote. This election matters.

In times of change where people are uncertain, the airways are full of misinformation and people do not know it matters whether you vote for people who have the courage to change and take on the tough problems and do the tough thing. What is in fashion today is talking tough and acting soft. I believe in what Teddy Roosevelt said—maybe the last great Republican President—talk soft, act tough. That's what we ought to do.

But there is reason for hope. We passed Family and Medical Leave to empower families to be successful workers and successful parents, after 7 years of gridlock and a couple of vetoes. We finally passed the Brady bill after 7 years, 7 years in which it could not be passed. We passed more legislation and had more agreements to expand our trade to generate jobs for Americans and for people in Ohio in the last year than in any year in the past 30 years. We passed more legislation to help States and localities and private businesses, retrain and educate people, for more Head Start international standards of excellence for our schools, to apprenticeships for the kids that don't go to college, to lower college loans, for interest rates on college loans—listen to this—for 20 million Americans, so that more people can afford to go to college, from working class, middle class families.

Now, that's what we have been doing there. And if you don't know about that it's because others are more interested in other issues. But that is what we have been doing there. And we need doers in the United States Congress. There have been some issues on which we have received some bipartisan help, and for that I am very grateful. I would love it if it happened on ever issue. But when it comes to pivotal issues like health care, I can do no better than the distinguished Republican Congressman from Iowa, Fred Grandy, who complained the other day that the Republicans have been ordered not to cooperate with the administration to try to achieve our common goal of universal health care for all Americans. I don't care whether people are Republicans or Democrats. I don't even care how they're

going to vote in the next election. I think they all ought to have health care, even if they ought to change their politics. This is not a political issue, it's an American issue. We cannot solve it without American doers in the United States Congress.

Now, let me say that I am, in spite of everything, full of hope. Look at the week. The United States had this week: the King of Jordan, the Prime Minister of Israel, with strong support from the United States, coming to Washington to put an end to the state of war and to commit to create a full, decent, lasting peace between them after all these years of separation. After a year and a half of hard work on our part, the President of Russia notifies me that, yes, Russian troops will withdraw entirely from Central and Eastern Europe by August 31st. For the first time since the end of World War II there will be no Russian troops there. We will be a safer place. We confirmed a brilliant new Justice of the Supreme Court. We learned that our growth rate was 3.7 percent in the second quarter of this year. Our military swung into action in a courageous and bold way in Rwanda to help save the lives of the people there.

The United States had a good week last week. And the Congress voted out the crime bill. It will be on the floor this week: 100,000 police officers; "three strikes and you're out"; \$8 billion in prevention programs to give something to say yes to, not just something to say no to; an assault weapons ban; a ban on handgun possession by minors unless they're under the supervision of adults; and funds to make our schools safe so kids don't have to duck under their desks when the shooting starts. That's a big deal. And all that happened last week.

And for the first time in history, we now have on the floor of the Congress—the first time in history on the floor of both the Senate and House there are bills that would guarantee health care to all Americans.

And I want to say this, just this, in closing: We have been waiting 60 years through Presidents of both parties to try to figure out a way to cover every American. We are the only major country in the world that not only does not provide coverage for all American working families, we are going in reverse. Ten years ago 88 percent of our people were

insured; today only 83 percent are. Five years ago, there were 5 million more Americans with health insurance than have it today. Five million Americans living and working in the United States of America today had health insurance 5 years ago and do not have it today.

And what's worse is we know what works. We know that the simplest, easiest thing to do is to ask employers and employees to share the responsibility of buying private insurance. We know it works from looking at other countries. I just came back from Germany. I met with hundreds of military families who are coming home. The only issue they said was, "Mr. President, don't let us come home to an America without health care for our children. We've been covered in the military; we see how it works in Germany." In Germany, everybody pays; everybody's covered; it's a world-class health care system. They've got world-class pharmaceuticals. They spend 8½ percent of their income to cover everybody. We spend over 14 percent of our income to cover 83 percent and leave one in six Americans uncovered. I think we can do better.

But the best example is close to home. For 20 years Hawaii—Hawaii has covered everybody. Now, if you've ever been to Hawaii, you know everything in Hawaii is more expensive than it is on the mainland, except health care, where small businesses pay rates that are 30 percent lower than any other place. Why? Because if everybody has to pay their fair share—if everybody has to pay their fair share, then you have everybody doing what's happened in this Cleveland business partnership here, where small businesses have been able to buy cheaper insurance. Insurance goes down for everybody, and coverage goes up.

If you just try to reform the insurance system, insurance rates go up if you put more sick people in, people stop covering, the pool gets smaller, and the rates go up again. Why should we not simply do what works?

And I want to close with this: This should not be a political thing. In 1971, the President of the United States, Richard Nixon and the man who is now the ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee, Senator Robert Packwood from Oregon, introduced

a bill that required employers and employees to split the cost of health care to cover everybody. So I say to the Republicans in the Congress, let's have a bipartisan American solution. You go back to where Richard Nixon was 23 years ago. I'll meet you halfway, and we'll take care of the American people with people like Joel Hyatt in the Senate.

Thank you very much, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:20 p.m. at Landerhaven Country Club. In his remarks, he referred to television talk show host David Letterman.

Remarks at a Health Care Rally in Jersey City, New Jersey

August 1, 1994

Thank you. Mr. McEntee, Mr. Sombrotto, Mr. Rivera, Congressman Torricelli, Congressman Klein, Congressman Menendez, to all those who entertained us and all those who have come here, even those who have come here who disagree with us—I have a few questions I want to ask them in a minute.

You know, I hear a lot of talk today about what constitutes real patriotism, what constitutes being a real American, characterizations of what we're trying to do with health care. I think Carolyn is a real American, and what is their answer to her? Just before I came over here I met the Agneses. He's a barber. He told me how much his health care had gone up and that his business might go down. What is the chanters' answer to him? Just before I came over here I met a woman named Jean McCabe, whose health insurance premiums got almost up to \$10,000. And she wrote us a letter and said, "Am I going to have to move to Canada or Germany or someplace where I can find somebody who will treat me like a decent citizen?" What is their answer to her? I met Michael and Joanne Britt. He's a truck driver; she's been sick. Their insurance cost them so much, they were living in a house trailer, and they thought they would never be able to buy a home, never set aside any money for retirement because they couldn't afford their health care, in this, a country that's supposed to be a middle class country that rewards

work and family and faith and playing by the rules. What is their answer to her?

I ran for President, my fellow Americans, for some pretty basic reasons. I thought this country was going in the wrong direction. I thought we were in danger of losing the American dream as we went to the 21st century. And I thought we could do something about it. And all the yellers and shouters in the world will not change the basic facts. When I became President, the deficit was going up; now it's going down. The economy was going down, and now it's going up.

Years and years and years, politicians in Washington just talked about things, and now we are doing things. It took 7 years and two vetoes to pass the family leave law to give hard-working middle class people the guarantee that if they had to take a little time off, they wouldn't lose their jobs if it was for their children or their parents. It took 7 years to pass the Brady bill, but now it's keeping people alive by checking the backgrounds of people before they get guns.

I heard all that talk about our economic program. Many of the same people last year were saying, "You pass the President's economic program, it's nothing but a big tax increase; it will collapse the economy." Well, here's what it did.

It had \$255 billion in spending cuts. It had tax cuts for 15 million working Americans to keep them at work and off of welfare, including 350,000 New Jersey families. It asked the wealthiest 1½ percent to pay a tax increase, and it reduced the Federal Government—I hear all the time the other side saying we hate big Government. Well, we Democrats passed a budget that will give you the smallest Federal Government since John Kennedy was President, three years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President, and produced 3.8 million new jobs and a 1½ percent unemployment rate drop and the largest number of new businesses formed in any year since World War II. That is what we say to the naysayers, a Government that works for ordinary Americans again.

For 6 years I heard them talking about crime in Washington and how tough they were on crime, except nothing ever happened. But last week, after 6 years and this

problem plaguing American families, what happened? The Congress decided to send for a final vote the toughest, smartest crime bill in the history of the country: a 20-percent increase in the number of police officers, 100,000 more in the United States; "three strikes and you're out"; an assault weapons ban like you had here in New Jersey that you had to fight like crazy to keep; a bill that makes it illegal for young people to have handguns unless they're under the supervision of adults; money to keep our schools safer, so our kids don't have to duck under their desks to dodge bullets; and more money to give our young people something to say yes to, summer jobs, midnight basketball, drug treatment programs, the chance to build a better life. That is what we are producing for middle class America to build a better country.

And now, now we come to health care. I don't know if you saw this, but Saturday, Hillary and I went down to Independence, Missouri, to President Truman's hometown, with the Vice President and Mrs. Gore. And the Governor of Missouri got up, and he read all these things. He said, "Just listen to what they're saying about our President. They're saying he wants socialized medicine. They're saying he's going to take health care away from the American people. They're saying he's going to mess it up." He went through all these quotes, and then he said, "This is not what they said about President Clinton; this is what they said 50 years ago about President Truman." The lines are still the same, and the objective is still the same. I am trying to get health care for ordinary American people.

Let me tell you something, folks. When I presented our plan, I went all around the country and I listened to what people said. They said, "We want you to change it some, make it less bureaucratic, provide more flexibility, give bigger breaks to small business, take some more time to phase it in." And we said we would do that. Those changes have been made. But one thing we shouldn't change is whether America at long last will join the ranks of all the other advanced countries in the world and provide health care for all the middle class working people in the United States.

If you're on welfare, you have health care. If you're in jail, you have health care. If you're rich, you have health care. If you're a politician, you've got it. The only people who can lose it are working people. Over 80 percent of the people in the United States without health insurance work for a living every day. And it is not right.

And let me tell you this. I say this to all the people who come here to disagree with us in good faith. How do you explain the fact that all of our competitors cover their people? How do you explain the fact that, while that is happening, in the last 5 years in America, there are now 5 million people in this country today who don't have health insurance who had it 5 years ago, that New Jersey has had almost a 50-percent increase in the number of people without health insurance in the last 5 years? Almost one million people in New Jersey alone don't have it. What is their answer? I have given you my answer. Let's ask the American people to give health insurance to everybody.

Let me say one other thing. I'm a big one on getting beyond all this slogan and name-calling and just asking what works. In the State of Hawaii, for the last 20 years in Hawaii, employers and employees have had the responsibility to make sure that everybody had health insurance. Now, if you've ever been to Hawaii, you know that everything in the entire State of Hawaii is more expensive than it is here because it's way out there in the ocean. That is, everything except one thing: health insurance. It is 30 percent cheaper in Hawaii than it is in the United States, on the average. The healthy population is greater. The infant mortality rate is down. And small business is booming because they can all afford health care. And that's what I want to do for the United States, what we know will work.

What is the answer of those who say, "We don't like what they did in Hawaii; we don't want cheaper health insurance; we don't want healthier people. We want people to be able to get a free ride and stick the taxpayer with what happens. It's all right with us if these country hospitals close down in places like my State and if Dennis Rivera's workers can't afford to take care of all the people without health insurance." What is

their answer? It is time for the shoe to be on the other foot. I have been out here for one year saying, let's give health care to the American people.

Now this time who advocates shared responsibility? Who in America says everybody ought to have health insurance? Well, the American Association of Retired People, all these folks in the unions who already have health care, they're doing it for the rest of Americans, spending your money. And I thank you for that. But for the first time, for the first time ever, we have the nurses association, the medical association, the pediatricians, the children's doctors association, the family doctors association, 600,000 small businesses who provide health care for their workers, all of them say, "If everybody did it we could make this a healthier, better, stronger country, and we would lower health care costs for tens of millions of Americans." That's what we're here for. That's what I want you to fight for. That's what I want Congress to vote for.

My fellow Americans, this decision rests no longer in my hands alone. The Congress has been under enormous pressure. There has been enormous disinformation out there. You've got people here holding up signs saying, "No Socialized Medicine." What does our plan require? Everybody to buy private insurance. Most of them have parents on Medicare. You want to repeal Medicare, ma'am? Do you think that's socialized medicine? I don't. Medicare, however, is paid for by all of us and by our employers. And they take care of the elderly people of this country; nobody wants to repeal it.

Our plan gives you your choice of doctors. You keep your doctor. You make your decision. It's private insurance. It's just what Hawaii has done. And there are people who say, "Don't ration health care." You talk to anybody who's had their insurance cut back or their premiums up or their deductibles increased. You talk to any doctor who's had to hire somebody just to call the insurance companies to get them to pay the bill. We are rationing health care today; 39 million Americans don't have it. We are losing ground.

There are millions and millions of people who are holding on by their fingernails with

worse and worse policies. What I want to do is stop rationing health care, avoid socialized medicine, give good, old-fashioned private American health care to every American working family. That's what we're trying to do. And all the disinformation in the world won't change it.

So I ask you this: Don't let the fear-mongers, don't let the dividers, don't let the people who disseminate false information frighten the United States Congress into walking away from the opportunity of a lifetime. Tell the Members of Congress you will support them. This is not partisan politics.

I met with three families before I came up here with these problems. I don't have any earthly idea whether they are Republicans or Democrats. I couldn't tell you to save my life who they voted for for President. But I can tell you one thing: If they get up and go to work and obey the law and do their best to raise their children, they deserve health insurance. And with your help, we're going to give it to them.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:10 p.m. at Liberty State Park. In his remarks, he referred to Gerald McEntee, president, AFSCME; Vince Sombrotto, president, Letter Carriers of the United States; Dennis Rivera, president, Local 1199; Health Security Express rider Carolyn Vilas; and Louis and Maria Agnes, of New Jersey, who had written to the President concerning their problems obtaining health care insurance.

Statement on Crime Legislation

August 1, 1994

Every major law enforcement organization in America supports this crime bill. Republican mayors have written members of their party in Congress to urge swift passage of the bill and Democratic mayors have done the same.

Today, the Nation's prosecutors have come to Washington to add their voices to this mighty chorus with its simple message: Pass the crime bill now.

Police officers want it because it bans the deadly assault weapons that outgun them every day. Mayors want it because it will put 100,000 more police officers on the streets. Prosecutors want it because it's full of tough

punishments that will allow them to seek the penalties violent criminals deserve.

The American people want action against the crime and violence that has become a familiar threat in almost every neighborhood.

It's time for the lawmakers to do what the law enforcers have asked: Pass the crime bill now.

Proclamation 6709—50th Anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising

August 1, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

On this day of remembrance, we pause together to recall the brutal path that has led to the triumph of freedom in Poland. We remember the brave men and women of the Polish Home Army who stood on the front lines of combat as their city was destroyed. We recall the children of Warsaw who braved sniper fire to deliver messages for the Resistance. We hold in our hearts the spirits of those who lost their lives. We grieve with their survivors. We speak to one another of those bloody days so that we may never know that sorrow again.

A half-century ago, the residents of Warsaw, Poland, could scarcely imagine that their city would restore its playgrounds for children or its gardens for flowers. For 63 monstrous days of Nazi aggression, it seemed impossible that a Polish arsenal stockpiled with courage, faith, and solidarity could prevail against the tanks, machine guns, and bombers of Hitler's tyranny. But since that time, when it seemed unfathomable to the valiant citizens of Warsaw that they would ever recapture freedom's light, the people of Poland have emerged victorious. Fifty years later, the weapons of Nazi terror are lost to history. Solidarity inspires us still.

Warsaw has earned the flowers that grace it today. Though battered by the chaos of the second World War and stifled by the strictures of the Cold War, the people of Poland have continued to rebuild their beloved capital. Brick by brick, building by building, the beauty and majesty that defined Warsaw for centuries are being reborn to a generation

of Poles who have just recently discovered the blessings of freedom.

The courage and hope that carried their parents and grandparents through the darkest days of the 1944 uprising remain. The legacy of that battle stirs today's residents to embrace the challenges of liberty. And on the strength of that tradition, democracy now thrives in Warsaw.

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 August 1, 1994, as the 50th Anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising. I call upon the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this first 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, 8:56 a.m., August 2, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on August 3.

Proclamation 6711—Helsinki Human Rights Day, 1994

August 1, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

For over 20 years, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe has been an important forum in leading humanity's ongoing struggle to define and defend human rights. The Helsinki Final Act of 1975 committed the United States, Canada, and 33 European states to respect "freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." It stands as a fundamental declaration of freedom—a beacon and a warning to all those who would turn away from democracy's welcoming light.

When the West called upon the states in the Eastern bloc to uphold their CSCE human rights commitments during the Cold War, CSCE members' support of these ideals played a pivotal role. In recent years, the end of the Cold War and the dramatic political changes sweeping Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union have allowed the CSCE to expand and reinforce its mandate even further. The 1990 Charter of Paris added to existing CSCE principles, embracing new commitments to political pluralism, economic liberty, and the rule of law. The 1992 Helsinki Summit emphasized that "the protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms and the strengthening of democratic institutions continue to be a vital basis" for comprehensive security. Today, the shared determination of CSCE members to uphold these essential values remains the keystone of European security.

As CSCE member states strive to put the Helsinki principles into practice, violent conflicts around the globe remind us that many societies emerging from totalitarian rule still have far to travel toward international standards of humanitarian democracy. Ethnic tensions, civil unrest, and human rights abuses are all too prevalent in several of the recently admitted CSCE nations. The United States stands steadfast in our commitment to full implementation of the human rights and humanitarian provisions of the Helsinki Accords, and I call upon all of the signatory states to uphold their pledge to protect human rights, to seek peaceful resolutions of conflicts, and to fully abide by their obligations under the Helsinki Accords.

International security depends as never before upon respect for the rights of individuals and for the democratic principles of government. As we recognize the magnitude of the Helsinki Accords in the history of nations, we reaffirm our commitment to advancing its timeless wisdom. The vigilant protection of these basic freedoms is the world's best hope for a Europe of growing cooperation and lasting peace.

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 August 1, 1994,

as Helsinki Human Rights Day and reaffirm the American commitment to upholding human dignity and freedom—principles that are enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act. As we Americans observe this day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities, let us remember our courageous citizens who have made sacrifices to secure the freedoms we enjoy. Let us work together to encourage respect for human rights and democratic values around the world.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this first 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, 2:15 p.m., August 2, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on August 4.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Rwanda

August 1, 1994

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

Since August 1993, when a fragile peace was signed between Rwandan Government Forces (RGF) and the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), the United Nations has been actively addressing the humanitarian crisis in Rwanda. On April 6, 1994, President Habyarimana of Rwanda, President Ntaryamira of Burundi and a number of government officials were killed when their plane crashed while approaching the airport in Kigali, Rwanda's capital. This incident ruptured the peace and led to a resumption of the civil war that has now resulted in the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Rwandans, many of them Tutsi civilians who were the victims of genocide on the part of radical Hutu elements aligned with the former government.

In early July 1994, the government fell and the RPF assumed power in Kigali, establishing a multi-party government. Since that time they have cooperated fully with us and have even requested human rights monitors

to better assure the safety of returning refugees. As a result of the Civil War, the nation's infrastructure has been virtually destroyed. An estimated 2.1 million Rwandan refugees have fled to neighboring Zaire, Burundi, Uganda, and Tanzania, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimates that a further 2.6 million persons are internally displaced.

The need to respond to disease, starvation, and dehydration in the refugee camps, especially in Zaire and Burundi, led me on July 29, 1994, to direct the expansion of capabilities at the Kigali airport to support the UNHCR relief operation more effectively. By providing a support infrastructure for the relief of refugees and displaced persons out of this capital city, I believe we will be better able to draw Rwandans back to their homes, away from the unsanitary conditions of the refugee camps, and closer to a more centralized distribution point for humanitarian aid. We have engaged in negotiations with the new government in order to promote these objectives. We have urged this new government to broaden its political base, refrain from retribution, respect the rule of law, and otherwise create the conditions of safety and security that would permit the refugees to return home.

In the afternoon of July 29, 1994, I directed General Joulwan, Commander in Chief, United States European Command, in addition to the relief operations he is already conducting through Goma, Zaire and Entebbe, Uganda, immediately deploy a contingent of U.S. forces, numbering approximately 200, to the airport at Kigali. These forces began to arrive on July 30, 1994. Other forces from Australia and the United Kingdom are committed to this effort in Kigali as well. During this initial phase of "Operation Support Hope," the United States and other committed nations will establish and operate a logistics base to support UNHCR humanitarian relief operations. In this effort, they will open a logistic coordination center for receiving and distributing relief supplies, provide airfield services and cargo handling, and provide security for the airport at Kigali. These efforts are directed at achieving the objectives of U.N. Security Council Resolutions 929, 925 and 918. No organized resist-

ance has been encountered to our efforts to date and none is expected.

United States Armed Forces will remain in Rwanda only as long as necessary to assist the UNHCR in establishing an effective distribution mechanism for humanitarian relief support to the Rwandan people. While it is not possible to estimate precisely how long it will take to satisfy this requirement, we believe that prolonged operations will not be necessary.

We do not intend that U.S. Armed Forces deployed to Rwanda become involved in hostilities. Nonetheless, a majority of the approximately 200 personnel deployed will be assigned to provide force protection and assure security of the Kigali airport. These security forces are equipped and ready to take such measures as may be needed to accomplish their humanitarian mission and defend themselves if necessary.

I have taken these actions pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct our foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive. I am providing this report consistent with the War Powers Resolution in accordance with my desire that the Congress be fully informed. I look forward to cooperating with the Congress in this effort to relieve human suffering.

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 letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on August 2.

Remarks Announcing United States Shipbuilding Industry Initiatives

August 2, 1994

Thank you. Secretary Peña, Secretary Brown, Ambassador Kantor, Admiral Herberger, John Dane, and Doug Ballis. Thanks for saving the sign.

I'd like to introduce the Members of the House who are here who supported this initiative and who have made a major contribution to what we're doing and obviously will be needed in the months and years ahead and whose districts will be affected by the

announcements we make today: Congressman Gene Taylor from Mississippi, Congressman Billy Tauzin from Louisiana, Congressman Bobby Scott from Virginia, and Congresswoman Lynn Schenk and Congressman Bob Filner from California. Thank you for your help. Would you stand? [*Applause*]

I'd like to begin by thanking Doug and Richard Vortman, NASSCO's CEO, who is also here, because they gave me one of those seminal experiences you have once in a while in life that takes an idea from your head to your heart. When you know something and you know you ought to do it, that's one thing. But when you feel it, it's another thing altogether.

They stopped work one day in May of 1992, before I was even the nominee of my party for President, so that I could speak to nearly 4,000 of their people and so that I could listen to them. I could see them working together, struggling together, trying to compete in the global economy, building the only commercial ship then being built anywhere in the United States of America. They made me feel welcome, but they also made sure I was aware of what the stakes were and what the issue was and how this was yet one more example of how we could compete and win in an area critical to our future if only we had the policies, the tools, and the drive to do it.

I wish all the people that I met that day could be in this room today. I'm afraid the fire marshal would evict us all if I had tried to achieve that. But they are the people who really taught me about this issue, and they are the people, they and the millions like them, for whom I fought both before I got here and for whom I try to fight every day in this office.

This is a great day for our American jobs, for our economy, for our shipbuilding industry. It's a great day for the idea that if we all work together we can figure out how to solve our problems even in difficult budgetary times.

Two years ago, every ship in America under construction except one was destined for defense, every one. And now we know that while our United States naval power is still unsurpassed in the world and must remain so, we cannot allow that one commer-

cial vessel I saw under construction in San Diego become a symbol of the past.

We know that one of the things that we needed most in 1992 and one of the things we're trying most to do today is to have a strategy for restructuring our defense industries so that they can fulfill a dual purpose, let me say, not so they can get out of defense work, because we will continue to need major investments in defense technologies for the foreseeable future, but so that with defense being scaled back, those kinds of folks can stay in business by being successful commercially as well.

When I ran for this job, when the economy was going down and the deficit was going up, it was obvious to me that there were many reasons for that, but one of them was that the Government had no strategy. What was our strategy to preserve aerospace, our biggest export? What was our strategy when it came to the shipbuilding industry? What was our strategy to help support our automakers when they had made radical changes all through the 1980's so that they could be more competitive again? What was our strategy?

And the truth is, we didn't have one. Well, now we do have one. We have strategies for those industries and for others and for our economy. We've concluded trade agreements that expanded the barriers of world trade and enabled us to do more: NAFTA, the GATT we're trying to pass in Congress now, all designed to help hard-working middle class Americans get ahead because they'll have the economic opportunities to do it.

I've said this many times, but I want to repeat it again: The mission of the United States at the close of the 20th century must be to keep the American dream alive in the 21st century. And to do it, we have to restore the economy, rebuild our communities at home, empower individuals to take responsibilities for themselves, put Government back on the side of ordinary people, create a world of greater peace and prosperity. That is what we must do.

And that is exactly what we are celebrating here today, not just four projects for four worthy companies with several thousand worthy American workers. In the last 19 months, we have dramatically reduced the

deficit. We're on the verge of getting 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Truman was President. We have seen 3.8 million new jobs come into this economy, even as we are scaling back the Federal work force so that by the end of this budget cycle it will be the smallest it's been since President Kennedy was here in the White House. The unemployment rate has gone down by 1½ percent, and we are making real progress in bringing manufacturing back. Between 1989 and 1992, we lost 1.4 million manufacturing jobs. Now we have 104,000 more than we had on the day I was inaugurated.

I am proud of these accomplishments of the American people, getting the American economy in order by getting our economic house in order, by instituting lifetime education and training programs that will have to embrace all of our people from the first day of preschool to the last day they work.

Two years ago, Doug and a lot of other people in NASSCO said, "This has been a great day, but don't forget us if you're elected." And we haven't forgotten them, but we've got to keep following through. And we have to think of this as a permanent partnership. I believe that if you look at the America that we're moving toward, the Government will adopt a less regulatory role, the Government will become a smaller percentage of our gross national product in the amount of money we spend. But the Government will have to be there in the competition in the global economy of the 21st century in partnership with the private sector to make sure that our people, when they're doing the right things, have a chance to compete and win and have a chance to seize the technologies of the 21st century.

Let me just make a couple of other remarks about that. Secretary Perry could not be here today with our other Cabinet members. But I do want to say that the Defense Department, I think, has done an exemplary job in promoting defense conversion. Secretary Perry has recently awarded the first \$30 million in matching grants out of a total of \$220 million we'll invest over the next 5 years to apply advanced technologies to make our shipbuilding industry even more competitive. We're spending hundreds of mil-

lions of dollars more in other areas to promote defense conversion as well.

I also want to join Secretary Peña in complimenting our Trade Representative, our Ambassador, Mickey Kantor, for the work he did in the OECD negotiations with the European countries on shipbuilding subsidies. They dragged on for 5 years, and his work will bring an end to unfair foreign shipbuilding subsidies that has kept us out of world markets too long. He did a good job with that; he did a good job with the GATT; he did a superb job with NAFTA. And we're selling rice to Japan for the first time—[laughter]—which makes my people happy back home in Arkansas. And I thank you, sir.

I also want to say a special word of thanks to the Secretary of Commerce. He was here not very long ago when we announced \$6 billion in aircraft exports. We had an announcement the other day of \$4 billion in telecommunications exports, and there are more in other high-wage manufacturing industries.

The next step, as Secretary Peña said, in our comprehensive maritime reform is to sustain the U.S. flag merchant fleet. And this week, as the House considers that maritime and security and trade act, I hope that you all will help us see that the Congress passes a bill similar to the one the administration has proposed.

Let me say again, this is a partnership, and this is a good beginning. And we're going in the right direction with the economy as a whole and with shipbuilding in particular, with Government and business and workers walking hand in hand into the 21st century. But we have to make this a part of the permanent process of doing business for America. I ask all of you to support that, to rededicate yourself to these objectives. This is a good day. As my daughter says, this is a big deal. [Laughter] But it is just a beginning. Let's keep it going.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:36 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Adm. Albert Herberger, Administrator, Maritime Administration; John Dane III, president, Trinity Shipyards; and Doug Ballis, National Steel and Shipbuilding Co. (NASSCO) employee.

Teleconference Remarks Announcing Additional California Earthquake Assistance

August 2, 1994

Mayor Richard Riordan. Mr. President, we'd like to thank you for the very quick response you've given to our letter of last Thursday and the extraordinary effort that your A-plus team is still doing for our great city.

Mayor Judy Abdo. We also want to say how grateful we are for the people who have worked so hard together to find these solutions. And Santa Monica is particularly grateful for the quick and decisive response that you've made.

The President. Well, I just want to say that it's been a privilege for all of us here in Washington to work with you to help get southern California back on its feet again.

I visited Los Angeles a couple of days after the earthquake and saw that destruction, and I was terribly moved by it. And now, in some ways, it's more moving to hear about all the progress that's been made in just 6 months. I think the people of southern California have certainly showed a great deal of courage and resilience, and you have all shown strong leadership. And I very much appreciate that.

[Mayor Riordan and Mayor Abdo discussed the extensive damage to housing and stated that Federal assistance is critical to the recovery effort in that area.]

The President. What about the ghost towns in the areas, both in Los Angeles and Santa Monica? That's still a problem, isn't it?

Senator Dianne Feinstein. Well, Mr. President, may I say something here?

The President. Sure.

Senator Feinstein. Oh, I think it was—James Lee, was it a month ago we went to them, the ghost towns, with Richard Alarcon?

The President. I don't think he's on the phone.

Senator Feinstein. Oh, he's not on the line. Richard, do you remember when it was?

The President. I know you toured the areas.

[Senator Feinstein discussed damaged and abandoned apartment buildings and expressed appreciation for increased HUD funding to alleviate the problem.]

The President. Well, one of the things that we found out and that Henry Cisneros talked to me a lot about was that years after the natural disasters that struck the Bay Area in northern California and in southern Florida, there are still these ghost towns, and communities are still suffering. Now it's more expensive to fix it than if we'd done it right away.

And so, I thought maybe what I would do is let Secretary Cisneros just talk a little bit about what he's been working with you, Senator Feinstein, Senator Boxer, and the mayors and the other members of your delegation on.

[Secretary of Transportation Henry Cisneros explained that \$225 million will be made available through the Community Development Block Grant Program to help rebuild abandoned neighborhoods.]

The President. Thank you, Henry. I am really pleased with the idea that you came up with, and I identify with the solution a lot because it's a source of funds I'm familiar with and something I've used myself in my former life when I was a Governor.

Today I sent the formal request to Congress to provide \$225 million in additional disaster assistance for the Los Angeles area, \$200 million to Los Angeles, \$25 million to Santa Monica, as a downpayment on our partnerships with the cities to solve this ghost town problem. This goes beyond the typical Federal disaster response, and it's possible frankly because we've been able to reallocate some other disaster funds. It doesn't meet the total need, and I know we'll have to have full cooperation and participation from local governments in the States as we go through this. But it is a very good beginning, and it gives you a chance to begin to get rid of this problem.

Mayor?

[Mayor Riordan thanked the President for the extra funds and the flexibility to direct the money where it is most needed. Mayor Abdo then stated that while Santa Monica

does not have ghost neighborhoods, the money will be used to repair abandoned buildings.]

The President. Senator Feinstein?

Senator Feinstein. Mr. President, I want to just ask Judy one question. Judy, do you know how many units that \$25 million will cover?

[Mayor Abdo explained that they will not know how many units the money will cover until they find out how much money will be needed after the SBA loans have been distributed. Senator Feinstein then thanked Secretary Cisneros for his efforts.]

Secretary Cisneros. Thank you very much, Senator.

Senator Feinstein. And I'm going to miss a vote, so I'm going to have to sign off.

The President. Thank you, Senator.

Senator Feinstein. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Well, I just wanted to make one final comment before we all sign off. Today we are marking the 6-month milestone in your recovery effort by releasing a report prepared by our Office of Management and Budget that describes what's been done so far. And I really want to thank again our FEMA Director, James Lee Witt, Secretary Peña, Erskine Bowles, our SBA Administrator, and of course, Henry Cisneros for all their hard work.

So far we have identified \$11.9 billion in Federal assistance to meet California's need after the earthquake. That's the largest amount ever provided to an individual disaster. And with the assistance, obviously, of both of you, Mayor Riordan, Mayor Abdo, and the hard work of your Senators and the California congressional delegation, Congress enacted that emergency relief package in record time.

Our report shows now that record numbers of applications for assistance have been received. FEMA has accepted over 600,000 registrations, which is twice the previous all-time high for Hurricane Hugo. The SBA has accepted over 200,000 disaster loan applications to repair homes and businesses, which is more than for the Midwest floods, Hurricane Andrew, the Loma Prieta earthquake, and Hurricane Hugo combined. And I know

that Henry has signed over 12,600 leases providing homes to families who were displaced by the earthquake. So we've tried to be creative and flexible in our response.

Secretary Peña's now-famous cost-plus-time contracting proposal led to the opening of damaged freeways in record time, faster than even I believed it could be done, and I'm an incurable optimist. And the SBA Administrator, Erskine Bowles, exercised his discretionary authority so that disaster loans went to larger numbers of major employers to retain communities. The Commerce Secretary developed new and innovative programs to help rebuild infrastructure and assist small businesses that don't otherwise qualify for Federal assistance. So we've tried to be quick and flexible and helpful.

And I just want to say again, looking back on the last 6 months, I feel good about what all of us have done together. But I know the job is not finished. And I hope this announcement today will give you, the leaders, as well as the citizens of southern California assurances that—my personal pledge and our entire administration—we're still committed over the long haul to make sure that we get over the Northridge earthquake and we make it, over the long run, a net plus for the people of southern California because of the rebound.

[The mayors expressed their appreciation to the President. Secretary Cisneros then discussed his plans to visit Los Angeles, and the mayors thanked him also.]

The President. Thank you very much. Goodbye.

NOTE: The teleconference began at 4:46 p.m. The President spoke from the Oval Office at the White House. During the teleconference, Senator Feinstein referred to Richard Alarcon, member, Los Angeles City Council.

Proclamation 6712—National Neighborhood Crime Watch Day, 1994

August 2, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Crime, in one way or another, affects every individual in every community in America. The loss of one parent touches all of our families. The death of one child breaks all of our hearts. But by reaching out to each other in a gesture of courage and cooperation, law enforcement officers and the citizens they serve forge a shield of safety—our greatest weapon in the fight against crime.

Robert Kennedy once said that each time one of us “stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope.” Tonight, millions of Americans across the country will join their neighbors in turning on lights from 9:00 to 10:00 o'clock p.m. in front of their homes. “National Night Out” provides communities the opportunity to heighten crime and drug prevention awareness, to encourage participation in anti-crime programs, and to strengthen the relationship between local police and private citizens. Already, we have seen how important these simple steps can be in avoiding tragedy. In big cities and small towns throughout our Nation, police rely on the active involvement of community members to help identify potential problems before they explode into violence. As we resolve tonight to end the violence, the message of this event is clear: Crime in America will not be tolerated.

One of the primary duties of any government is to work to keep its citizens safe from harm. I welcome this responsibility, and I am determined to fulfill it. But no government program will be truly successful without the help of each American. I hope that the lights coming on across America this evening will serve as a signal of both warning and hope. With shared responsibility and a willingness

to change, we can turn the tide on the wave of crime in America. Working together, we can build a brighter, more secure future for all of our people.

The Congress, by House Joint Resolution 374, has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation observing August 2, 1994, as "National Neighborhood Crime Watch Day."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim August 2, 1994, as National Neighborhood Crime Watch Day. I call upon the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this second 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, 11:16 a.m., August 3, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on August 4.

Message to the Congress on Iraq

August 2, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of March 3, 1994, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order No. 12722 of August 2, 1990. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

Executive Order No. 12722 ordered the immediate blocking of all property and interests in property of the Government of Iraq (including the Central Bank of Iraq), then or thereafter located in the United States or within the possession or control of a United States person. That order also prohibited the importation into the United States of goods and services of Iraqi origin, as well as the

exportation of goods, services, and technology from the United States to Iraq. The order prohibited travel-related transactions to or from Iraq and the performance of any contract in support of any industrial, commercial, or governmental project in Iraq. United States persons were also prohibited from granting or extending credit or loans to the Government of Iraq.

The foregoing prohibitions (as well as the blocking of Government of Iraq property) were continued and augmented on August 9, 1990, by Executive Order No. 12724, which was issued in order to align the sanctions imposed by the United States with United Nations Security Council Resolution 661 of August 6, 1990.

Executive Order No. 12817 was issued on October 21, 1992, to implement in the United States measures adopted in United Nations Security Council Resolution 778 of October 2, 1992. Resolution 778 requires U.N. Member States temporarily to transfer to a U.N. escrow account up to \$200 million apiece in Iraqi oil sale proceeds paid by purchasers after the imposition of U.N. sanctions on Iraq, to finance Iraq's obligations for U.N. activities with respect to Iraq, such as expenses to verify Iraqi weapons destruction, and to provide humanitarian assistance in Iraq on a nonpartisan basis. A portion of the escrowed funds will also fund the activities of the U.N. Compensation Commission in Geneva, which will handle claims from victims of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Member States also may make voluntary contributions to the account. The funds placed in the escrow account are to be returned, with interest, to the Member States that transferred them to the United Nations, as funds are received from future sales of Iraqi oil authorized by the U.N. Security Council. No Member State is required to fund more than half of the total transfers or contributions to the escrow account.

This report discusses only matters concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order No. 12722 and matters relating to Executive Orders Nos. 12724 and 12817 (the "Executive orders"). The report covers events from February 2, 1994, through August 1, 1994.

1. During the reporting period, there were no amendments to the Iraqi Sanctions Regulations.

2. Investigations of possible violations of the Iraqi sanctions continue to be pursued and appropriate enforcement actions taken. There are currently 30 enforcement actions pending. These are intended to deter future activities in violation of the sanctions. Additional civil penalty notices were prepared during the reporting period for violations of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and Iraqi Sanctions Regulations with respect to transactions involving Iraq. Three penalties totaling \$38,450 were collected from three banks for violation of the prohibitions against Iraq, and noncompliance with reporting requirements and an Office of Foreign Assets Control directive license.

3. Investigation also continues into the roles played by various individuals and firms outside Iraq in the Iraqi government procurement network. These investigations may lead to additions to the Office of Foreign Assets Control's listing of individuals and organizations determined to be Specially Designated Nationals ("SDNs") of the Government of Iraq. One Jordanian-Iraqi joint venture company prominently involved in shipments to Iraq was identified as an SDN of Iraq on May 4, 1994. A copy of the notice is attached.

4. Pursuant to Executive Order No. 12817 implementing United Nations Security Council Resolution 778, on October 26, 1992, the Office of Foreign Assets Control directed the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to establish a blocked account for receipt of certain post-August 6, 1990, Iraqi oil sales proceeds, and to hold, invest, and transfer these funds as required by the order. On March 1, 1994, following payments by the Governments of the United Kingdom (\$447,761.19), the Netherlands (\$1,566,994.55), Australia (\$476,110.00), and the European Community (\$3,758,310.31), respectively, to the special United Nations-controlled account, entitled United Nations Security Council Resolution 778 Escrow Account, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of \$6,240,176.05 from the blocked account it holds to the United Nations-con-

trolled account. Similarly, on March 22, 1994, following the payment of \$525,182.50 by the Government of the Netherlands, \$2,478,089.89 by the European Community, \$2,352,800.00 by the Government of the United Kingdom, \$444,444.44 by the Government of Denmark, \$1,204,899.30 by the Government of Sweden, and \$3,100,000.00 by the Government of Japan, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of \$10,105,416.13 to the United Nations-controlled account. Again on June 30, 1994, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer \$6,969,862.89 to the United Nations-controlled account, an amount corresponding to the aggregate total of recent payments by the governments of other Member States: European Community (\$1,042,774.31), United Kingdom (\$1,570,804.48), the Netherlands (\$1,062,219.51), Kuwait (\$2,000,000.00), and Sweden (\$1,294,064.59). Cumulative transfers from the blocked Federal Reserve Bank of New York account since issuance of Executive Order No. 12817 have amounted to \$130,928,726.04 of the up to \$200 million that the United States is obligated to match from blocked Iraqi oil payments, pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 778.

5. The Office of Foreign Assets Control has issued a total of 496 specific licenses regarding transactions pertaining to Iraq or Iraqi assets since August 1990. Since my last report, 52 specific licenses have been issued. Licenses were issued for transactions such as the filing of legal actions against Iraqi governmental entities, legal representation of Iraq, and the exportation to Iraq of donated medicine, medical supplies, food intended for humanitarian relief purposes, the execution of powers of attorney relating to the administration of personal assets and decedents' estates in Iraq, and the protection of preexistent intellectual property rights in Iraq.

6. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from February 2, 1994, through August 1, 1994, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with re-

spect to Iraq are reported to be about \$2.3 million, most of which represents wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of State (particularly the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, the Bureau of Near East and South Asian Affairs, the Bureau of International Organizations, and the Office of the Legal Adviser), and the Department of Transportation (particularly the U.S. Coast Guard).

7. The United States imposed economic sanctions on Iraq in response to Iraq's illegal invasion and occupation of Kuwait, a clear act of brutal aggression. The United States, together with the international community, is maintaining economic sanctions against Iraq because the Iraqi regime has failed to comply fully with United Nations Security Council resolutions. Security Council resolutions on Iraq call for the elimination of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, the inviolability of the Iraq-Kuwait boundary, the release of Kuwaiti and other third-country nationals, compensation for victims of Iraqi aggression, long-term monitoring of weapons of mass destruction capabilities, the return of Kuwaiti assets stolen during Iraq's illegal occupation of Kuwait, renunciation of terrorism, an end to internal Iraqi repression of its own civilian population, and the facilitation of access of international relief organizations to all those in need in all parts of Iraq. Four years after the invasion, a pattern of defiance persists: a refusal to recognize the international boundary with Kuwait or to account for missing Kuwaiti detainees, sponsorship of assassinations in Lebanon and in northern Iraq; incomplete declarations to weapons inspectors, and ongoing widespread human rights violations, among other things. As a result, the U.N. sanctions remain in place; the United States will continue to enforce those sanctions under domestic authority.

The Baghdad government continued to violate basic human rights of its own citizens through systematic repression of minorities and denial of humanitarian assistance. The

Government of Iraq has repeatedly said it will not be bound by United Nations Security Council Resolution 688. For more than 3 years, Baghdad has maintained a complete blockade of food, fuel, and medicine on northern Iraq. The Iraqi military routinely harasses residents of the north, and has attempted to "Arabize" Kurdish, Turcomen, and Assyrian areas in the north. Iraq has not relented in its artillery attacks against civilian population centers in the south, or in its burning and draining operations in the southern marshes, which have forced thousands to flee to neighboring States.

In 1991, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolutions 706 and 712, which would permit Iraq to sell up to \$1.6 billion of oil under U.N. auspices to fund the provision of food, medicine, and other humanitarian supplies to the people of Iraq. The resolutions also provide for the payment of compensation to victims of Iraqi aggression and other U.N. activities with respect to Iraq. The equitable distribution within Iraq of this humanitarian assistance would be supervised and monitored by the United Nations. The Iraqi regime so far has refused to accept these resolutions and has thereby chosen to perpetuate the suffering of its civilian population. Nearly a year ago, the Iraqi government informed the United Nations that it would not implement Resolutions 706 and 712.

The policies and actions of the Saddam Hussein regime continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, as well as to regional peace and security. The U.N. resolutions require that the Security Council be assured of Iraq's peaceful intentions in judging its compliance with sanctions. Because of Iraq's failure to comply fully with these resolutions, the United States will continue to apply economic sanctions to deter it from threatening peace and stability in the region.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
August 2, 1994.

**Statement on Senate Action on
Health Care Reform Legislation**

August 2, 1994

The bill unveiled by Senator Mitchell achieves what the American people want, health coverage that can never be taken away. The bill provides health security for hard-working middle class Americans who deserve nothing less. And it places a high priority on covering the Nation's precious resource, our children. I applaud the majority leader and the Members of the Senate who have been working diligently to bring a bill to the floor that works for ordinary Americans.

The Senate bill provides for universal coverage, enables Americans to keep their current insurance and their doctor, maintains quality health care, and provides greater opportunity to keep health coverage affordable. It builds on the current system of shared responsibility which we already know works.

We have made tremendous progress. The Senate and House are poised to vote for legislation that covers every American for the first time in our Nation's history. We have come this far, and we must not turn back now. If Congress fails to achieve universal coverage, if hard-working middle class Americans are left out in the cold, and if costs are not controlled, that's simply unacceptable.

The House and Senate will soon begin this debate, a debate that will engage every American family concerned about their health security. While differences in the House and Senate bills will be worked out as the legislative process moves forward, achieving universal coverage remains the critical goal. During the course of this historic floor debate, there will be those who say that reaching universal coverage is not necessary. To those people I say: Let the debate begin. Those of us who are fighting for universal coverage are fighting for middle class Americans. This is a debate that we must win and that we will win.

**Statement on the Resignation of
Deputy Assistant to the President
and Director of Media Affairs Jeff
Eller**

August 2, 1994

From the earliest days of my campaign for President through our first year and a half in the White House, Jeff has served with dedication and uncompromising loyalty. He played a vital role in redefining the technological means used to communicate my policies and programs, and I will miss his service and counsel.

NOTE: This statement was included in a statement by the Press Secretary announcing that Mr. Eller will be leaving the administration in September.

**Appointment of Interim National
AIDS Policy Coordinator**

August 2, 1994

The President today appointed Patricia S. Fleming to serve as interim National AIDS Policy Coordinator.

Ms. Fleming, currently special assistant to Health and Human Services Secretary Donna E. Shalala, will serve until a permanent coordinator takes office.

"This administration has made significant strides in the fight against this terrible epidemic. We've increased our budgets for AIDS research, treatment, and prevention and have fought hard to provide health insurance for all Americans, regardless of preexisting conditions. Patsy Fleming will make sure we don't lose our momentum," said the President.

NOTE: This item was part of a statement by the Press Secretary announcing the appointment.

**Remarks to Health Security Express
Participants**

August 3, 1994

The President. My fellow Americans, Congress has to decide whether it's going to

listen to the insurance companies or to Jan Cox's last wish.

We all know what the problem is here. You've just ridden a bus across the country, seeing real people who are just working hard, making the best they can of their lives, wanting a decent break. Those of you who have had these kinds of personal experiences that Daniel and Carolyn and John talked about can't figure out why we spend more than anybody else on health care, cover fewer people than any other country, and get poorer health results. It is because organized, intense, discrete minority interests are doing very well on a system that costs more than any other country's and covers fewer people. And every time you try to change it, they say, well, the world will come to an end.

Well, like Hillary said, we ran for this job, along with Vice President and Mrs. Gore, because maybe we could be the home office of the "American association of ordinary citizens." That's what we wanted to do. And every time we try to make a change, that's what they said.

We showed up here; the deficit was going up, and the economy was going down. And I put together a plan, and I urged the people on the other side to work with me. And they said, "No, if we vote for this, the sky will fall, the economy will collapse. And so we'll all vote against it and call it a big tax increase."

But the truth is the plan cut spending, raised taxes on the richest 1½ percent of Americans, gave 15 million working people a tax cut; thanks to the Secretary of Education, gave 20 million Americans an opportunity to refinance their college loans at a lower interest rate. And, lo and behold, it produced a drop in unemployment and 3.8 million new jobs, and the sky didn't fall. Now the deficit's going down, and the economy's coming up. But it's hard to overcome these organized, intense interests.

We had a different sort of fight over the big trade battle last year over on NAFTA. They said, "If you do this, the economy will collapse." But lo and behold, the Congress, this time with a bipartisan effort, passed NAFTA, and we're exporting 5 times as many cars to Mexico as we were last year. They're our biggest, most growing market.

Change is hard up here, because even though most Members of Congress were once just like you, when they get up here they're a long way from home, and they know that you and the President are presented to the folks back home partly through the rhetoric and the money spent by organized, intense minority interests.

And somehow, some way, this fight has got to be about Daniel Lumley and Carolyn Mosley and John and Jan Cox. That's what it's got to be about. It's got to be about my friend Justin Dart, sitting back there, and all the Americans with disabilities who could be in the work force, making money, paying taxes, contributing to our future, if they could just get health insurance while they're in the work force; all the nurses who hired on to help people get well, and instead spend all their time calling insurance companies to try to figure out if this or that procedure can be done by the doctor in the first place. Goodness only knows how many people we employ in this country that would be working more productively in any other country. We have to put hundreds of thousands of people to work every day to figure out who's not covered or what's not covered in an insurance policy. There's not anybody else in the world spending their time and spinning their wheels, putting people to work asking them to spend their entire working life reading the fine print of insurance policies to see what is not covered. Can you imagine a more unsatisfying thing to do with your life?

Lee Brown, our drug policy leader, do you know why he's here today? Because if we could pass health insurance for all Americans, it would include drug treatment for all Americans. Now, he's a policeman; he spent all of his life trying to lower crime and fight criminals, be tough on law and order. But he learned as a police officer that there are a lot of people in trouble with drug and alcohol abuse, and they need treatment. And we'd save billions and billions of dollars.

And it's not like we don't know what to do. Twenty years ago, Hawaii said, everybody here is going to get insurance; we're going to have employers and employees cover their health insurance. And if you've never been to Hawaii—I hope you get to go someday; it's a wonderful place—but everything there

is more expensive than any place else because it's way out on an island somewhere, everything except health care, where the premiums for small business are 30 percent below the national average because everybody pays and no one runs away and everybody is covered.

And you ought to be taken care of, whether you're a young man riding a motorcycle in the prime of your life or a young woman giving yourself to nursing or a man following a religious mission to work at a Christian radio station or any other thing. It just ought to be that way.

We have a consensus in this country on universal health care. What we do not have is a consensus among people elected to represent the American people on making the tough decisions necessary to get universal health care.

There are lots of things like that in life. A bunch of us, including me, would like to be thinner, but we don't diet. *[Laughter]* A lot of people would like to be stronger, but they don't lift weights.

In the end, it comes down, when you've got something everybody wants to do but is not easy to do, the people that hired on have to make the decisions. And the Members of the United States Congress hired on, just like I did. We didn't say, "Vote for me in a representative form of government, and I will make all the necessary decisions to solve the problems of the country except those that are difficult, controversial, and make people mad." That was not the deal.

And you need to hang around this town, and you need to tell your stories. Because the questions that I get asked are, "Well, what about this detail or that bill, or who is up, or who is down?" I say I have answered my question. My question is, am I for you or not? Answer: Yes. And secondly, second question, did I offer a plan to solve your problem? The answer: Yes. Third question, was I willing to meet people who had different ideas or better ideas more than half-way? The answer is yes.

These bills provide for longer phase-in. They give less orders, fewer orders. And they give more options to smaller business; they give a better financial break to small business. They are less bureaucratic. We have

listened to the American people, and Congress has presented bills to do that. They've bent over backwards to recognize that the American people want options, and they don't like to be told to do anything. I don't blame them. Nobody likes that. But the conservative thing to do is to ask everybody to carry as much of their own load as they can and then for the rest of us to help.

Those who are opposed to universal coverage say, "We've got a whole class of people we're not going to ask to carry any load at all, and we'll ask everybody who's already doing their part to do even more." I think we have the conservative position, my fellow Americans, the responsible position. Everybody should do what they can, and then we'll help those who need more.

I just want to ask you to remember this: Make this debate about John and Jan Cox, about the story Carolyn Mosley told, about the dreams of the future—teaching our children—that Daniel Lumley has, and about the personal stories that are here in this audience and all across America. Don't let it become part of some rhetoric, hot air, process, conflict, interest group deal. And say a simple word: We have moved; we have reached out to people of different views and different parties. This is not a partisan issue. I don't have any earthly idea what political party these three people are in or who they voted for President, and I do not care. I want them to have health care.

You make the debate about them, and remind the Congress that, just like the President, they signed on to represent ordinary Americans, to make the tough decisions and not to walk away. And this is a decision America has walked away from for 60 years. President Truman, three times, asked the American people to get the Congress to solve this problem, and the Congress said no. President Nixon, 23 years ago, asked the Congress to require employers and employees to split the difference and cover, with private health insurance, all Americans. Now, it's been long enough, folks. I know we're supposed to deliberate up here, but we have now deliberated through three generations. *[Laughter]*

Audience members. Pass it now! Pass it now! Pass it now!

The President. Pass it now, for them and for you.

God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:10 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Health Security Express riders Daniel Lumley, Carolyn Mosley, John Cox, and Mr. Cox's late wife, Jan.

The President's News Conference

August 3, 1994

The President. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Tonight I want to speak with you about crime, health care, and the progress of our national economic strategy. As I have said so many times, the central mission of this administration, renewing the American dream, requires us to restore economic growth, rebuild American communities, empower individual citizens to take personal responsibility for their own futures, and make Government work for ordinary citizens again. We are making progress.

Remember, we are about, now, a year from the time when Congress passed our economic recovery plan. I remember then that our opponents said if that plan passed the sky would fall, unemployment would go up, the deficit would explode. Well, they were wrong. Look at the facts. We cut \$255 billion in spending; raised tax rates on only 1.2 percent of the wealthiest Americans; cut taxes for 15 million working families of modest incomes; made 90 percent of our small businesses eligible for a tax cut and 20 million Americans available or eligible to refinance their college loans at lower interest rates. Now the deficit is going down 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President. We've got almost 4 million new jobs, very low inflation, a 1½ percent drop in unemployment.

There were other skeptics later who said the sky would fall if we passed the North American Free Trade Agreement. They, too, were wrong. We can see this year that automobile sales, for example, to Mexico are growing at five times the rate of last year, and our trade with Mexico is growing more rapidly than that with any other country. And while I know an awful lot of people are still

hurting, the road ahead looks good. According to Fortune Magazine, for the first time in a decade, all 50 States will expand their private economies next year. Let me say that again. For the first time in a decade, all 50 States will experience economic growth next year.

None of this came without a fight. And now we're involved in two more historic fights. The first is on crime. We have a chance to pass the toughest, smartest crime bill in the history of the United States after 6 years of bickering over it. Let me remind you of what that bill will do. It will put 100,000 police officers on the streets of our communities, a 20 percent increase. It will make "three strikes and you're out" the law of the land. It will ban deadly assault weapons and handgun ownership by minors. It will provide tougher sentences for violent criminals and more prisons to put them in. And we've listened to police, prosecutors, and community leaders who tell us that they need much more for prevention programs, to give our young people something to say yes to, as well as something to say no to.

Believe it or not, there are still special interests here in Washington trying to derail this crime bill. But we are fighting them and the American people will win this fight, too.

Still, the recovery we are building, the communities we are trying to make safer, the individual citizens we're trying to empower to compete and win in the global economy, all of these people are at risk unless and until we reform health care.

Our system still costs too much and covers too few. It is actually going in the wrong direction. In the past 5 years, 5 million more Americans have lost their health insurance, almost all of them working people and their children. We're fighting for health care reform not just for those who don't have health insurance, but for those who do have it and who could lose it because they have to change jobs, because someone in their family gets sick, because they simply have to pay too much for it. They deserve better, and we're fighting to see that they get it.

We want to guarantee private, not Government, insurance for every American. The plan I originally proposed has been changed, and much of it for the better. The proposals

before Congress are less bureaucratic. They're more flexible. They provide more protection and support for small business. They contain a reasonable phase-in time, over a period of years, to make sure we get it right. No bureaucrat will pick your doctor. You can keep your own plan or pick a better one. This approach controls Government spending but relies on competitive forces in the free market to restrain the growth of private health insurance premiums. Much of it has changed for the better. But one rock-solid principle remains: private insurance guaranteed for everyone.

We know it will work. For 20 years Hawaii has required employers and employees to split the cost of insuring all employees. People still pick their doctors there. Health care is getting better there. The economy is doing well there. And almost everything in Hawaii is more expensive than it is here on the mainland, except for health insurance, where small businesses pay health insurance costs that are, on average, 30 percent lower than they are in the rest of America.

Now, after 60 years of trying and 18 months of sometimes trying debate, the question of guaranteeing coverage for all Americans has come to the floor of the Congress and will be decided in the next few weeks in a few critical votes. The votes will be soon and they will be close. I want to urge the American people to tell their Senators and Congressmen to put aside partisanship and think of the American people and their fundamental interests and needs. We have an historic opportunity. We dare not pass it up. This is a fight for the American people we also have to win.

Health Care Legislation

Q. Mr. President, in January, you waved a pen and said you would veto legislation that didn't guarantee every American private health insurance that could never be taken away. Now you've indicated you will support a Senate bill that does not guarantee coverage and sets a goal of 95 percent, leaving millions of Americans uninsured. Are you now revising your veto threat? And doesn't the fact that you indicated you'd support this less ambitious Senate plan make it harder for

House Members to go along with a bill that's more like your original proposal?

The President. Well, first of all, I disagree with your characterization of the Mitchell bill. I believe it will achieve universal coverage for all Americans, and that is the one criteria I have set out. What the Mitchell bill says is, is that if you make a dramatic amount of progress in a short time—that is, if you move from where we are now, at about 83 percent of coverage, up to 95 percent in a few years—that is evidence that we can achieve full coverage in the near future without requiring insurance to be bought. That is what that bill says.

If it is deficit neutral, and if it is passed in the way that it is, I believe it will achieve full coverage, because what the bill also says is, if we don't make that amount of progress in a few years, there will be a requirement on the Congress to provide for full coverage, and if the Congress doesn't act, then automatically employers and employees will be required to purchase insurance. I believe it does meet the objective I set out in the State of the Union address, and I would sign it.

Q. What about the second part of the question, Mr. President? Doesn't it make the fact that you've now indicated support for a less ambitious Senate bill—won't that make it harder to persuade House people to go along with a stronger bill?

The President. Well, what the Mitchell bill does is to put the employer requirement at the end of the process, rather than at the beginning. And Senator Mitchell is convinced that that is the most ambitious bill he can pass, but that it meets the requirement; and it says to the people who have not been supportive of our approach, "Look, we'll try it in a competitive way first, and if that doesn't work, then we'll have a requirement." I think the same debate is going on in the House.

My own view is that the questions now should shift to the members of the other party, to the congressional Republicans. At one time, when we started this debate and I said I wanted universal coverage, many Members in Congress stood up and clapped, of both parties. At one time there were 2 dozen Republican Senators on a bill to give universal coverage to all Americans. They

have all abandoned that bill. We have reached out to them, as was our responsibility to try to work together in a bipartisan fashion, and every time we have done it, they have moved away.

So the questions now should shift to them. Are we going to cover all Americans or not? Are we going to have a bill that provides health care security or not? If you don't like our approaches in the Senate and the House, what is your alternative? That's what I hope we'll see.

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, on Haiti, you sought and received the approval of the United Nations to launch an invasion if necessary. Why do you need a green light from the international community and not from the American Congress? Will you ask lawmakers to take it up?

The President. Well first, let me say that I agree with the resolution adopted by the Senate today that the action of the United Nations should not be interpreted as an approval by Congress. It has no impact on what Congress would do.

Second, let me say I think all Americans should be pleased that the United Nations has stated with a strong, firm voice—that includes many voices from our own area—that we should keep on the table the option of forcibly removing the dictators who had usurped power in Haiti and who have trampled human rights and murdered innocent people.

Now, let me remind you all of what our interests are there. We have Americans living and working there, several thousands of them. We have a million Haitian Americans in this country who have family and friends there. We have an interest in promoting democracy in our hemisphere. We have an interest in stabilizing those democracies that are in our hemisphere. For the first time ever, 33 of the 35 nations in the Caribbean and Central and South America are governed by popularly elected leaders, but many of those democracies are fragile. As we look ahead to the next century, we need a strong and democratic Latin America and Central America and Caribbean with which to trade and grow.

So those are our fundamental interests. I would welcome the support of the Congress, and I hope that I will have that. Like my predecessors of both parties, I have not agreed that I was constitutionally mandated to get it. But at this moment I think we have done all we need to do because I don't want to cross that bridge until we come to it. We have kept force on the table. We have continued to move it up as an option as the dictators there have been more obstinate. But it is premature, in my judgment, to go beyond that now.

Whitewater Hearings

Q. President Clinton, a number of political analysts, including some who are quite friendly to you, have said that the focus on the Whitewater affair has both undercut public confidence in you and also in your ability to get your programs through Congress. Do you agree with that? And what impact do you think Whitewater has had, particularly with the hearings this week?

The President. Well, I would think, first of all, in the last couple of weeks it should have been very helpful to the administration because we have seen three reports: one from the Special Counsel, Mr. Fiske, who has said there was absolutely no violation of the law in any of these contracts; and then two, one by the Office of Government Ethics and one by Mr. Cutler, the White House Counsel, saying that no ethical rule was violated. Secondly, we have been fully cooperative as we always said we would be. So from my point of view, we've done all we could.

Now, I can't say what the impact has been. All I can tell you is that I said we would cooperate fully, and we have. I have said repeatedly that I did nothing wrong, and I didn't. And I have continued to work for the welfare and the interest of the American people.

Almost all—I've watched none of these hearings. I've not kept up with them. I've been working on jobs and health care and the crime bill and peace in the Middle East and doing the things I was hired to do by the American people. They will have to make up their mind when all the dust clears what they think the impact of it is. But I'm convinced we're having a very productive time.

I think we'll get this crime bill. We have health care bills providing universal coverage on the floor of both Houses of Congress for the first time in the history of the Republic. No President since Harry Truman has been able to do that, and many have tried, including President Nixon. So I feel good about the progress we're making, and that's all I can worry about. I've got to get up there every day and go to work and try to help the American people.

Q. Mr. President, Roger Altman ran into a real buzz saw in the Whitewater hearings, and even some Democrats are questioning his truthfulness. Does he have the credibility to continue as number two at Treasury? Are you going to ask for his resignation?

The President. Well, let me say, first of all, he spoke with the Senate committee for more than 10 hours yesterday—that's a very long time—and he answered all of their questions. He then spoke for several hours with the House committee today. In that, he admitted that he had not given all the information to them in a timely fashion that he should have. But he said repeatedly that he had not willfully misled them.

I would like to emphasize, first of all, I do not countenance anybody being less than forthright with the Congress. There have been many people, including people that are not particularly friends of our administration, who have talked about how we have been much more cooperative with these investigations than previous administrations have been. That's what I told the American people I would do, and that is what I have done.

But if you look at the facts, let's go back to the fundamental facts: There was no violation of the law; there was no violation of any ethics rule. The Secretary of the Treasury has pointed out that Mr. Altman has done a superb job in his position. He was critical to the passage of our economic program that produced almost 4 million jobs in 18 months. He was important in the passage of our trade initiatives; he has done a good job there. The Secretary of the Treasury has confidence in him, and so do I. And I think he has now answered all the questions that the Senate could possibly have about an incident that involved no violation of the law and no violation of ethics.

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, to come back to Haiti for a moment, you mentioned a number of American interests that we have in Haiti. But what involves national security, if it's at stake? Is there anything in Haiti that involves our security that would require us to go in and invade the country?

The President. Well first of all, I think our security is caught up in whether people in this hemisphere are moving toward democracy and open markets and observation of the rule of law. And when one country in our hemisphere on our back door has an election, votes for a leader, then that leader is deposed by people who murder, who kill, who rape, who maim, who throw the human rights monitors out, who now won't even let people leave who have been approved for leaving, it seems to me that if you look at the possible ramifications of that on other countries in the Caribbean and in Central and South America, that is where our security interest is.

I can tell you that as I was calling other nations to get them to help in the Safe Haven project, to be willing to take some Haitians who leave, that is the thing that other leaders mentioned to me over and over again, "We know that many of our democracies are fragile, but we're moving in the right direction. We don't want to see Latin America take one more wrong turn. We're moving right; we want to stay right." And I think that is profoundly important to us.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, in just another few weeks we will know whether North Korea has transformed more fuel rods into weapons-grade plutonium. What are the consequences if North Korea does make more weapons-grade plutonium, and are you prepared to carry out that threat?

The President. I think I can do no better than to reiterate what I have always said, that North Korea's fate is still in its own hands; it must decide what its own future should be. I think at this time when North Korea has shown a willingness to stop reprocessing and to stop refueling, and when our talks are about to begin again next Friday, we should

take the facts as we have them and keep working for progress.

This is an issue which is very important to the long-term security of the United States. The question of a country that belongs to the nonproliferation regime deciding to become a nuclear power, the prospect that nuclear capacity could be transferred either by design or by accident to other countries or to rogue groups, this is a very serious thing for our long-term security. And we have spent a lot of time to make sure we are firm and deliberate; but that firmness, that deliberateness has led to these talks, which were interrupted when Kim Il-song passed away. We start the talks again on Friday. The agreement the North Koreans made is still holding about refueling and reprocessing. I think we should focus on that now and keep working for a satisfactory conclusion.

Q. Are you confident that we will know whether they violate these agreements?

The President: Yes, I am. I believe that. I have no reason to believe that we will not know if that agreement is violated.

President's Approval Rating

Q. Mr. President, as you pointed out in your opening statement, the economy has been growing. Last week we saw the peace agreement, or the framework for a peace agreement between Israel and Jordan. Yet your approval rating continues to slide in the polls. To what do you attribute that? Is it the message? Is it the messengers? And a related part of that question: Has Leon Panetta made any recommendations to you for changes in the White House to improve things here?

The President. Well, first of all, I'm not the best judge of that. Maybe I'm just not as good a talker as you folks thought I was when I got elected President. Maybe there's so much going on it's hard for anything specific to get through. Maybe it's partly a function of the times in which we live.

Whenever we move from one historic era into another—at the end of World War I, at the end of World War II, moving into the cold war; now at the end of the cold war, moving toward the 21st century—our people are filled with a mixture of hope and concern. Almost every American is genuinely con-

cerned about something now, whether it's their economic circumstances, their health care, insecurity over crime, concern about what's happening to the fabric of our society with so many children being born out of wedlock and so many families breaking down. There's something gripping the concern of most Americans. And when people have these balances going on, hope or fear, it is sometimes difficult to get through with the hope and the progress.

I can't worry about that. All I can do is to show up for work here every day, and, as I said today to the folks who rode the buses for health care, try to make this the home office of the "American association for ordinary citizens." And if I keep doing that, I think that the future will take care of itself. My only concern is to continue to be able to be effective, and that's what I will work for.

Health Care Legislation

Q. Mr. President, on health care, there were indications on Capitol Hill today that time is now becoming an important factor; that there's a need to get legislative language, there's a need to get various budgetary estimates, and that it may be very difficult to get a vote before the end of this month. Are you prepared now to insist that Congress remain in session and not take its recess until there is action in both Houses?

The President. Well, my belief is that Senator Mitchell has done enough work on his bill, and that the House bill has been out there in its basic framework, so that the recess will probably have to be delayed, but could still occur. I do believe that they should and will stay here until they can take action on those bills, each House on its own bill. I believe that will happen, and I think that's a good thing, because that's a way of their putting the American people first, which is something I think should be done.

Q. A two-part question on health care: When you put your own health care plan forward, you said you wanted to build on the private insurance industry. The House bill that Congressman Gephardt has put forward could turn control of almost half the health care system over to the Federal Government. Why do you support that approach, as op-

posed to your original idea? And secondly, is Senator Mitchell's bill now your new bottom line, your new minimum? If there's anything less than that coming out of the Senate, would that draw a veto?

The President. Let me answer the second question. My goal has been what it has always been. I want a system that will take us to universal coverage. If it takes a few years to get there, that's fine with me. We don't want to mess it up; we want to have the chance to continue to work and strengthen the program along the way.

In the case of the House bill, as you know, I have always thought that we ought to allow every American to buy into the Federal Employees Health Insurance bill, which is essentially a private plan. The House bill offers a Medicare program, if you will, like the senior citizens buy into now, but only if people decide not to buy private health insurance. So it still has a preference for private health insurance, and I think that is consistent with what I think we should do. I still believe the best thing to do is to build more on the system that most of us have now.

Q. Which approach do you favor, the Mitchell approach or the Gephardt approach?

The President. Well, I'm not going to get into being a legislator. My job is to try to keep the American people's eye on the ball and to try to keep the Members of Congress working together. What I favor is now for our friends on the other side of the aisle and all the Democrats to get together, think about the interests of the American people and come up with a program that solves the problem.

Let me just say, if I might just stop for a moment and say I think it is terribly important in this debate when these issues tend to be complex and detailed to keep our eye on the central reality here, which is how do we solve the problem? I asked two of the people that rode those buses to come here tonight. I want them to just stand up, Daniel Lumley and John Cox.

And let me answer your question this way. Daniel Lumley was a young man who lost his arm riding a motorcycle. He wants to be a schoolteacher, he wants to be a public servant; he wants to know that he'll always be

able to get health insurance when he works, even though he has a very apparent preexisting condition. Like millions and millions of Americans with disabilities, he can work and do fine and pay taxes—which releases the burden on the rest of us—if he can get insurance.

John Cox left his job with health insurance and went to work for a Christian radio station because he thought it was his mission in life to do that. He thought he was covered by health insurance and he thought his employer was paying it, and he wasn't. When his wife came down sick, because they didn't have health insurance even though he was working, they didn't go to the doctor. They just talked to a doctor over the phone for months and months. Finally, she became so ill they had to see a doctor at an emergency room. By that time she had cancer that had progressed to the point when it could not be fully treated. He took this bus ride across the country when his wife was dying, because she wanted him to. She died during the bus ride. He buried her 2 days ago, and he came up here today to be with us. My answer to you is if the program works for John Cox and for Daniel Lumley, I'll be for it.

Whitewater Hearings

Q. Mr. President, if I could ask you a specific question on these Whitewater hearings, which I know you're not watching, but many of us were watching until 2 a.m. in the morning last night. One of the problems that Roger Altman, the Deputy Treasury Secretary, seems to have is that he didn't recuse himself or step down as chairman of the Resolution Trust Corporation because he feared that there could be some sort of appearance of a conflict. He had decided to step down, but was talked out of it by Bernard Nussbaum, your former Counsel, and other White House aides. That seems to be the source of a lot of problems that he has. And Josh Steiner, the Treasury Chief of Staff, says that you and the First Lady were furious that Roger Altman told the New York Times editorial writer about this decision before you learned about it. What was so bad about his decision to recuse himself if there was nothing that he could have done to interfere in

the RTC investigation of Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan?

The President. First of all, I never would promote anybody interfering in any investigation. I welcome this investigation, and it will vindicate what I have been saying all along. I had no problem with Mr. Altman deciding of his own independent judgment and consultation with his superior, the Secretary of the Treasury, that he ought to recuse himself. The only thing that upset me was I did not want to see him stampeded into it if it wasn't the right thing to do. I just wanted the decision to be made on the merits. I think it's a pretty simple, straightforward position I had, and I think it was the right one.

Baseball Strike

Q. Mr. President, Atlanta Braves owner Ted Turner last week called on you to intervene with Government arbitration to head off a baseball strike. Now that your Labor Secretary has met with both sides of the talks, do you see any Government role in this matter? Do you see anything that you personally can do to head off a strike?

The President. Let me say first of all, just as a lifelong baseball fan, I suppose I have a greater interest in this than maybe a President even should. I mean, the prospect of seeing records that are 30 and 40 years old broken, for those of us who like the offensive as well as the defensive side of baseball, this is an exhilarating thing. I think it would be heartbreaking for the American people if our national pastime didn't get through this whole season. And it's a great opportunity for these young players and what they can become.

Secondly, the Secretary of Labor, as you pointed out, did meet with the representatives of the players and the owners. And we discussed what could be done and tried to facilitate a better communications between them. There may be some other things which can be done, but at this time the situation is sufficiently delicate that I think we need to leave it at that. If we can play a constructive role, we will. We do not want to play a destructive role. We all hope that somehow the strike can be averted.

Health Care Legislation

Q. Mr. President, there are many Democratic Members of the House, your allies, who disagree with you, they don't believe that Senator Mitchell's bill is a universal coverage bill. Are you ready to tell them that you think that Senator Mitchell's bill is the best that can possibly come out of Congress this year?

The President. Well, first of all, let's remember how a bill becomes law. [Laughter] It's very important. Senator Mitchell has to find a majority for a bill that can pass the Senate. Then there must be a majority of people supporting a bill that passes the House. The Senate task is very hard because, except on the budget, a tiny minority—41 percent of the Senate—can keep any other bill from even coming to a vote. He has a difficult task. Then the bill goes to a conference and a final bill will come back and will be voted on in both Houses. We have seen many times how a bill passes the House, a bill passes the Senate, a final one comes out that's different from either one. We don't know what will happen.

Let me tell you what I hope will happen. What I hope will happen is that the debates on the floor of the Senate and the House will be widely publicized, heavily watched, and that the debate will grip the imagination of ordinary American citizens who themselves may not be part of any discrete interest group; and that there will be a climate in the country welling up—as I believe it is now—for action that works, that solves the human problem.

I believe George Mitchell, as many of the Senators pointed out, in a situation in which every time he tried to do something, the members of the other party moved away from a position they had previously had—normally when a bill becomes law, if you take one position and the people in the other party take another, you move toward them, they move toward you, you work out an agreement. Here's a case where we had 24 Senators of the other party committed to universal coverage and they have all abandoned the plan they were originally for. And as he has moved toward them, they have moved away. In that environment, I think he has done a fine job with a bill that I personally

believe will achieve universal coverage. And that's all I can say. It is my opinion that it will work.

Whitewater Hearings

Q. Mr. President, strictly from a management standpoint, given the conflicting recollections of the various members of the Treasury Department team, do you believe they can continue to work together effectively?

The President. Well, the management of the Treasury Department is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury. All I can tell you is, the important thing for the American people is the Treasury Department has worked very well. Nearly every American, nearly every expert in this town believes that it has worked very well across a whole broad range of issues, and that the Secretary of the Treasury has done an absolutely superb job in both domestic and international economic arenas with the support of his team. The management questions are things that he will have to resolve. But I will say again, there was no violation of the law, there was no violation of the ethics rules. The errors which were made have been acknowledged and questions have been answered at extreme length. I think that is a very good thing.

Health Care Reform

Q. You've worked hard to open new markets for American businesses. Are you upset or disappointed that businesses have worked so hard against health care reform?

The President. No, because not all businesses have. It is true we have worked hard to open markets for business with NAFTA, with the new worldwide GATT agreement, selling our airplanes, selling our high-tech equipment, reviving our shipbuilding industry—all the things we've done. But frankly, I think the amazing story of this health care debate is not that there are still some business interest against it, but that we have more business interest for it than ever before. Let me just say that many of the Fortune 500 companies support the idea that every business should do what it can to cover the employee and the employee should pay something. We now have 600,000 small businesses who cover their employees and are paying

too much, who have come out for our position that all of their colleagues should do the same.

I think that is very impressive. When you look at that plus all the other medical groups that have come out for our approach, it is a truly astonishing thing. And what I hope is, again, when this debate starts that all the people who are doing for something, instead of just against something, I hope that they will prevail.

Press Conferences

Q. Mr. President, will you tell us why you hold so few solo press conferences? This is only your third, and you have been heard to complain that the lords of the right-wing radio have uninterrupted communication with the American people. And you have the same chance but don't take it. Could you tell us why?

The President. I think it's a mistake, and I intend to do more on a more regular basis. Besides that, I actually enjoy these, and I think we should do more and do them on a more regular basis, and I intend to. It's one of the changes that I intend to make.

Health Care Legislation

Q. Mr. President—all right, sir. I wanted to just tell you——

The President. I could hear you in the distance. [*Laughter*]

Q. I've just been informed by a volunteer who knows what she's talking about, Mrs. B.A. Bentsen, wife of the Secretary of the Treasury—she works to get prenatal care for millions of mothers. And she says that the money, the Government money has run out completely for prenatal care, which means that we will have deformed babies that we will have to pay for the rest of their lives in institutions. Can't you do something about this?

The President. Well, of course we can. One of the things that this health care bill will do, either one of them, would be to cover more prenatal care. One of the biggest problems we have in the United States, with about one in six of our people without health insurance, is that a lot of people don't get preventive care when they should. It is true that when women see the doctor several

times before their babies are born, the babies are far more likely to be born healthy and at normal birth weight. And that is a focus of both bills. Senator Mitchell's bill, because of the phase-in time, went out of its way to try to take care of that issue.

Syria

Q. Mr. President, if I could go back to a foreign policy issue. Syria appears to be the big missing piece of the puzzle in the Middle East now. Following the meeting between the Israeli Prime Minister and King Hussein of Jordan, do you see any indication that Syria wants to make peace at this point? Do you see any reason for optimism that they're willing to talk directly to Israel?

The President. I think there are difficult issues still between Israel and Syria, but I believe both leaders do want to make peace. As you know, before I announced that King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin would come here to end their state of war and to commit to establishing full peace, I had a long talk with President Asad on the telephone. I then spoke with him again. I am convinced that he is still very much interested in a comprehensive peace. And we have one piece of public evidence of that, which is that the whole ceremony between Israel and Jordan signing the Washington Declaration was shown on television in Syria without comment. We have other indications that they are. And you may be sure that the Secretary of State and Dennis Ross and all of our team, as well as I, are doing everything we can to keep pushing that.

Q. What are those other indications, sir?

The President. I don't think I should say more than that. We've been pretty successful in the Middle East by letting the parties make their own decisions and letting them percolate up.

Health Care Legislation

Q. You may not be a legislator, but you are the titular head of the Democratic Party. Why should you ask Democrats in the House for marginal constituencies to vote for the Gephardt bill when, in fact, the Mitchell bill may be more politically palatable?

The President. Well, let me say, again, the Senate and the House are going to debate

both these bills, and they will work through the process and decide where to come out. But let me say, if you just take Mr. Cox there, he's from Athens, Texas. Now, Athens, Texas, is no different from New York City or San Francisco, California, or my home in Arkansas when it comes to the existence of people who have these problems. And I think the House and the Senate should each pass a bill which they can best explain to their folks back home as something that solves the problem.

I would remind you that we know that universal coverage is popular with the American people. What we also know is that they're concerned about having something that changes something so fundamental in their lives. They want to make sure we fix what is wrong, keep what is right. So in both bills we have reassured the rank-and-file voters. Both bills in different ways may offend various organized interest groups who may be able to advertise and affect the attitudes of rank-and-file voters, but we know that both these bills, by having a longer phase-in time, less bureaucracy, more flexibility and more support for small business, clear choice of plans, that those things have answered the concerns of American voters in every congressional district in the country.

Haiti

Q. Congressman Bill Richardson went recently to Haiti and met for, I think, 5 hours with General Cédras, and he came back and he said Cédras was not an intransigent man. He has been invited to return to Haiti. Has he talked to you about it, and would you consider it a good idea for him to go back to Haiti now that the U.N. has passed this resolution?

The President. I have talked to Congressman Richardson. I have no comment about any further trips. It is difficult to conclude that Mr. Cédras is not intransigent. After all, he promised to leave Haiti on October 30th at the implementation of the Governors Island accord, and he broke his promise. And he has continued to visit untold misery on his people. He knows what to do to end the problems of the people of Haiti, and he can do it.

Economic Plan

Q. Mr. President, earlier this year, last year, rather, in your economic program, you sacrificed a lot of your investment program to get deficit reduction, as we've learned, over the objections of many of those on your staff. The deficit reduction part has worked out even better than you expected, as you said. But since that time the stock market has drifted lower, long-term interest rates are higher than when you took office, and there are some signs of a slow-down on the horizon. Housing starts and new home sales, for example, are down. At this point, do you think perhaps you make a mistake that you went too far into deficit reduction and that, from your point of view, the country might have been better off had you put more money into infrastructure and into investment?

The President. Absolutely not. Given the options that we had, the right decision was made. Let me take you back in time. We had had the slowest job growth rate for the previous 4 years that we'd had since the Great Depression. The economy was going down; the deficit was going up. Our position in the global economy depended on our ability to get the deficit down. Our ability to generate private economic activity depended on our ability to drive interest rates down.

If someone had told any economist a year and a half ago that we could create almost 4 million jobs, take the unemployment rate down over a point and a half, have no inflation and still have long-term rates almost exactly where they were on the date I took office, no one would have believed that. They'd say if you're going to improve the economy that much, long-term interest rates will go way up.

Because we were committed to bringing the deficit down without inflation, interest rates went way down, and then when we had a lot of economic growth, came back up some. The stock market is higher than it was when I took office, and the long-term expectations are very good.

Most businesses expect to grow next year, both large and small. Every survey shows that. Consumer confidence and business confidence and long-term economic growth are high. The rate of growth may vary from time

to time. My job is to keep the growth going and keep jobs coming into the economy and that is what we are doing.

Q. [Inaudible]—betrayed your democratic heritage or your campaign promises?

The President. No.

Q. Do you feel that you're an Eisenhower Republican, as a recent book put it?

The President. No. I think we did the right thing. In the 21st century most job growth is going to come from the private sector. We will have to do more public work in two areas: in infrastructure, just like all of our competitors do, our roads, our bridges, our airports, the things that make you a rich and powerful country; our telecommunications infrastructure that the Vice President's always talking about will have to have various supports. The second thing we'll have to do is we'll have to give more direct or indirect support to create jobs in high unemployment areas. That's what our empowerment zones are all about: enticing people through tax incentives to invest in areas where unemployment is high.

But I would remind you we have increased programs for education and training. We have dramatically increased the availability of low-interest college loans. We have increased the number of people who can apply for national service loans. We have increased Head Start. We have increased immunization eligibility for little kids by millions. We have increased spending on the things which are critical to our future.

Will we have to invest more there? We will. But first we had to get our economic house in order. You cannot keep spending money you don't have and expect to get ahead of the game. We have now done that, and we can focus on investment.

Defense Executive Salaries

Q. Thank you, sir.

The President. You're persistent. I owe it to you just for effort. You'd develop arthritis getting up and down so many times if I didn't—[laughter].

Q. Thank you, sir. If I may shift to a fresh subject, the Senate Appropriations Committee is hopping mad about what it calls "outrageously high" salaries that are being paid to defense and aerospace company execu-

tives in this country—compensation that is frequently paid by the taxpayers under Defense Department regulations, and sometimes to the tune of as much as \$7 million or more. The committee is offering language which would rule out payments any higher than the salary that the Defense Secretary makes. Do you agree with the committee's finding? And would you support that kind of limit?

The President. I'm not familiar enough with the issue to give you an intelligent answer. I will look into it, and I'll be glad to give you an answer. But I don't know enough about the issue to answer the question in an appropriate way.

Megamergers

Q. Mr. President, okay—[laughter].

The President. I can't believe a member of the press is pushing a microphone away. This is a historic moment in itself. [Laughter]

Q. Mr. President, what is the administration doing to stop the megamergers, particularly in the telecommunications industry, in the pharmaceutical industry, and in retailing? We have seen Viacom-Paramount. We now have—Macy's is trying, and we're reading today about American Cyanamid merging with American Home Products; mergers which are not in the interest of the public and the stockholders. And in the case of Macy's, Macy's Federated has a stockholder meeting on the same day as major competitors. They don't want stockholders to come and ask questions. They're in collusion with the competitors; and the administration is not lifting one finger.

The President. Well, you've drawn a lot of conclusions there in a short time. I don't know if I can answer them all. Let me say this: There are two ways in which mergers can be not in the interest of the people of the United States. First is if they violate our antitrust laws; that is, if they do significant damage to the competitive environment. And our administration has tried to reinvigorate the antitrust division of the Justice Department to a significantly higher level than in the last two administrations.

Secondly is, as you suggest, is if there is some illegal erosion of the rights and interests of the stockholders of these companies,

or there are workers or others that have legal rights that are being undermined. That is within the jurisdiction of the Securities and Exchange Commission. I think we have a very able person chairing that Commission.

I would be glad to ask them to look into these things more than I'm sure they already are, but I am not in a position to draw the conclusions you have drawn, because I think they are trying to protect the public interest.

Health Care Legislation

Q. There are 37 million uninsured Americans. If you can't get a bill that will cover all of them, and you get one that will cover, say, 20 million, would you really refuse to sign it? And if you do, and don't get a bill at all, how would you explain that to those 20 million?

The President. First of all, keep in mind that most of our problem is with working Americans. And the problem with the so-called "half a loaf" here is that it won't work. That is, we have evidence now in the States—about 40 States have tried to just change the rules on insurance and put a little more money into covering very poor people to increase health care coverage. No one could say that is not good on its own, but the problem is if that is all you do, what has happened in the States is that putting people into a health insurance pool who cost more to insure without expanding the size of the pools leads to higher rates. Once the rates get higher, small businesses on the margin and individuals who are young and healthy get out. That makes the pool even smaller; and rates go up more.

So what would happen, I am convinced, if we did what you suggest is what has happened in the States. Coverage would go up a little bit for a while; then it would go right back down, as it has in the United States for the last 5 years as States have tried to do this.

So, again, I say we have no evidence that unless we are moving toward full coverage that we can control cost and maintain coverage for the working families of the country.

Yes, one more. We're almost out of time.

Haiti

Q. You spoke with some thoroughness tonight about why you think it is in the United States interest to not have a military dictatorship in Haiti. My question is, if an invasion force is dispatched and overthrows that military regime, what are the United States obligations at that point to nurture, to create an environment in that troubled country where democracy would have a chance? And how long would this last?

The President. I think the United States have significant obligations. But if you look at the United Nations resolution and what we have said all along, over the long run what we need is a United Nations mission in Haiti that the United States would be a part of, but that other countries would participate in also, that would do the following things: Number one, it would have to retrain and reorient the military to engaged in the rebuilding of the country. Number two, it would have to reorient and retrain the police to be a genuine police force, not an instrument of terror for one political group. Number three, we would have to, in addition to that, have a real dedicated effort led by a lot of our Haitian-Americans and others to rebuild the troubled economy of Haiti, which is in terrible, terrible shape. All those things we would have to do. But it would not necessarily be the United States doing it. In fact, it could not be; it would be a United Nations mission as envisaged by the United Nations and the resolution that they adopted.

Thank you very much.

Q. Mr. President, can I follow up here—one last question on health care?

The President. One last question on health care? [Laughter] Did I recognize you earlier?

Q. You did, but it's a——

The President. Oh, no—I've got to go. [Laughter]

NOTE: The President's 68th news conference began at 8 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Leon B. Panetta, Chief of Staff to the President, and Dennis B. Ross, Director, Policy Planning Staff, Department of State.

Remarks Honoring the Young American Medal Winners

August 4, 1994

Thank you. Thank you so much, General Reno. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for being here. I would like to thank Janet Reno for the superb job she has done as the Attorney General of the United States and for the human face she has put on law enforcement in this country and the understanding she has brought as a career prosecutor to this work, the understanding that really is embodied in these awards today, which is that we have a job to do here in Washington but what really makes America great and what really makes America work is what happens on the streets, in the schools, in the neighborhoods, in the workplaces of America every day.

I want to thank the Director of our Office of Drug Policy, Lee Brown, for being here; two Congressmen from the areas of two of the honorees today, Congressman Jerry Costello of Illinois and Congressman Steve Schiff of New Mexico, thank you for being here. I understand the Mayor of Belleville, Illinois, Roger Cook, is here. I thank the members of the Young American Medals Committee; the Administrator of the DEA, Tom Constantine; and Eduardo Gonzalez, the Director of the Marshals Service, who are also here.

Last year was my first opportunity to engage in this ceremony. I just loved it. And the Attorney General was right. This job of mine is an interesting and diverse job, and on most days it's quite a wonderful job. But it rarely is so filled with joy as when you can recognize the wonder of the work of our young people.

I think of our mission here in our administration at this time as the timeless one of trying to secure a future for our young people, so that every person in this country, without regard to their region or race or income or background, can live up to the fullest of their God-given abilities. In this time, at the end of the cold war and at the beginning of a new era that is not yet fully clear to Americans, moving into a global economy with new opportunities and, to be sure, new troubles as well, that means as a minimum

that here we have to restore economic growth and opportunity. We have to help people to rebuild the strength of our communities and our families. We have to empower individuals to do more for themselves. In short, we've got to make this Government work for ordinary citizens in a world we're working to make more peaceful and prosperous.

Now, in the last few weeks, we've had some pretty good news on that. Our economy is clearly coming back. For the first time in 10 years it's predicted that all 50 States will have economic growth next year. We had a peace agreement signed here between Jordan and Israel last week, which must have brought joy to the hearts of every American that has seen that troubled region torn for so long. There are many good things happening. The largest, toughest, smartest crime bill in the history of the United States is in final debating stages and about to be voted on in the Congress. For the first time in the history of our country, both Houses of Congress are considering a bill to provide health care coverage to all Americans.

But still, we have to recognize that in the end it is still true that the strength of this country is what happens on Main Street, what happens in the schools, what happens where ordinary Americans live and work.

Today we celebrate the best of our young people for their courage and their commitment. We know that life requires both to be fully successful. And we know that our country is still around now after 218 years because we've been blessed with an abundance of both.

I must tell you that when I got up this morning and, as is my custom early in the morning, I wandered around, I did some of my routine, and then I sat and read the schedule for the day and I read the stories of these young people, I was reminded of a line that I used in my Inaugural Address but sometimes here in the heat of battle I forget: "There is nothing wrong with this country that cannot be fixed by what is right with this country." Today we honor in dramatic and breathtaking fashion what is right with this country.

The first recipient of the Young American Medal for Bravery is Carlo Montez Clark of

Belleville, Illinois. He was on his way to a convenience store when he noticed smoke coming from a nearby building. He tried twice to get into the building, but was overcome by smoke. Finally, on the third try he got into the building, risking his own life, and saved the life of an elderly woman who suffered from emphysema. Let's give him a big hand. *[Applause]* Thank you.

Now I would like to recognize, for service, Robyn Mae Davis of Albuquerque, New Mexico. She's worked hard to spread the important message of the dangers of alcohol abuse among young people. She tried to get the New Mexico State Fair to refrain from serving alcohol for a day or so; they declined. So she organized a human chain around the New Mexico State Fair in protest of their policy. As a result, for 4 days the fair was completely alcohol-free. I wonder if she would like to join my congressional lobbying staff. *[Laughter]* Good for you, Robyn, and congratulations.

Our second winner of the Young American Medal for Bravery is Brandon Sisco of Texarkana, Texas. When Brandon's school bus made a routine stop, a young girl got off the bus and was attacked by two ferocious dogs. She was bitten many times. Brandon jumped off the bus and bravely fought off the dogs, guided the 6-year-old to safety inside the bus where he comforted her until paramedics arrived. At considerable risk to himself, he saved the young girl's life. Let's give him a round of applause. *[Applause]*

Our final recipient is Amanda Stewart of Keyes, Oklahoma. In 1990 Amanda was paralyzed in a car accident. She began a three-State campaign to raise consciousness regarding the dangers of drinking and driving. She told her peers they should think first about getting into a car with someone who had been drinking. She asked them to think before driving off first without fastening a seat belt. After an experience which would have crushed the spirits and broken the will of many people, even people 2 or 3 times her age, this brave and beautiful young woman has doubtless inspired countless young people to change their behavior, to secure a better future for themselves. And in the process, she has exercised influence, power, and goodness far beyond anything

that anyone might have imagined. Thank you, Amanda, for your commitment and your courage.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me close with what I always think of at moments like this. These young people have reminded us, as the Attorney General has said, of the power of one person to make a difference. Each of us in our own way have that power. And I think we would all admit, starting with the President, that every day at the end of the day we have done less than we might have done to exercise that power that is within us all, divinely inspired and given to us for whatever time we're on this Earth. Let's look at them and remember our obligations to make the most of every day.

Thank you, and bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:32 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Memorandum on the Civil Rights Working Group

August 4, 1994

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Civil Rights Working Group

I am writing to you about our responsibility to promote equal opportunity for all Americans. We have accomplished much in our pursuit of a society in which all our people can achieve their God-given potential. But we still have a long way to go.

Americans believe that in spite of our differences, there is in all of us a common core of humanity that obliges us to respect one another and to live in harmony and peace. We must build on this belief and give real meaning to civil rights by tearing down all remaining barriers to equal opportunity—in education, employment, housing, and every area of American life.

Throughout the Nation, each of us must bring new energy to our efforts to promote an open and inclusive society. Those of us who are public servants have a special obligation. At the Federal level, we will do this by re-evaluating the civil rights missions, policies, and resources of every agency, so that they carry out their missions in a manner

consistent with the Administration's commitment to equal opportunity. In reviewing our activities, we must seek not only to eliminate barriers to equal access and opportunity, but also to identify opportunities for innovation. No Federal office should be exempt from the obligation to further the struggle for civil rights. And every State and local government should be encouraged to do the same.

On January 17, 1994, I issued an Executive order establishing a President's Fair Housing Council to be chaired by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Working across agencies and programs, this Council will bring new focus and leadership to the administration of the Federal Government's fair housing programs. On February 11, 1994, I issued an Executive order directing agencies to develop strategies to identify, analyze, and address environmental inequities that are the result of Federal policies. That order will increase public participation in the environmental decision-making process.

In addition to these efforts, I believe more can be done to exercise leadership for civil rights enforcement. That is why I hereby establish a Civil Rights Working Group, under the auspices of the Domestic Policy Council, to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of Federal civil rights enforcement missions and policies. The Civil Rights Working Group will identify barriers to equal access, impediments to effective enforcement of the law, and effective strategies to promote tolerance and understanding in our communities and workplaces. More important, I expect the Working Group to develop new approaches to address these issues.

The principal focus of the Working Group will be our civil rights enforcement efforts. We must recognize, however, that public and private enforcement resources will never be fully adequate to the task, and all of the remaining obstacles to opportunity cannot be removed through litigation alone. Therefore, I direct the Working Group to identify innovative strategies that can leverage our limited resources to provide new avenues for equal opportunity and equal rights. Among those potential strategies are new measures relying on civic education and voluntary efforts to engage citizens in overcoming the effects of

past discrimination. These new strategies should be designed to complement our improved and reinvigorated enforcement efforts.

The Attorney General and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget will co-chair the Working Group. The following Administration officials will serve as members: the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Assistant to the President for Economic Policy, the Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy, and the Assistant to the President and Director of Public Liaison. I also have invited the Chairperson of the Commission on Civil Rights to participate in this crucial endeavor on an informal basis, respecting the independent and critical voice we expect of that Commission. Finally, this membership list is not exclusive. I invite and encourage all Cabinet officers and agency heads to participate in the Working Group.

The Working Group will advise appropriate Administration officials and me on how we might modify Federal laws and policies to strengthen protection under the laws and on how to improve coordination of the vast array of Federal programs that directly or indirectly affect civil rights. I direct the Working Group to provide the Cabinet and me with a brief progress report no less than every 6 months, and specifically to:

- (a) examine each Federal agency with a significant civil rights mission and provide me with an evaluation of how well that mission is being implemented. These analyses should examine whether each agency uses the experience gained from enforcement activities of other agencies and other levels of government. Counterproductive and inconsistent practices should be identified and proposals for change recommended;
- (b) examine cross-cutting civil rights law enforcement challenges such as voting rights and equal access to government benefit programs and identify innovative means of coordinating and leveraging resources;
- (c) develop better measures of performance for Federal civil rights enforcement programs, taking into account the real impact of programs on the daily lives of all Americans; and
- (d) support and advise all agencies as we reinvent our strategies for the promotion of an open and inclusive society.

With this interagency effort, I underscore the commitment of this Administration to bring new energy and imagination to the opportunity agenda. In departments and agencies throughout the Federal Government, this work is already well underway. The Working Group will provide a mechanism to expand and accelerate that vital work. Its work will be among our greatest contributions to the people we serve.

William J. Clinton

Remarks on the Anniversary of the Passage of the Economic Program

August 5, 1994

Well, thank you all. We've established one thing beyond doubt. We all have enough sense to come in out of the rain. [*Laughter*]

Thank you, Mr. Quimby, and thank all of you. We've had representatives of four fine companies speak here today: the head of one of our largest corporations; the head of a medium-sized high-tech company, growing and growing into the world economy; the head of a small company that's doubled the number of—or now a man that's moved from a small job to a large job in a small company that's growing very rapidly; and a new employee. The Vice President and I wanted these folks here for this announcement today because they represent what our efforts are all about.

I said the other night in my press conference that there are a lot of lobby groups in Washington, but I wanted the White House to be known as the “home office of the ‘American association of ordinary citi-

zens.’” And what I mean by that is that in this time of profound change, what we need to be doing is figuring out how we can make the changes necessary together to enable all of our people to live up to their potential, to fulfill their dreams, to move into the next century with the American dream alive in every family and with American leadership secure. And when I sought this job, I was convinced that would require some changes in my political party, some change in the other political party, and some changes in the way we do our work here in Washington.

If you listen to the four stories here, that’s really what’s behind all these arcane arguments and all the political rhetoric over economic policy: the simple question of whether people will be able to pursue their destinies and their dreams and live up to the fullest of their abilities. I could never hope to say it any better than these four people did, and I think we should give them all another round of applause. *[Applause]*

Today, we celebrate because this morning, as the chart to my left shows, the Labor Department reported that since our administration came into office, our economy has produced more than 4 million new jobs, almost all of them in the private sector. Now, as we know, when I ran for office, I said I thought we could produce 8 million new jobs in 4 years and that we would do 4 by the end of ’94. So we’re 6 months ahead of schedule.

I do want to correct one thing. You know, I get criticized sometimes for my attention to detail, but I want to show you this. Where is it? I asked for this pen this morning when I looked at this chart because when I looked at the numbers, there are actually not 4 million new jobs but 4.1 million new jobs. And now that we’re out of the rain, I’m going to make a correction on it.

Manufacturing jobs have been increasing in this country for 7 months in a row now for the first time in 10 years. All the jobs created last month, 100 percent of them, were in the private sector, not in government. Companies like Kenlee Precision have added those second and third shifts, jobs that made it possible for people like Charles Quimby to get ahead. Companies like Ellicott Machine have been able to hire new

workers like Frankie McLaurin. Executives like Bob Eaton and Carol Bartz are making a good beginning in this remarkable partnership we have to renew America. And they described to you, perhaps better than I could, what the role of the National Government is in their agenda for the future, what we should be doing and what we should not be doing.

None of this has been easy. Indeed, I have been mystified since I got here about why some of these things are as hard as they are and why they take as long as they do. One of the problems is that in this town, sometimes words replace reality. In the computer business and in high technology, virtual reality is a very good thing. It enables you to replicate situations and to avoid future problems. In Washington, I’m not sure we have virtual reality; I think what we have up here is virtual unreality, which is a bad thing because it enables you to almost dehumanize problems and turn them into words and rhetoric and labels. And we have all these word battles up here that don’t seem to make any sense to ordinary people.

Once in a while I watch the evening news, and I’m usually working when it’s on—once in a while I watch it, and I see the way we’re presented, and I look at that and I say, well, heck, if I was still back home I wouldn’t be for that guy either. *[Laughter]* Just because of the way it all plays out. You know, it’s so—it’s kind of unreal. And what we’ve got to do is find ways to bring reality, your reality, the way you look at the world, the way you live with the world every day, into the decisionmaking of this town.

And that’s what we did when we passed that economic plan. Bob Eaton had it right. He said, well, he wouldn’t have done it in the same way we did, but he was glad we got the job done. Well, that’s the way I feel about his cars. I don’t have any idea if I’d make the same decisions he makes on everything, but they make awful good cars and I’m glad they got the job done. In the end, that’s the way we should judge ourselves.

And we did the best we could with that economic program, considering the fact that at the moment of voting we had no help from the other side. They said the sky would fall. One of them, and I quote, said, “Taxes will

go up. The economy will sputter along. The deficit will reach another record high. It's a recipe for disaster." That was wrong. That was wrong.

What did we do? We did have a tax increase on the wealthiest Americans, but it's still—the rates are well below where they were in 1980. And all the money went to pay down the deficit and to finance a tax break for 15 million working families who were just above the poverty line, and we didn't want them to go back to welfare. We wanted to encourage people with low wages to keep working and to keep raising their kids and to stick by the American dream. There were too many people who were giving up work for welfare, and we wanted it to be the reverse. So I plead guilty to that.

We also cut \$255 billion in spending, and we passed a tough budget that helped to drive those interest rates down, get this economy going again. This year, we're about to pass another tough budget that eliminates 100 Government programs outright, contains the first reduction in domestic discretionary spending in 25 years—outright reduction—and continues to drive that deficit down while increasing the money we're spending to empower people to succeed in the global economy: more for education and training, more for Head Start for little kids, the establishment of a lifetime learning system, for world-class standards in our public schools, more apprenticeships for young people who get out of high school and don't want to go to college. And our economic program made it possible for 20 million Americans to refinance their college loans at lower interest rates and better repayment terms. That is the direction in which we ought to be going.

And finally, as you heard Carol and Bob talking about, we're trying to expand the barriers of trade, or tear down the barriers and expand the frontiers. Frankie said that Ellicott was doing well largely because of NAFTA. They also said—a different group said that the sky would fall if we did that. But there we had a bipartisan majority fighting for change. We passed it. Our car sales in Mexico are growing 5 times as fast as they did before NAFTA was passed. Mexico is now our fastest growing trading partner. Even though their economy is in a down pe-

riod, we're still having explosive growth. Think what it will be like when they start to grow again. This is very important.

We're trying to sell airplanes all around the world. We just announced a new ship-building initiative. The Trade Ambassador, Mr. Kantor, has resolved agricultural disputes with Canada. We're selling rice to Japan for the first time. We are moving in to the global economy, and we are working on these things. And I don't know that these things fall very neatly into the kind of words people throw at each other here in this town. Is it liberal or conservative, Republican or Democrat? I don't know, and I don't care. I just want people to be able to work and to do well and to have this economy grow.

And I know to do that—when we have the deficit coming down for 3 years in a row for the first time since Truman was President, when we're moving toward the smallest Federal Government that we've had since Kennedy was President, and when the economy is growing this rapidly—last year we had more businesses formed than in any year since World War II—we're not doing bad. We've got to get rid of the rhetoric and go back to reality.

And I would say this: The future looks good. Fortune Magazine predicts for the first time in 10 years, the economy in every State in America will grow next year. And that is very good. Most businesses expect to grow next year and to expand. And consumer confidence is high.

But we have to continue to face the tough problems up here. And one of the things that I hope very much will happen is that the experience that we had working through these economic problems and the results that have been achieved when you take on a problem, risks of unpopularity in the short run, even if you win by the narrowest of margins, if you actually address a problem, you get results. That is very good because that proves that Washington is not all that unreal after all, that there really is some connection to our lives up here and the way you live where you are. Because if you ignore the problems in these four companies, 10 years from now there won't be anybody from your companies to show up here and talk at the White House.

In the end, you have to face the challenges before you. We are now seeing that again. We have some challenges ahead of us. The Congress must, must approve the worldwide GATT trade agreement that we negotiated, that we got agreement on, but the Congress has to enact it. It will mean a tax cut in the form of lower tariffs and lower costs for Americans and people all across the world of—listen to this—\$744 billion over the next 10 years. It will create hundreds of thousands of high-paying American jobs. We have got to finish the job on the trade issue. The next step is GATT.

Before I close, I want to mention two other issues, but it's the same point, problems you can't run away from. We must address the health care situation this year, not just for the people who don't have health insurance but for the people who do but who pay too much for it and who could lose it, not just for the companies who don't provide health care but for the companies who do and pay too much for it.

Why have the Big Three automakers supported us in health reform all along? Because one of the reasons we lost jobs and market share in the automobile industry is that they were paying too much for health care. And one of the reasons they were paying too much for health care is they were paying for all the people in this country who don't cover themselves and who don't do their own part.

Now, here are some basic facts that nobody can ignore. We can all disagree on the solution; nobody can ignore these facts. Of all the countries in the world, we spend more than anybody else on health care by a long ways, but we're the only major country that doesn't cover everybody with health insurance. Of all the countries in the world with which we compete, we are the only one going in the wrong direction. Today there are 5 million Americans, 85 percent of them working people and their kids, who are in this country today who do not have health insurance, who had it 5 years ago. So we're going in the wrong direction.

We have problems here with people who have health insurance but could lose it if they change jobs, somebody in their family gets sick, they have a preexisting condition, or the cost of the policy goes through the roof.

Yesterday I gave awards to four young Americans who have done heroic things and important community service. The United States has been doing this through the Justice Department for the last 44 years. One of these young Americans was the daughter of a farmer, who happens to be a Republican, in the panhandle of Oklahoma. She was injured and paralyzed from here down in a car wreck in 1990. This girl, a beautiful girl, could have given up on life, but instead she decided she would devote herself to try and encourage other young people not to drink and drive and not to ride with people who drink and drive and always put their seatbelts on in a car. She was going to try to help other people avoid what had happened to her. And her daddy is just a hard-working farmer. She's got a sister who is a lovely girl; she's got a wonderful mother. They were paying over \$3,000 a year for a limited health insurance policy with very high deductibles. All of her costs were a couple of years ago, attendant on her wreck. This is 4 years later; they were just notified that their insurance premiums were going from \$3,100 a year to \$9,300 a year. And this farmer is going to have to drop his insurance.

Now, with these two wonderful kids, he's got to figure out how they're going to college, what they're going to do, living out there in a little town in western Oklahoma. And like he told me, he said, "You know, this is not a political deal." He said, "I'm a Republican; I'm a conservative. I don't want the Government to do anything for me, but we need some help here. There's something wrong if I can't take care of my family, hard as I'm working."

So again, I say to the Members of Congress on this, let's just do something about this. Most small businesses in America are struggling to provide health care, and they're paying too much for it, because they can't get the same rates that big business and Government gets. Some big businesses, like Chrysler, are paying too much for it because when people who don't have health insurance get sick, they still get care. They go to the emergency room, and then their costs are passed along to everybody else in higher hospital bills and higher insurance premiums.

We know that something works. We know what they do in Hawaii works. It's the only State where employers and employees are required to split the difference and cover health insurance. And we know that even though most everything else in Hawaii is more expensive than it is on the mainland because it's way out there in the Pacific, health insurance costs for small business are 30 percent lower there than the national average. Why? Because everybody has to pay something, but you're only paying for yourself, you're not paying for anybody else, number one, and number two, because small and medium-sized companies get to band together in big buying groups so they can buy insurance with the same competitive power as Chrysler and the Federal Government. So we know that works.

So I just think I would say again, all I ask of any of you is to ask the Members of Congress to put aside partisanship, rhetoric, and this sort of word-throwing, and let's just think about the people of America, just like we do here, 4.1 Americans who have jobs, all different races, all different religions, all different political groups. All I know is, we're better off that they're in that line. And we'd be better off if we solved the health care problem, and we're going to pay a terrible price if we don't.

One last issue I want to mention: I went to the Justice Department last week for what was a great celebration. We had hundreds of police officers there to celebrate the fact that after 6 years of bickering, the House and the Senate had both passed crime bills and had agreed on a common bill through their conference committees to send back so that each one of them could pass identical bills, so that I could sign a crime bill into law that would give us 100,000 police officers on the street—that's a 20 percent increase; that would ban 19 kinds of assault weapons and protect 650 hunting and sporting weapons, to make sure that this was not a gun control issue, this was an assault weapons issue; that would ban handgun ownership by minors; provide for safe schools; provide for "three strikes and you're out," tough penalties, more prison cells, and billions of dollars for prevention programs to give children something to say yes to as well as something to say no to,

the biggest, toughest, smartest crime bill this country's ever passed.

Unbelievably, after 8 days nothing has happened. The bills are there. We need it. The American people know how bad we need it. The Democratic mayors and the Republican mayors have endorsed it. The Democratic Governors and the Republican Governors have endorsed it. Every police organization in the country, the attorney generals, the local prosecutors out there in the country where people know that crime strikes people without regard to race or political party, everybody is for this crime bill. But here the crime bill is, stuck in a web spun by a powerful special interest.

You see, before a bill can come to vote in the House of Representatives, it has to be voted out of the Rules Committee. And then the House has to vote first on whether the bill's going to actually be brought to a vote, not on the bill but whether it's going to be brought to a vote. It's a procedure.

The National Rifle Association is trying to block the vote on the rule because they are against the assault weapons ban, because they know that a majority of the House and the Senate will vote for this bill if it gets to a vote. So they are trying to block the vote on the rule, hoping that people can hide and say, "Well, I didn't really vote against the bill, but there was something about the way it was coming up I didn't like."

I got a letter from a kid from New Orleans last spring who asked me to do something about the crime problem. He said, "I'm 9 years old, and I'm really scared that something's going to happen to me." And 9 days later that kid was shot dead. Now, we've been waiting for 8 days for a vote on this crime bill. We have debated this. We fought the assault weapons ban. I thought the NRA was going to win, but we won fair and square. We only won by two votes, but we won, the police officers and those of us who don't want the cops to be outgunned. It was a fair and square deal. We won. And we won in the Senate. And it's in the bill. And I didn't think we could beat them, but we did. We worked like crazy, and we did.

It is wrong to let the NRA, and other interest groups, too, to be fair, who have some other bone to pick with this bill but who

know it cannot be defeated on the merits, to use a procedural vote to keep the American people from getting the police, from the kids from getting this prevention money, from the people from getting the “three strikes and you’re out law,” from the police from getting the help they need with the prisons, and all the rest of this. This is a good deal, and we’re not paying for it with a tax increase. We’re paying for it by reducing the size of the Federal bureaucracy by more than a quarter of a million between now and 1999.

And I want to plead with you to ask the Congress over the weekend not to let procedure get in the way of saving the lives and the future of the United States. We showed up here to make decisions. If anybody wants to vote against the crime bill, let them vote against it. There are people who are going to vote against it because they’re honestly opposed to capital punishment or because they’re honestly opposed to the assault weapons ban or because they’re honestly opposed to the prevention funds. Let them vote against it. That’s fine.

But do not let us pull another Washington, DC, game here and let this crime bill go down on some procedural hide-and-seek. If we’re going to have a shoot out, let’s do it in high noon, broad daylight, where everybody knows what the deal is.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:55 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Charles Quimby, manufacturing manager, Kenlee Precision Corp.; Frankie McLaurin, steelworker, Ellicott Machine Corp.; Robert Eaton, chairman and CEO, Chrysler Corp.; and Carol Bartz, chairman, CEO, and president, Autodesk, Inc.

Nomination for U.S. District Court Judges

August 5, 1994

The President today nominated two individuals to serve on the U.S. District Court: Robert N. Chatigny for the District of Connecticut and Judith D. McConnell for the Southern District of California.

“Each of these nominees has an exceptional record of legal achievement,” the

President said. “I know they will serve on the Federal bench with distinction.”

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

Nomination for an Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs

August 5, 1994

The President has formally submitted to the Senate the nomination of Dr. Kenneth W. Kizer as Under Secretary for Health in the Department of Veterans Affairs.

“Dr. Kizer brings a wide range of clinical and administrative expertise to the VA at a time when tested leadership will be crucial to the Department’s success in the framework of national health care reform,” the President said.

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was 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.

July 30

In the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Independence, MO, where they met with families from the State who have problems with the current health care system. They then toured the Harry S. Truman Library in the afternoon.

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Cleveland, OH, where they attended a fundraising dinner for senatorial candidate Joel Hyatt at a private residence. Following the dinner, they returned to Washington, DC.

August 1

In the morning, the President traveled to Jersey City, NJ, where he met with families from the State who have problems with the

current health care system. He returned to the White House in the late afternoon.

August 2

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton attended a Democratic National Committee fundraiser at a private residence in Oxon Hill, MD.

The President declared major disasters exist in Oregon and Washington following severe damage to the ocean salmon fishing industries caused by the El Niño weather pattern and recent drought.

The President announced his intention to nominate the following individuals to the National Science Board:

- Eve L. Menger;
- Claudia Mitchell-Kernan;
- Diana S. Natalicio;
- Robert M. Solow;
- Warren M. Washington;
- John A. White.

The President announced his intention to appoint Dolores Kohl as a member of the Commission on Presidential Scholars.

The President announced his intention to appoint the following individuals to the National Advisory Board on Indian Education:

- Joseph Abeyta;
- Agnes Cavis;
- Rosemary Ackley Christensen;
- Mark Maryboy;
- Aleta Paisano-Suazo;
- Janine Pease-Windy Boy;
- Scott Ratliff;
- Sherry Red Owl.

The White House announced that the President has invited President Leonid Kuchma of Ukraine to Washington, DC, for an official working visit on November 29.

August 3

The President announced his intention to appoint Barbara Blum, LaDonna Harris, Loren Kieve, and Catherine Baker Stetson to the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development Board of Trustees.

The President announced his intention to appoint Kit Dobelle as a member of the Commission on Presidential Scholars.

August 4

The President announced his intention to nominate Herschelle Challenor to the National Security Education Board.

The President announced his intention to nominate Sheldon C. “Shay” Bilchik as Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention at the Department of Justice.

August 5

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton went to Camp David, MD.

The President announced his intention to nominate Kenneth Spencer Yalowitz as Ambassador to Belarus.

The President announced his intention to appoint Joseph M. Aragon, Stephen R. Colgate, and Kenneth Young as members of the Board of Directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

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 5

Robert N. Chatigny,
of Connecticut, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Connecticut, vice Warren W. Eginton, retired.

Judith D. McConnell,
of California, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of California (new position).

Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as

items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released July 30

Transcript of remarks by the Vice President to Health Security Express participants

Transcript of remarks by Hillary Clinton to Health Security Express participants

Released August 2

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by the Press Secretary on the upcoming visit of President Leonid Kuchma of Ukraine on November 29

Released August 3

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of remarks by Chief of Staff Leon Panetta on health care reform

Transcript of remarks by Health Care Express participant John Cox

Released August 4

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the support of economists for prompt ratification of the Uruguay round agreement

Transcript of a press briefing on the anniversary of the passage of the economic program by Assistant to the President for Economic Policy Bob Rubin, Office of Management and Budget Director-designate Alice Rivlin, Chair of the Council of Economic Advisers Laura D'Andrea Tyson, Secretary of Labor Bob Reich, Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown, Small Business Administrator Erskine Bowles, Deputy Secretary of the Treasury Roger Altman, and U.S. Trade Ambassador Mickey Kantor

Transcript of remarks by Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala, Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown, and Secretary of Labor Robert Reich on health care reform

Released August 5

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by Special Counsel to the President Lloyd Cutler on appointment of a new independent counsel

**Acts Approved
by the President**

Approved August 1

S. 832 / Public Law 103–284

To designate the plaza to be constructed on the Federal Triangle property in Washington, DC, as the “Woodrow Wilson Plaza”

H.R. 1346 / Public Law 103–285

To designate the Federal building located on St. Croix, Virgin Islands, as the “Almeric L. Christian Federal Building”

H.R. 1873 / Public Law 103–286

To require certain payments made to victims of Nazi persecution to be disregarded in determining eligibility for and the amount of benefits or services based on need

H.R. 2532 / Public Law 103–287

To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse in Lubbock, Texas, as the “George H. Mahon Federal Building and United States Courthouse”

H.R. 3770 / Public Law 103–288

To designate the United States courthouse located at 940 Front Street in San Diego, California, and the Federal building attached to the courthouse as the “Edward J. Schwartz Courthouse and Federal Building”

H.R. 3840 / Public Law 103–289

To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 100 East Houston Street in Marshall, Texas, as the “Sam B. Hall, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse”

S. 1880 / Public Law 103–290

To provide that the National Education Commission on Time and Learning shall terminate on September 30, 1994

S.J. Res. 172 / Public Law 103–291
Designating May 29, 1995, through June 6,
1995, as a “Time for the National Observance
of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II”

H.R. 572 / Private Law 103–3
For the relief of Melissa Johnson
S. 537 / Private Law 103–4
For the relief of Tania Gil Compton