Originally Processed With FOIA(s): **FOIA Number:**
S

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential Library Staff.

Record Group/Collection: George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Aarhus, Carol, Files
Subseries: Alpha File, 1990-1992

OA/ID Number: 13860
Folder ID Number: 13860-003

Folder Title:
Assorted As-Delivered Press Texts of [Presidential] Speeches [3]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	19	2	5	1

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release August 7, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT CEREMONY HONORING THE
50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LANDING ON GUADALCANAL

Marine Corps Memorial
Arlington, Virginia

11:11 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very much. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Senator Chafee, and the other members of Congress that are with us who are veterans of Guadalcanal. May I salute the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs General Colin Powell; Commandant of the Marines Carl Mundy. General Sullivan, Commandant of the Army is with us. The Acting Secretary of the Navy Sean O'Keefe; distinguished Commandant of the Coast Guard William Kime; and of course, the Medal of Honor recipient, Mitchell Paige. But most important, you Marines.

I would like to open -- (applause.) I thought they had a little life left in them.

I'd like to open if I may with a story. It's a story of heroism, a story of courage, sacrifice. It's a story from Guadalcanal. Kenneth Bailey was commanding officer of Company C, 1st Marine Raider Battalion, when his men were called upon to defend Henderson Field during the Japanese assault September 12 and 13th of 1942. The enemy had penetrated our main line of defense, their number superior to ours. And only a miracle it seemed could defend that airfield.

And Major Bailey and his men provided the miracle, turning back the flank attack, then covering the withdrawal of our main force. And in the fighting, Major Bailey sustained severe wounds to his head. And even so, for 10 hours he and his men engaged the enemy in vicious hand-to-hand combat.

The attack was repulsed and Henderson Field was secured. And Major Bailey died two weeks later from machine-gun fire in yet another battle on Guadalcanal. He received the Congressional Medal of Honor for his gallantry on Bloody Ridge.

Major Bailey's story serves as a summation for thousands of other stories; tales that could be told by the brave men gathered here who survived the hell that was Guadalcanal.

Secretary Cheney mentioned the lesson of those battles, and I'm struck, recounting Major Bailey's story, of one lesson in particular. Kenneth Bailey was from Pawnee, Oklahoma, a town of 2,00 near the Arkansas River in the north central part of the state. And in the months and years before the great war in the Pacific, who could have predicted that a son from Pawnee, Oklahoma; or the sons of Raritan, New Jersey; or Sioux Falls, South Dakota; or Rutland, Vermont -- who could have foretold that these young men from every corner of America would be called upon to defend freedom 6,000 miles away on an obscure Pacific island called Guadalcanal?

It's safe to say that few, if any, had ever heard of the island. None could have predicted what would transpire there. But

it was on Guadalcanal that the forces of freedom began their long march -- a march that wouldn't end until three years later in Tokyo Bay on the deck of the USS Missouri. (Applause.)

No one can foretell when or where freedom will be challenged. That is one of the lessons of Guadalcanal. How many Americans in 1947 had heard of Inchon or Pusin or Chosin? How many of us 15 years later had heard of De Nang or Khe Sahn? And how few Americans in the summer of '90 had yet heard of Khafji or Safwan. And yet today, these names are indelibly part of the roll call of honor, places where Americans made their stand and offered up their sweat and blood to a cause greater than themselves.

And we honor the dead, not merely for their sake, but for our own sake as well. And in commemoration and remembrance, we learn again that freedom, in the deepest sense, always hangs in the balance. That we earn it day by day in hot wars and cold; that its price, as Jefferson said, is eternal vigilance, an endlessly renewed dedication to keeping our great country strong, our defenses second to none, our leadership unquestioned and unchallenged.

There was a rhyme passed around during those dark six months that I'm sure many Marines here today out front remember. Six months, as the battle raged on, when freedom hung by the unbreakable thread of American bravery and resolve. Every Marine who wasn't fighting on the island knew the lines, "Say a prayer for your pal on Guadalcanal."

This morning in this place -- and thank you, Pastor, for your loving invocation -- this morning and in this place, we remember those words and the men who inspired them. And with hearts full of pride and awe and thanksgiving, we once again say a prayer for those who fought and died in a place few had known of, but which all of us will never forget.

May God bless them. May God bless you. And may God bless our great country, the United States of America. (Applause.) Thank you. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END 11:18 A.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Houston, Texas)

For Immediate Release October 31, 1991

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AND THE VICE PRESIDENT
AT BUSH-QUAYLE FUNDRAISING DINNER

Sheraton Astrodome Hotel
Houston, Texas

9:25 P.M. CST

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Phil. Mr. President, Barbara, Marilyn, distinguished head table, ladies and gentlemen. Let me just go on the record once again and to tell all of you people of Texas what you already know -- Phil Gramm is one of the best United States senators in the entire country. (Applause.)

And what a tremendous honor for Marilyn and me to be back in Houston, Texas -- the home of the 41st President of the United States of America. (Applause.) And after speaking to all of those lawyers -- (laughter) -- several weeks ago, I'm delighted to be among friends. (Laughter and applause.) Since I'm a lawyer and Marilyn's a lawyer, we know it's tough to be a lawyer. (Laughter.) After all, when a lawyer states his or her position, no matter how right he may be, the other party always finds fault with everything he says. And, believe it or not, lawyers are often criticized by the press. (Laughter.)

At times, you'd think there's even a feeding frenzy against lawyers. They're subjected to ridicule, lawyer-bashing, and even lawyer jokes. I sure hope something like that never happens to me. (Laughter and applause.)

For almost three years now, I've had the opportunity to work side-by-side with our great President. History judges presidents on the decisions they make. I might also add that history does, and should, judge presidents on how they make those decisions. I have had the opportunity to see from close range how this President faces the tough choices every day. He does it calmly, carefully, thoughtfully and, yes, at times prayerfully.

I've seen him search long and hard for the right answers to the difficult challenges that face our country. For President George Bush, the question at the beginning of the day and at the end of the day is what will serve the best interests of America and her people?

The most dramatic moment perhaps came last January when the President made the decision that Saddam Hussein would have to be expelled from Kuwait by force. Our President gave Saddam every opportunity to leave. But the dictator of Iraq thought the President and the coalition that he had put together lacked the political will to do what had to be done.

Well, our President, your friend and neighbor, did what was right. Because in his heart and in his mind, he knew what was right. He knows that honor, decency and service aren't just words, they're a way of life. George Bush's way of life.

And to know the President is also to know his wonderful family. Barbara, the children, the grandchildren and, of course, Millie and Ranger -- (laughter) -- but you and I know that the George

Bush family extends to all of us in this room tonight. And let me just say this: On behalf of millions in our country, we are proud of our great First Family. (Applause.)

Speaking of being proud, let me just say how proud I am of my partner for nearly 19 years. She's involved herself in disaster preparedness around the world and, yes, she's done a tremendous service for women of America in her crusade against the dreaded disease of breast cancer. Thank you, Marilyn. (Applause.)

Two of my favorite historians, Will and Ariel Durant, once said that, "the family is the nucleus of civilization." The last three decades have been tough on the American family. Today, almost 25 percent of America's kids live with just one parent; 15 million children do not have a father in the home. And just about every social problem you can think of is somehow related to the breakdown of the family.

Now, we can talk all we want about what government should or should not do when it comes to the American family. But one thing is certain: Values mean something. Real life means something. Because there is no substitute for role models. And in their togetherness and their values, the Bush family is an example for all Americans to follow. (Applause.)

Behind the scenes, the picture is the same. A family deeply committed to one another. I can recall the number of times when the President interrupted important meetings to take a call from his wife, his daughter, or from one of his sons. His devotion to family is one of the many reasons that people look up to him.

Tonight, we are the George Bush political family, and proud of it. A family united because of our belief in many of the same principles and ideas. And ideas are important. Ideas are powerful. And one idea that you and I agree on, Mr. President, is the need to limit the terms of members of Congress. (Applause.)

And let me say this: If Ronald Reagan was limited to two terms, and if you, Mr. President, are limited to two terms in office, then surely for the good of the country, the Senate careers of Howard Metzenbaum and Ted Kennedy should be limited to two terms. (Applause.)

Our President is a global statesman; one who yearns for peace, works for peace and knows how to bring about peace. The mere mention of his name evokes trust, respect and love. I've seen it time and time again: President George Bush simply brings out the best in the American people. He is, as you well know, one of the most decent people you will ever meet. He has a steady inner compass that tells him what is fair and what is right. And when he knows what is right for his country, he is absolutely determined to achieve it.

Ladies and gentlemen, like all of you, I am proud to say that George Bush is our President. But it makes me even more proud to call him a very special friend.

Thank you very much. Good night, and God bless you. (Applause.)

* * * * *

THE PRESIDENT: Please be seated. And, Bob, thank you. Thank you for the superior and wonderful job you've done. You know, this is the very first event for the Bush-Quayle fundraising effort. And we wanted to start amongst friends, and we wanted to get somebody good, somebody effective to head this dinner. And I can't think of anybody better than Bob Cruikshank and all those up here and all

those out there that have come through. It is a wonderful beginning, and I'm grateful -- and I know Dan is -- to every single one of you.

I want to thank my Vice President, your Vice President and his marvelous wife, Marilyn. I can't begin to tell you of all the things he does. But I think the country now sees his substance and his value, and it's something I see every single day that I'm President as we take on a Congress that, frankly, needs a little leadership up there. I've heard him take the gloves off a little bit there, and that's fine. That suits the heck out of me. (Applause.)

I also want to say to Bob Mosbacher how grateful I am to have him at my side. I know all of you know him -- everybody in this room knows him as a friend. But I know him not just as a friend of longstanding, but as an effective member of our Cabinet. And I can tell you, he is out there -- domestically and around the world promoting the American free enterprise system, looking after the interests of American investment, American jobs, here and abroad.

And, Bob, I'm very grateful to you.

May I also thank Bobby Holt. Yes, Midland's out there somewhere. (Laughter.) Holt is everywhere, and he's doing a wonderful job as our Chairman, our National Chairman, taking the role the Bob Mosbacher has so successfully filled for us in the previous campaign.

Senator Phil Gramm -- I agree with everything Dan Quayle said about him. I see him in action. And I'll tell you -- when you have the minority in the Senate, when you have to play defense because of the numbers, you want a tenacious bulldog, free thinker, enterprising senator at your side like Phil Gramm. I'm grateful to him every single day that I'm President. (Applause.)

I want to thank Willie Alexander for being with us, and Reverend Claude Payne, my pastor; Milo Hamilton, of course; and then the Aggies -- the Texas A&M Singing Cadets. I don't know how they can still stay standing. (Applause.) This is about a 45-minute speech. Let's see how they do at the end of this one. (Laughter.)

It's great to be back. Milo, one slight correction -- you said I said, "There's so-and-so." I was looking at Red Adair, and I said, "There's that so-and-so." (Laughter.)

You know, coming back here really does take you back in a sense to roots. I first became active in politics out in Odessa and Midland in '52 when I headed the Eisenhower-Nixon campaign, Barbara at my side. In '56, the same role. I think it was in that year that she and I conducted the very first primary that was ever held in Midland, Texas. Three people -- some of you have heard this story; it happens to be true -- three people voted all day in that precinct: Barbara, me, and one drunk that thought he was going to the Democratic precinct. (Laughter.) And that's the gospel truth. (Laughter.)

Then, I came down here to Texas, and early in the '60s I became Harris County Republican Chairman. There, I think more than anyplace, Barbara and I first got a taste of what was to become a way of life for us. The party was small -- very, very small in those days. And yet, the ideals and the ideas were sound. Fiscal sanity, people controlling their own destinies more; limited government; trust in the people; a compassionate, fair government; strong defense; a country not afraid to lead. Those were some of the things that brought us together in this tiny party matrix 30 years ago in Harris County. And I must say, those are the same ideals that both Dan and I have -- the same ideas that we believe in. Thirty years later, I still feel strongly about those principles and other fundamental principles that join us here tonight.

Lately, the opposition up there in Washington says we don't have an agenda. But I've noticed that their agenda for Congress is stopping our agenda for America. They are old thinkers, tired, old ideas, and all they want to do is block the agenda that I was elected to perform on by the American people, and I'm a little tired of it. (Applause.) You work your heart out for new ideas in trying to bring new systems to this country, and you face the old -- same old tired liberal cliches in Washington, D.C. We are pro-growth, we are pro-family, we are a pro-freedom agenda, and that is our agenda -- to build a better America. And I wish we had more people in the Senate like Phil Gramm and we'd be singing swiftly ahead, I'll tell you. (Applause.)

I was privileged to work with my dear friend, Hugh Liedtke, and others in starting two or three very small companies here in Texas. And I never forgot, and I never will forget what America owes to its small business men and women. That's one reason that, for over the last three years, I've fought against policies that would drive small business into the ground -- through government mandates.

Every time you turn around, you've got some subcommittee chairman that's been there 30 years trying to mandate new benefits and tell some guy in Midland or Odessa how to run his life. And we're sick and tired of it. And next year, we're going to change it. (Applause.)

Dan Quayle has a committee trying to do something about overregulation. And you ought to hear them squirming over there in the House of Representatives, refusing to let him get his job done because they're thinking old, tired thoughts that the federal government ought to regulate every inch of your life. And we're tired of that one, too. (Applause.)

Look, I'll be the first to agree we need economic growth in this country. But we can't get it if Congress keeps piling on mandated benefits. Wonderful new programs designed by a subcommittee chairman in Washington, D.C., telling everybody exactly how they're going to take their leave, what they're going to do about helping people in their neighborhoods. This isn't the way America ought to be operating. I have this wonderful sense that -- I get frustrated at times, but I've got this wonderful sense that we can change that next year by taking our message that the Congress has been around there too darn long, controlled by the same party, and it's time to change it. (Applause.)

Let me give you an example. I'm just getting warmed up because I heard George Mitchell on the television a few minutes ago. Now, let me tell you something here. (Laughter.) Let me talk to you about an issue. I don't think there is anybody in this country, any fair-minded man or woman who doesn't sympathize with someone who wants to work and is out of work. It's very easy to demagogue on this issue. Nobody who has one grain of compassion likes to veto an unemployment compensation bill. But someone -- and I think I was the one elected to do this -- must consider the welfare of all the people in this country.

So let me tell you what my position is on this unemployment compensation. Number one: I want to see the Democrats in the Senate lay politics aside and help those whose unemployment benefits have run out. Families are hurting out there. And I've said for months that I want to help them.

Secondly, I want a bill that, in helping them, does not burden every single taxpayer in this country -- those that are working and those that aren't working. I don't want to see the budget agreement that Phil Gramm and others worked so hard to get into place, the spending caps on it -- the only control that you as taxpayers have on a spendthrift Congress -- I don't want to see it

broken. And the only safeguard we have against more and more spending is that budget agreement.

Every time I turn around, the liberal Democrats want to bust the agreement. That would add to the deficit and eventually add to the tax burden of present generations and the debt burden of future generations.

Number three on this same subject -- we have a proposal before the Congress that extends benefits. It lays aside all this political rhetoric that you hear from these Democrats and gets the checks in the mail to those families that are hurting and does it within the budget agreement. Bob Dole proposed that weeks ago. But the Democrats want to ram it down my ear in a political victory, and I'm going to veto their bill if they send it down in a way that's going to bust this budget again. Now, they can mark that one down. (Applause.)

I think it's a crying shame to play politics when people are hurting in this country. I really believe that. And they can get a bill signed by me tomorrow if they get going and send something down that lives within the budget agreement that we all agreed to, that they themselves agreed to. You tell me who's playing politics with that issue when people are hurting in this country.

It's not all negative. At times, we're able to persuade -- I remember how Lyndon used to talk: "Come reason with me." Wrench the guy's arm out of his socket. (Laughter.) And he was working with control of both Houses of the Congress. I don't know how he'd do it today.

But sometimes we are able to persuade the opposition to cooperate, to join with us. I've reached out to the Congress. I don't believe there's a person in America that thinks I haven't reached out to the Congress -- not always in a kind and gentle way, but always reached out to the Congress, trying to get something done for the American people and do it in a manner I was elected to do it. I was the one that was elected -- Dan Quayle and I were the ones that were elected by all the people in this country. And the senators have their responsibilities -- of course, they do. But I think I have a responsibility to perform on what I told the people three years ago that I would do.

We did get the Clean Air Act through -- compromise. Good, fair negotiation with the Democrats, amendments that employ free-market incentives and really do help the environment. We advanced the cause of property rights and home ownership with this HOPE, this home ownership initiative. We've broken down the barriers to employment of 43 million Americans with our landmark Americans with Disabilities Act, which I was very proud -- emotional in signing last year on the South Lawn of the White House.

Other times we can do some positive things on our own. Just last week, I signed an executive order to take the first steps in reforming our legal system. Dan Quayle's committee came up with some very sound recommendations, and I was proud to incorporate them into an executive order. We're trying, frankly, to put an end to some of these outrageous lawsuits and monstrous settlements that scare every small businessman, every doctor and everybody else in this country to death. (Applause.)

There's only so much of it we can do with executive order. We need liability reform legislation. And yet, that legislation is bottled up by these people I'm saying tonight are old thinkers. They just don't want to take on the pressure groups, the lobbies, the tough constituents that come together and try to get for the few that which the many are denied.

Americans want liability reform. And I'd like to see the Congress move out now and do something about it. Dan Quayle has been out there on the cutting edge of this, and I am 100-percent behind him.

And I might say that he's touched -- he referred to it -- touched a sore spot with some of the members of the ABA, the American Bar Association, when he called for legal reform. But he touched a nerve with a whole lot more everyday Americans who just plain stood up and cheered. He's done a great job on it, and I am very proud to have him by my side on this issue and all the other issues we're talking about here tonight. (Applause.)

The Senate did a good job in a bipartisan manner on the crime bill. But then it goes over to the House, and some of these old thinkers I'm telling you about are denying the changes that the American people so clearly spoke about in the presidential elections of 1988. We've got -- you talk about these incentives to get jobs -- we've got some incentive in a transportation bill -- a job-heavy transportation bill, and yet, a good one. We beat back some bad legislation. We've got a good one there.

In the State of the Union message, I said to Congress, hey, how about passing a transportation bill in 100 days? That was 241 days ago and they haven't got it down to my desk to be signed yet. I think the people are tired of this kind of old thinking, old politics.

One area where we don't need a lot of legislation -- need some, but not a lot -- is in education. We have an initiative called America 2000 -- a concept designed to literally revolutionize our schools.

Lamar Alexander, David Kearns, coming together as a fantastic team there, rethinking -- working with governors, Democrats, Republicans alike, to redefine what we need to achieve educational excellence.

And you talk about an exciting concept, one that's gathering momentum and excitement around the country, it's that one. And fortunately, we don't need a lot of legislation because one of the key education committees that you have to go to is tired -- think how much money are we going to spend for this; how much money are we going to spend for that -- programs that have failed.

It's not a question of money. It's not a question of that. We spent $190 billion in 1980 on education; we spend $400 billion today, and we're way back in the tail end of education around the world. It isn't good enough. And we've got to think anew. Give me more senators like Phil and give me more congressmen like Bill Archer, and by golly, you'll see the change in education that the American people want. (Applause.)

You hear about consumer confidence. Yes, there's a lack of confidence. And one thing that would change it right now is sound, forward-looking banking reform legislation. And we've got those proposals, and they've been gutted by partisan infighting. How I long for a Congress where we can at least take the offense on these important issues.

One subject that many of you know an awful lot about in this room -- a national energy strategy. We need that from the Congress. It would mean jobs, it would mean increased production, and it would mean less dependence on foreign oil for our energy requirements.

And I am going to continue to support environmentally responsive access to ANWR, the Alaskan Refuge, for energy production. We need it. And if you're worried about caribou, take a look at the

arguments that were used about the pipeline. They'd say the caribou would be extinct. You've got to shake them away with a stick; they're all making love lying up against the pipeline. And you've got thousands of caribou up there. (Applause.) And yet the same voices, the same voices are arguing against ANWR today. I mean, come on. (Laughter and applause.)

I want to see us reduce our reliance on foreign oil, and we can if we pass an energy bill, one like the one that came out of Senator Bennett Johnston's -- good Democrat on this issue -- and Senator Malcolm Wallop -- came out of their committee.

You know, we hear a lot about economic growth. I've called for economic growth initiatives in three State of the Union messages, and a part of that -- one part of the economic growth was a capital gains tax cut. So what happens in Washington, D.C.? They jump up and down and scream, "this is a tax cut for the rich." Let me tell you, I'll make them a proposal right here tonight. I will take all the political heat that they can muster. Whatever country, however much demagoguery they can bring to bear on that issue, I'll take that heat if they will give this capital gains cut a chance. Because it will create jobs and get America back to work again. And it is not a tax cut for the rich -- (applause.) It is a jobs measure -- a small-business-creation measure -- a shot-in-the-arm-for-a-sluggish-economy measure.

History has already shown that it does not add to the deficit. The Treasury scores it as a plus, not a minus. It reduces the deficit. So let the opposition carry on all they want. We've all heard it before -- good heavens, I'm 67, I've heard it for a thousand years -- "tax cut for the rich, breaks for the rich." Let's try something a little bit different than the mandated programs from Washington that offer people a lack of dignity and a lack of hope. And in the meantime, give the Americans a break, give them some jobs. Get going with our motivation package.

Finally, it's time we got around to -- rid of a practice where a privileged few stand outside the law -- where attending to the national interest takes a back seat to serving the special interests. And very frankly, it's time that the United States Congress started following the laws it imposes on every citizen in this country. (Applause.)

I gave the Congress a gentle nudge on this the other day, pointing out that with all the pious cries during those Thomas hearings, Congress -- now, get this -- has exempted itself from sexual harassment laws. Word of honor. Yesterday the Senate did take one step to put itself under the same laws that the rest of the people have to obey. But that's just not enough. It's time that those who make the laws, live by the laws that they make others live by. Now, that is fair play, and it's long overdue. (Applause.)

And speaking of Clarence Thomas, I am delighted that he's on the Supreme Court. Men supported him overwhelmingly. Women supported him overwhelmingly. Blacks supported him overwhelmingly. But the liberals in the Senate didn't support him at all. And I'm glad that the people won out on that one. (Applause.)

When I hear the critics in Congress arguing about our priorities -- foreign policy or domestic policy -- I wonder where their priorities are. The "global marketplace" isn't off in Europe or Asia or in Africa -- it's right here in our neighborhoods, in our businesses, in our schools. Take a look at our North American Free Trade Agreement. It will have a monumental effect on the quality of life here in the United States over the next decade.

We're not doing this to be nice to Mexico, we're doing it because it is in the best interest of the workers and the people of the United States of America. Every billion dollars in new trade

means 20,000 more jobs. A better-educated work force means higher quality products, which means more economic growth. The cycle continues -- and growth means more jobs, more opportunity for everyone.

But the world beyond our borders affects us in other ways, and we've got to make a choice: do we meet its challenges, or do we fall behind?

And, yes, since I've been President, we have been called upon to meet one crucial challenge after another. And meet them we did -- each and every one. From Eastern Europe to Panama to the Persian Gulf, to dealing with the Soviet Union as history unfolds before your very eyes -- in all of these, it is America that stands as a beacon of freedom throughout the world. And our prestige around the world has never been higher than it is today. (Applause.)

I'm still on Madrid daylight saving, or something; my eyes kind of -- because yesterday I was in Madrid, and I helped open that Middle East peace conference in Madrid. But over there, I made a terrible mistake. I flipped on CNN -- and I say that with respect to CNN guys down here, but I turned it on and I saw one of the Democrat leaders, one of the elected Democrat leaders in the House of Representatives attack me for being at that historic conference. I could not believe the small-bore nature of that partisan criticism. Here you have a historic peace conference. You're bringing together people that have been hostile and wouldn't even have been in the same room at any time in their history. And this guy gets on and says I shouldn't be in Madrid for 36 hours.

Come on. We have a responsibility here. I have a responsibility to lead and I'm not going to let Democratic, liberal carping keep me from leading. (Applause.)

If I had to get -- let me put it to you so you can understand it. Let me put it in Red Adair's terms -- "If I'd have had to let Ted Kennedy tell me whether I could move a quarter-of-a-million troops to the Middle East or let Schwarzkopf move from St. Petersburg or Tampa to Saudi Arabia, Schwarzkopf would still be there; the troops would still be there; and Saddam Hussein would still be in Kuwait, maybe moving into Saudi Arabia. That's what was at stake. And thank God, I didn't have to listen to these carpers telling me how to run that war. (Applause.)

I'm getting warmed up for next year. (Laughter.) I told them I was not going to do this until about March or April off next year. (Laughter.) But they get under your skin for a while. I've reached out to this Congress. (Laughter.) I really have tried. And I'm getting sick and tired, as the Congress winds up, of this partisan, liberal criticism. I can't wait now to roll up my sleeves and become a candidate. (Laughter and applause.)

My point is simply this: We live in an integrated world. And in that world, you can't neatly divide foreign policy from domestic policy. When I talk with foreign leaders about new markets for American products, is it foreign policy or domestic? When I meet with groups of Latin American leaders, as I did in Cartagena, to help try to keep drugs out of America's schools and neighborhoods, is that foreign policy or is that domestic policy? When Desert Storm reignited Americans' faith in themselves, was that just foreign policy?

No. It demonstrated our special role as the world's preeminent moral, political, economic and military power. The pride that we felt in our fighting men and women -- and in ourselves -- shouldn't be trivialized as something "foreign."

Anyone who says we should retreat into an isolationistic cocoon is living in the last century -- when we should be focusing on

the next century and the life that our kids can have in that next century. They should know that America's destiny has always been to lead. And if I have anything to do with it, lead we will. (Applause.)

I'll tell you, yes, there are plenty of real problems out there all across our country. They're human problems where real people, real lives are at stake. Dan talked about the family. Where families are ripped asunder. Tons of problems out there. But we are going to prevail because I firmly believe that the American spirit is alive and well.

In Texas or in Washington, I know we'll keep up the fight. And we will hold as our banner the frontier resolve and the common-sense ideals of those early Texans who built our great state. I am absolutely convinced, no matter what the obstacles we face in a partisan nature, that we can do something for the kids, that we can build a better America.

So I want to thank you for being here with us tonight. It means a great deal, in many, many more ways than I can possibly tell you, for Barbara and me to start this journey -- this fundraising journey right here where we feel, what Bob talked about, a sense of love and warmth and friendship. That means an awful lot, whether you're President of the United States or still living around the corner.

Thank you and God bless each and every one of you. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END 10:10 P.M. CST

line for a settlement. During the week of May 20 representatives of the Government of Turkey and of the Turkish Cypriot community traveled to New York for consultations with Mr. Gustave Feissel, the Secretary General's Director for Cyprus Affairs. During these consultations the Turkish side made proposals on the issues of territorial adjustments and the return of displaced persons.

On May 22 Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs Under Secretary Ozceri met with Secretary [illegible]ker and Under Secretary Kimmitt. Th[illegible]iscussed the proposals of the Turkish side, and Secretary Baker reemphasized the importance of continued flexibility by all the parties concerned.

On May 29 President Vassiliou met with Secretary Baker for a full discussion of the Cyprus problem. Then, on May 30, President Vassiliou met with me in the Oval Office. During these meetings both Secretary Baker and I discussed with President Vassiliou recent developments affecting the intercommunal negotiations and urged him to be flexible with respect to completing the outline for a settlement.

Based on the developments of the last 2 months, I continue to believe that a moment of opportunity exists to finish the long overdue outline of a Cyprus solution, and that [illegible]ompletion can lead to a final settlement [illegible] the Cyprus problem in the foreseeable future. While many obstacles remain before the outline can be concluded, I am convinced that each of these obstacles can be removed, and the path to a just and lasting settlement cleared, if the leaders of both communities on the island will make the difficult decisions required to make agreement possible. It is my earnest hope that they will do so.

Sincerely,

George Bush

Note: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Claiborne Pell, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The original was not available for verification of this letter.

Address to the Nation on the Nomination of Robert Gates To Be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency

September 13, 1991

My Fellow Americans:

This week millions of you watched and listened as Judge Clarence Thomas appeared in his Senate hearings as my nominee for the Supreme Court. And now the Nation knows what I know: Clarence Thomas is a magnificent American. The hearings have revealed his warmth, his grace, his intellectual vitality. And above all, Judge Thomas is driven by a passion for fairness, deepened by life experience, disciplined by profound understanding of our Constitution and the wisdom of our forefathers.

This is no time for special interest agendas to block this important appointment. As the Senate continues its deliberations, I am confident that we'll agree that Judge Thomas is the right man for the Supreme Court.

Next week, the Senate will begin its deliberations on another nomination crucial to America's well-being for many years to come: my choice of Bob Gates as Director of Central Intelligence.

Our victory against Saddam's aggression and the extraordinary changes in the Soviet Union have our spirits soaring. But we must recognize that while the coming years offer great hopes, they pose challenges as well. The times demand a vigorous, experienced Director of Central Intelligence. We have that man in Robert Gates.

Bob Gates was nurtured in the love of American democratic values in the Kansas community called home. He studied at three of our best universities, earning a doctorate in Russian and Soviet history. Twenty-five years ago he entered the "silent service" of the CIA. He became CIA's Deputy Director in the 1980's. The achievements of American intelligence during that decade owe much to his innovative and effective leadership.

As one who once had the privilege to serve as Director of Central Intelligence, I have boundless admiration for the women and men of our professional intelligence services. I deeply believe Bob Gates is the man best qualified to lead our intelligence community through the challenges of the 1990's.

During my hours of decision in Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, Bob Gates stood by my side every step of the way, giving wise counsel, helping bring the best out of our civilian and military commanders.

I need Bob Gates now at the helm of our intelligence services. As hearings on Bob Gates' nomination begin in the Senate next week, I hope all Americans will join me in asking the Senate to approve his nomination promptly.

Thank you, and may God bless the United States of America.

Note: The President spoke at 4:01 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Clarence Thomas, nominee for Supreme Court Associate Justice; President Saddam Hussein of Iraq; and Robert M. Gates, Assistant to the President and Deputy for National Security Affairs. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this address.

Proclamation 6336—Energy Awareness Month, 1991

September 13, 1991

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Meeting our Nation's future energy needs is a task of immense proportions—and utmost importance. To some American motorists, this challenge might be symbolized by long lines for gasoline and high prices at the pump. To others, it might be symbolized by lowering the thermostat during winter months. However, when it comes to building a secure energy future for the United States, there is more at stake than meets the eye. Safe, reliable, and affordable sources of energy are vital not only to our personal mobility and comfort but also to our Nation's productivity and security. America's utility companies and other energy providers supply th[illegible] power that are needed to o[illegible] ries and farms, our schools stallations, and other places

Continuing instability [illegible] some regions of the world need to use energy efficie[illegible] our dependence on insec[illegible] energy; and to develop n[illegible] sources. Of course, we mu[illegible] ance efforts in these areas mination to maintain a gr[illegible] We must also balance thei[illegible] mitment to a cleaner, he[illegible] ment.

Our comprehensive N[illegible] Strategy calls for the wise [illegible] velopment of all of our Na[illegible] sources, including coal, natu[illegible] clear energy, as well as hyd[illegible] and other forms of renew[illegible] also calls for the developm[illegible] nology for oil and gas explo[illegible] use of alternative fuels; and[illegible] servation efforts.

This month, the United[illegible] ment of Energy will be wo[illegible] public awareness of our[illegible] needs and the energy optio[illegible] able to us. With strong l[illegible] levels of government—an[illegible] tained cooperation of bu[illegible] energy providers, and con[illegible] ers—we can implement th[illegible] policies and practices that[illegible] America's well-being.

Now, Therefore, I, Geo[illegible] dent of the United States[illegible] virtue of the authority vest[illegible] Constitution and laws of th[illegible] do hereby proclaim Oc[illegible] Energy Awareness Month. I[illegible] cans to observe this month[illegible] educational programs and a[illegible]

In Witness Whereof, I h[illegible] my hand this thirteenth da[illegible] in the year of our Lord ni[illegible] and ninety-one, and of the I[illegible] the United States of Ameri[illegible] dred and sixteenth.

[Filed with the Office of t[illegible] ter, 11:17 a.m., September 1

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release July 24, 1991

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
ON NATIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY

Room 450
Old Executive Office Building

2:53 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Please be seated. Thank you all very much. Well, may I just thank everybody for coming, and first of all greet our Secretaries: Jim Watkins, who is doing an absolutely superb job on the energy front, and I'm delighted that he's here. And I think after I do my number here, why, he will get into a lot more of the substance. But I want to salute also Manuel Lujan and Bill Reilly, key players in our drive to do a better job on the energy front.

And, of course, we have in the front row, in case those of you in the back haven't seen them, Senator Wallop and Senator Bennett Johnston and Phil Sharp. And Mike Deland is over here. I'm getting in trouble because I'm going to -- I thought Martin Allday was supposed to be here from FERC. There he is right there in the second row -- Midland, Texas man. (Laughter.) Thank you again.

Five months ago -- and many of you, maybe not all, but put it this way, most were probably here that day -- we announced our comprehensive and balanced strategy for an energy future that is secure, efficient and environmentally sound. And our National Energy Strategy is designed to meet needs this nation can't afford to compromise: continued economic growth, increased energy efficiency, strong environmental protection and then a reduced dependence on foreign oil.

This strategy relies on the magic of the marketplace, the resourcefulness of the American people and the responsible leadership of industry and government. As we enter the next American century, this balanced approach will propel a larger and larger American economy in a more and more energy-efficient way.

And some have pushed for radical measures in order to reduce the oil imports and reduce our dependency; measures that, in my view, would hurt American industries and jobs and consumers. So we've got to act with care, but it is our firm belief that we've got to act comprehensively.

And our Energy Strategy strikes a balance. We believe it is a sound and reasonable middle ground that will achieve greater energy security without endangering the environment or stopping the economy in its tracks.

We start by using energy more efficiently. And we've got to accelerate our research efforts, to keep America on the cutting edge of new energy technologies like alternative fuels, electric cars, high-speed rail, solar and geothermal, safer and more secure nuclear technology.

Today, we want to build an energy future that opens the door to new and diverse energy sources, because our energy future should never be at the mercy of foreign exporters.

As Jim Watkins will tell you, most of the initiatives contained in this strategy can be implemented under existing

authority. And the administration has already made, I think, a great deal of progress. We've set in motion a substantial part of the strategy already, in other words, without waiting for needed legislation -- legislation that's needed in other areas.

On the legislative front, we've made substantial headway since we released the strategy last February. And I just can't tell you how much I appreciate the leadership of the members of Congress that are here. We're talking principally about the Senate bill here, but Senator Johnston and Senator Wallop, the Senate Energy Committee passed a comprehensive and a balanced energy bill, one which embodies the key elements of our strategy. And for them it hasn't been easy. They've had to compensate and consider a lot of interests up there, but they've done a superb job. And I urge the full Senate to act swiftly on this bill which should win support from conservationists and industry alike.

There's been a lot said about the Johnston-Wallop bill, some of it, frankly, not very accurate. Let me tell you what it actually does. On balance, it defines a very positive role in energy for the federal government. It enhances efficiency, energy efficiency, in areas like building efficiency standards, federal energy management efforts, energy conservation investments by utilities, and the development of new transportation technologies and alternative fuels.

On the supply side, it ensures access to the energy we need to sustain continued growth, growth that is environmentally sound. And we've made a lot of progress on cleaner-burning gasoline over the last few years -- private industry doing a superb job with its own research in this area. And in the bill before the Senate, we've encouraged the use of a whole range of environmentally-sound fuels like ethanol, methanol, electricity, propane, and certainly, encouraging the use of more clean burning natural gas.

We anticipate that the Johnston-Wallop bill will reach the Senate floor hopefully right after the August recess. I would defer to the experts, but that's what we're hoping for. It won't get there -- they've a pretty full calendar before the August recess. The House began mark-up on the bill last week, and we're hoping for the same comprehensive approach there that was achieved in the Senate.

We need Congress to act wisely and, I think, act soon -- and I know these members agree with that -- on this important domestic policy initiative. And we need action on all fronts: to remain world leaders in technology; to protect the environment; to make the most of our domestic resources; and to encourage energy efficiency through incentives for industrial, commercial and private consumers.

Unfortunately, some critics don't seem to see the big picture. They focus on one or two issues that admittedly are controversial. And if I think they're controversial, talk to the senators and congressmen about it, because they get hammered on all sides on these issues. ANWR clearly is one of them.

And let me give you a little history. In 1980, Congress specifically avoided designating part of the coastal plain in Alaska -- the ANWR, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge -- as wilderness. And instead, Congress asked the Interior Department to determine whether the resources of ANWR could be developed without harming the environment.

Well, since then, Interior has conducted or examined more than 170 studies. And time after time, these studies have shown that under strict environmental oversight, ANWR's coastal plain and its resources could, indeed, be developed safely. The wildlife will be protected. John Turner, the Director of Fish and Wildlife, is here today, and he's conducted rigorous studies. The way of life will be protected. And finally, the state of Alaska fully supports ANWR's development.

So I urge the Congress to take a look at these facts, more than 170 studies and the considered opinion of Alaska's own government, and not to be distracted by the critics, many of whom come from the extreme side. There are some that aren't, that just reasonably have doubt, but we cannot let our policy be shaped in this manner. And so please encourage people to take a look at the record.

Of course, all of you are here today because you can make a difference in the energy future of this country. And some people act as if Washington can snap its fingers and impose an energy strategy on the rest of the country. We know that just won't work.

The best part of our strategy is that it does draw upon our greatest resource -- I'd call it a national resource -- and that is the ingenuity of our own people. With their resourcefulness, we can ensure that America in the next century will be energy efficient, environmentally sound and economically strong.

And so I really wanted to come over here today, first of all to say thank you, to salute those members of Congress who are out front and laying it on the line -- it's not without a political downside to any of them -- to stand up courageously for the kind of program that we've talked about here.

And as Bennett, Malcolm and Congressman Sharp will tell you, sure there are differences from time to time, but we're all on the same general track here. And I think it's the right one for our country.

So I want to thank you for your support. And I hope, and I'm right confident looking around this room, that we can count on your continuing support. So thank you all very much for your interest, taking the time from these fantastically busy schedules that everybody around this room has. And we're with you. I'm strongly in support of this program that our able Secretary, Jim Watkins will outline in more detail. And once again, thanks for coming. (Applause.)

END 3:04 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(New York, New York)

For Immediate Release July 24, 1990

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE NEW YORK REPUBLICAN PARTY

Waldorf Astoria Hotel
New York, New York

7:50 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all. Thank you so much, Senator. And let me say how very pleased I am to be here. A salute first to Senator D'Amato who's doing such a superb job in Washington. (Applause.) He and I have to leave before the broccoli to get back to -- (laughter) -- get back down there, so I hope you'll excuse us. But let me salute my old friend, the Borough President. Mr. President, we're proud of you, Guy Molinari. (Applause.) And, of course, our Senate Leader, Ralph Marino. I just met with him and we talked about the importance of keeping control of this Senate, given the significance of redistricting coming up.

It is absolutely essential, and thus I want to thank everybody that has helped in this dinner. It is key that Ralph continue to run the Senate on the Republican side. We've got to keep control of it. (Applause.) And I expect because of his responsibilities as head of this whole campaign for the Senate, Guy Valella, over here, knows that he's got some big shoes to fill, too -- big responsibilities. Rapp, it's good to see you again -- Rapp Rappleyea, the leader over here on our -- I wish we had some more troops for him, and maybe we will out of this selection on the assembly.

I want to salute our able Party Chairman, Pat Barrett, a man whose given up an awful lot to lead our troops. (Applause.) And my old friend, Dick Rosenbaum, the National Committeeman. (Applause.) Comptroller Ned Regan, and Bernard Smith, running here. Is it okay to mention my brother John? Okay. All right. (Applause.) And I'm going to be in real trouble, but Rita -- Rita DiMartino. I see her all over the place. She's like Batman -- she's everywhere. And Joe Mondello and many other leaders -- I'm very, very pleased to be here. (Applause.) I want to single out two, however, who deserve our support. They have mine, and they are going to surprise a lot of people. Pierre Rinfret for Governor, and Geoff Yancey. (Applause.) We need them. They're a good team. They've got great families.

You know, for two years, when I was Ambassador to the U.N., Barbara and I lived up here, in this -- rough living here in this very hotel, room 42 A. And whenever I complained about anything, the Silver Fox would roll her eyes and say: "Just where do you think we live? The Waldorf Astoria?" Well, here we are back again, and I'm pleased to be here. And I understand that New York has been selected as the site of a very important event in 1992 -- a convention that will attract thousands of participants from all over the country -- people who hope to put their past setbacks behind them and plan a winning strategy for future. That's right -- the first reunion of all the ex-managers of the New York Yankees will be held right here in New York City. (Laughter and applause.)

Then there's another -- the other future New York convention -- the Democrats'. Let me say that my hand is still extended to them when it comes to working for the good of the nation. I look forward to the Senate hearings of David Souter; I am sure that they will find him to be tough, but fair. He's a first-rate appellate judge, an outstanding jurist and a great legal mind. And I

am delighted that he is the nominee for the Supreme Court. (Applause.)

Many Democrats in Washington have supported me in meeting this fantastic era of change abroad that Al D'Amato so generously referred to, are working with me now to pass the first revision of the Clean Air Act in more than 13 years -- tougher standards to cut down on acid rain and other air pollutants. And they worked with me so I could sign into law a bill ending discrimination against disabled Americans. So tough negotiations can get results. I see Amory Houghton out here, and he and other congressmen on the Republican side know this. They're in the minority, but they're working hard. Tough negotiations can get results. But differences between the parties are still broad and they're still deep, and much remains to be done -- too much. With more Republicans in Washington and in Albany, think of how much more we can achieve.

In New York, we face a tremendous opportunity to fight the Democrat gerrymander -- an opportunity to end discrimination against voters by race and by party. That is our mission this November -- (applause) -- that is our mission, and it is one that transcends mere politics because we're deeply concerned about the future of this great state.

To coin a phrase, we love New York, all of New York, from the oak-lined avenues of Long Island, to Yankee Stadium, to Broadway. From the city streets of Buffalo, to the New York of farm towns and the Adirondacks -- New York is a city of lights, a state of grandeur, a place where dreams come true. It certainly is for me -- after all, New York is where Barbara Bush was born, and she's doing pretty darn well. (Applause.)

But we are concerned for the future, because New York has become something else -- it's become a showcase of liberal policies. And after 16 years of dominance by liberal Democrats, it's time to judge the results.

For 92 months, America has enjoyed peacetime economic expansion and the creation of more than 22 million jobs. But not all the benefits of those years were enjoyed by the people of New York State. Throughout the 1980s, while most of America was growing and looking forward to the future, life in New York -- especially in the City -- was becoming more expensive, more difficult and more dangerous, regrettably, than ever before.

Liberal Democrats blame every problem on Republican policies, especially Republican economic policies. But in the late '70s, a large airline centered in New York didn't go out of business. It just decided to move south, to Texas, taking more than a thousand jobs with it. And in 1987, a large energy corporation based in New York didn't go out of business. It just decided to move south to Virginia, taking 3,600 jobs with it. In fact, since 1983, almost a third of the Fortune 500 corporations based here have chosen to leave.

Now, New Yorkers want a change. New Yorkers want the companies and the good jobs they represent to stay -- right here in New York. And New Yorkers want an end to open-air drug marts and these muggings. And New Yorkers want -- (applause) -- and New Yorkers want a government the empowers people -- not bureaucracies. (Applause.)

Twenty-nine out of the last 35 years of Democratic dominance in Congress have also taken their toll. Only a President carries a national mandate.

But like Republicans before me, I know that to deal with a Democrat Congress is to often face government by gridlock -- with spending skyrocketing out of control, good legislation thrown aside for pork, and a budget deficit looming over our children's children.

It is time we asked the American people to end the

gridlock. To choose the liberal mindset of the Democratic Party or to choose our path -- the Republican path of opportunity and growth. To empower government to run their lives, or to empower people to run their lives for themselves. Time to ask America to choose. (Applause.)

Here in New York, you must choose a governor. And let it be a Republican governor -- Pierre Rinfret. Here's a family man -- I hope you've all met his family -- a decorated war hero, a successful entrepreneur who pulled himself out of Hell's Kitchen, and wants to lead others out of poverty. And some say maybe he's not be a politician. Well, he may not be a politician, but maybe New York doesn't need another politician. Maybe New York needs a change right now. (Applause.) So, Pierre, we are all for you -- you and your ticket -- best of luck. (Applause.)

You know, New York faces another choice: to keep your outstanding Senate Leader Ralph Marino and his colleagues as your prime line of defense against a liberal governor and his assembly. Republicans, you see, like what works. And that's why your Republican Senate has been -- and will remain -- your watchdog against big spenders. And, more, a sane proponent of what works.

So be thankful that your Republicans in the Senate forced a spending cap, forced baseline budgeting. It is the Republicans in the New York Senate who managed to trim $1.5 billion in Democratic spending proposals. (Applause.) They know you can't trust a party that would double the fare of the Staten Island Ferry. (Laughter.) And kidding aside, think of what these Republicans would achieve if they could work with a Republican governor in a Republican assembly.

Jobs and spending are important. But safe streets are of equal concern, especially in a city that lives in fear. And that's why New York agrees with us: those violent criminals deserve nothing less than punishment, swift and sure. (Applause.)

So Republicans are united in wanting to change lenient, blame-the-victim laws -- liberal Democrats don't want to change these laws. (Applause.) Republicans want to allow the women of this state to be able to defend themselves with MACE, and liberal Democrats don't. (Applause.) And Republicans -- and this is a big one nationally -- Republicans want murderers and drug kingpins to pay the ultimate penalty and liberal Democrats don't. (Applause.)

In Washington, we argue that those who sell drugs are selling death. And we propose that drug kingpins reap what they sow. But our crime bill faces another obstacle. Fifteen months ago, I stood before the U.S. Capitol and announced America's determination to take back the streets.

The Senate has now cleared a crime bill -- Al D'Amato fighting for it -- a major new package, 423 days after I proposed it. It's not a perfect bill. It does nothing to ensure that evidence gathered by good, decent policemen acting in good faith isn't barred by technicalities that let bad people go free. But this bill will go a long way toward toughening sentences for violent crime, and reducing repetitive appeals.

Now this legislation is over in the House side now, before the House. And let us tell the members of the House, 423 days is long enough. Don't keep our men and women in blue waiting. Pass a tough bill, and pass it soon. (Applause.)

Let me give you another example of how a liberal Congress, long in power, jealously clings to the failed policies of the past. In April of last year, our Administration asked Congress to pass the Education Excellence Act -- reform proposals to reward achievement and allow educational choice. And yet Congress killed many of these sensible and cost-effective proposals. And then they doubled our request with hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of unnecessary, unrelated and costly changes.

If liberal Democrats should have learned anything, it is that you cannot reform an education system by throwing billions of dollars at it. So when is it going to penetrate liberal thinking that we shouldn't throw money at an ineffective education system that is already the most expensive in the entire industrialized world? When are they going to start demanding results and stop measuring the value of a program by the size of its price tag? And when are they going to stop blocking genuine, much-needed reform? (Applause.)

Where the liberal mindset dominates, the net result has been the same: Bad schools, dangerous streets, big deficits. Of course, times can change, and I hope they do. As you know, I met this morning, and will meet every morning this week, with the congressional leadership, the Speaker and the Democratic leader and the minority leader on the House side, and the two Senate leaders, one Republican, one Democrat on the Senate -- met to work for an agreement to lower our federal deficit.

We all know that the Democrats have a long track record on spending. But if the Berlin Wall could come down in the same year that America goes nuts over the Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles, who knows what could happen next? (Applause.)

And again, times can change. The leaders of Congress can work with me to break the impasse on reducing the budget deficit. And I think they are trying. I've saluted Dick Gephardt and I'll do it here again tonight. I believe he's trying hard. He's the one that has to lead this enormously diverse group into trying to get a deal. The spotlight is on both sides to place progress over partisanship and the national interest over special interest. I welcome sincere efforts from both sides of the aisle, and I'm eager to get an agreement with congressional leaders to achieve meaningful budget reform. And this is my hope. But as long as the liberal mindset dominates, we will be forced to measure our successes in catastrophes averted and calamities mitigated.

The genius of the American system is that it allows for checks and balances. But this doesn't mean that the voters must choose political stalemate, year after year, decade after decade. So let me be blunt: Divided government just isn't good enough, for America or for New York. We must have more Republicans up there in Albany and in Washington. And I think it's time to ask the American people to let us show what we can do without the albatross of liberal legislatures. It's time to ask America to choose.

As we go into the 1990 election season, remember an adage from a great Republican governor of New York, and a great President. Theodore Roosevelt said: "In life, as in a football game, the principle to follow is: Hit the line hard." The choice is clear: Republican reform or the Democratic status quo. And when we present the people with this stark choice, rest assured -- we will hit the line hard in November.

Thank you for all you have done to help this party. We are pledged to be in there supporting Pierre Rinfret and the rest of the ticket. May God bless you, and God bless the United States of America. Thank you all very, very much.

END

8:09 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Billings, Montana)

For Immediate Release July 20, 1990

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT ANTIDRUG RALLY

Daylis Stadium
Billings, Montana

9:10 A.M. MDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you for that warm welcome on this cool day. And thank you, Governor. I am so very happy that so many of you could join us this morning in this Daylis Stadium -- home of the Big Sky State Games. Cycling, golf, handball, shooting, swimming, tennis, -- (applause) -- track and field -- sounds like a weekend at Camp David. (Laughter.) How come no horseshoes around here? (Laughter.) I am very pleased to see sports play a prominent role in education, drug awareness programs, and scholarship activities. And first, best of luck to all tomorrow's participants. Good luck to each and every one of you. (Applause.)

I want to thank everybody and single out a few for this special hospitality. Doris Poppler, the Acting United States Attorney, has done a superb job on pulling all this together. The Attorney General, Marc Racicot. Senators Baucus and Burns and Governor Stephens and Mayor Larsen. We're honored to have with us also Robert Helmick, the President of the U.S. Olympic Committee. And then, of course, a very special hello to a special guest, Edwin Moses, whom I just was chatting with earlier -- an Olympic hurdler, and would you believe a bobsledder, too? (Laughter.) But you got a great turnout and great participants.

And I'm especially honored to be able to congratulate the 5th and 6th grade graduates of the DARE program who are out there in the crowd. (Applause.) You see, these kids are setting a wonderful example, not only for their friends and classmates, but for all the adults as well. And they're proof that each of us, no matter how young or how old, has a part to play in this war on drugs.

The drug problem facing America is the reason that I'm out here today with you. For over 100 years now, the people of Montana have been known as proud, hardworking, community-minded people. And that is where the answer to this nation's drug problem lies -- right here in the community. And there is no problem so great that all of us working together cannot solve.

We're beginning to see signs that our efforts, national efforts, against drugs are working. And last summer, a major nationwide survey found that the number of current drug users in this country had dropped by almost 40 percent in just three years. That's good news for America. It's good news for the next generation. (Applause.) And then in February, mid-February, another survey showed that the number of high school seniors using drugs declined in 1989, a long-term trend that has brought seniors' drug use to its lowest level in 15 years. So that's all good news. But the good news isn't limited to just these national statistics. Last year, the state of Montana reported a decrease in the number of drug abuse violations. It is news like this that deepens my faith, my conviction, that together we can win this national war against drugs. (Applause.)

But like all wars, we must be united in our efforts as a country and as a community. Parents, teachers, children, law

enforcement officials must join as one. Business, labor, the professions -- all must be a part of this crusade for a drug-free America.

Each of you here today, by your presence, is sending the dealers of death a strong Montana message: We will not surrender our children. We will not surrender our community. (Applause.) Billings, Montana is in this fight to win -- and win it you will, win it we will.

You know, I know you're going to win because this state, like so many others across this great land, is taking the initiative -- you're fighting back. You've had enough. Last year, the Montana Board of Crime Control began the innovative Drug Abuse Resistance Education program throughout the state. For those of you not familiar with that, with DARE, it is a unique program that targets primarily 5th and 6th graders by using well-trained uniformed officers to teach the kids about the dangers of drug use. The program helps students recognize and resist the subtle pressures that influence kids to experiment with drugs and alcohol. Over 7,500 children statewide received instruction in the program's first year and this number does not include the kids in kindergarten through 4th grade who were taught about drugs through another program designed especially for them. So let's give a pat on the back to all the kids who have said no to drugs, and our thanks to the law enforcement officers who help them say no. (Applause.) We're very proud of all of them. Keep up the good work. In your own way, you are making America proud.

Another example of community involvement with young people are the antidrug programs supported by the Freemasons of America, like the Center for Adolescent Development's Montana Teen Institute. This innovative center takes at-risk teens who are willing to commit to swear off drugs and gives them the tools they need to avoid drug use. Teens like Manual Zuniga. An alum of the Teen Institute, Manual's new goal in life is to be a U.S. Marshal so he can help others. Manual says "all kids need the help of parents and all adults to fight the bad guys. I would rather be a role model to my community and have made a stand to live a drug-free life."

Often, kids, themselves, are some of our best troops on the front line against drugs. They understand the enormous power of friendship in helping one another avoid drugs. One such program gaining recognition not just around the country, but around the world, is Youth to Youth -- a community drug prevention program for middle school and high school age young people. Recognizing the influential force of peer pressure, the Youth to Youth program uses that pressure to encourage young people to live alcohol and drug-free lives. Proof that kids talking to kids can make a difference, is reflected in the words of a young man in Landisville, PA, who said, "All my friends are drug free, so I've learned that drug free is the way to be." Wise, wise words.

Parents will agree that there is nothing more heart-wrenching than to witness something as sinister as drugs and alcohol dim the sparkle of your childrens' eyes, steal their exuberance, destroy their dreams. But, parents don't have to stand by and hope their kids are spared from this devastation. Instead, each and every one of us -- that means grandparents, aunts and uncles, cousins, neighbors, friends, anyone -- can make a huge difference by setting a good example, and by watching for the overt signs -- the overt signs of abuse, the overt signs of trouble.

But, the most effective way to reach our kids is by talking to them about drugs, and even more important -- listening to them. Then, through caring, and, yes, discipline, -- help them turn their backs on drugs. When a kid has someone who cares enough to listen, he will not care about drugs.

But, kids, communities, families and friends have some special allies in this battle. In towns as small as Laurel and as big as Los Angeles, brave men and women who believe that this country

is worth fighting for, face danger and face death every single day. They form the "thin blue line" between good and evil protecting our children from drugs -- protecting all of us from the terrible threat of crime.

Right here in Montana, you know all too well that sometimes these modern-day champions are called upon to pay the ultimate price. You've lost one of the town of Hardin's finest in Janet Rogers, and our hearts go out to George Rogers and his three boys, Jace, Logan, and Chad, whom I'm told are here today. Your wife, your mother was a true American hero. (Applause.)

But let's face it -- heroes alone can't win wars. So in Washington the administration, under the able leadership of our tough Drug Czar Bill Bennett, is taking action to help support our law enforcement officers across the country. As we meet today in Montana, this beautiful state, we're still waiting for the House to act on our Anticrime Package. Earlier this year, we were pleased that Congress passed our request for more agents, more prosecutors, and more prisons to get criminals off the streets and behind bars where they belong. But we must do more.

I urge the House -- the House of Representatives -- to pass a major portion of the Violent Crime Act. Legislation that will back up our new lawmen with new laws -- laws that are fair, fast, and final. Fair -- an exclusionary rule designed to punish the guilty -- and not punish the good cops who have acted in good faith. (Applause.) And when I say fast -- fast -- we need habeas corpus reforms to stop the frivolous appeals that are choking our courts. (Applause.) And final -- I'm talking about fair and constitutionally sound death penalty provisions for these major traffickers. (Applause.) To win the war on drugs, we must have a united effort. This isn't Republican or Democrat or liberal or conservative. It's got to be bipartisan.

But now, it's time for Congress to act. Our children, our communities and our cops have waited long enough.

As I look out over this magnificent audience -- an ocean of red, white, and blue, I see America at her best. This country's strength has always been her people, people who for generations have always helped, not only for the neighbor next door, but for the stranger in trouble down the street. This was true over a hundred years ago, when this great land -- Montana -- became a state. Back then, the sight of smoke on the horizon, a sure sign of trouble, farmers would drop their plows and mountain men would leave their traps, and shopkeepers would abandon their stores, to help a neighbor in distress. Some of our first what I call "points of light." In 1990, this sense of community, this sense of caring still remains, as Americans support one another in this battle against drugs. Today, there is again smoke on the horizon, and every single one of you in this stadium are here to help. You're a community bound together not by geography, but by caring. And you should be very, very proud. So thank you for having me here and God bless the great state of Montana.

Thank you all very, very much. Thank you. (Applause.)

END 9:20 A.M. MDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release October 28, 1991

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT BRIEFING FOR TRAVEL AND TOURISM CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

Room 450
Old Executive Office Building

12:26 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: I want to thank you all very much for being here. And I normally don't go around wearing make-up -- I want you to know that -- but we have a little studio in here and I've just completed a satellite broadcast out to the West Coast and I did not want to keep you waiting any more.

But Bob, thank you very much for being here. Let me salute, too, that you may have heard from -- I don't know whether Mike Boskin and Roger -- Roger Porter was here and Mike Boskin, I believe. Has he been? They are key players on our team, and I'm glad they've participated. I want to salute John Keller, who is sorely missed at the White House. He and I worked together for many, many years and now he's over there. We're still working together, but out of different buildings and I know he's doing a good job. I want to salute Rock Schnabel and Roger Ballou, the President of American Express Travel Related Services, whom I've just met out here. So, here we go.

I am told that this is perhaps one of -- well, put it this way, one of the most unprecedented gatherings of travel and tourism executives. And I want to thank you all for taking the time to come here. I wanted to just pop in on this briefing to show support for the extraordinary contributions that your group is making, not only to the industry --travel and tourism industry -- but to the economic well-being of our nation. And it's high time that this industry -- travel and tourism, a $327 billion economic powerhouse -- received the recognition that it so richly deserves.

Let me just cite some numbers that most of you know, but some around the country don't know: In 1990, international visitors spent more than $50 billion on U.S. tourism and transportation services. We expect a $5 billion increase in 1991. U.S. earnings from tourism are growing faster than our receipts from goods and services as a whole -- and this has been the case for over 30 years.

In terms of income generated and jobs created or sustained, tourism is among the top three industries in 37 of our 50 states. In 1990, nearly a million Americans owed their livelihood to international visitors. Add to that just over five million jobs generated by domestic travel and tourism for a total of nearly six million American jobs.

This solid record of growth has not gone unnoticed by small communities and by rural areas facing the challenge to diversify their economies. More and more rural communities are making tourism a part of the economic development options for the nineties. And the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration, along with other government agencies, are working to put small-town America on the tourist map.

An example of our administration's commitment to this idea is a Presidential Initiative on Rural Economic Development which recognizes that new economic opportunities for rural America will be found primarily in off-farm employment opportunities such as tourism, retirement living and commercial recreation. As part of that initiative, federal agencies will provide leadership for educational outreach programs in rural tourism development.

I am also pleased to report that next month USTTA and other federal agencies will sponsor a nationally-televised conference, "Turn It Around With Tourism," in conjunction with, in this instance, the University of Minnesota. This conference is intended to strengthen tourism-related businesses in small towns and in rural communities.

On the international front, this administration has sought to foster liberalized trade and to obtain the adaptation of international rules for the conduct of trade in services, including tourism, as well as encourage trade-related investment.

Several initiatives will have this affect by reducing barriers to tourism services, thereby opening up additional travel markets to companies.

They will also "lock in" beneficial conditions for market access in key existing tourism markets. Such an example is the fact that the United States has signed trade addenda with five Eastern European countries, including Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Soviet Union. And we are currently working on a sixth addendum with Romania. These addenda will ensure that the U.S. travel industry receives the same benefits from agreements with our trading partners as other industries.

Supporting this industry takes the work of everyone -- public and private. Our daughter, incidentally -- our only daughter, Dorothy -- helped me understand this when she worked in the Office of Tourism in the state of Maine. As for me -- tough duty though it may be -- I continue to do my part for the commercial recreation industry. (Laughter.) Fishing, boating, tennis, golf, running, hunting and all of this. (Applause.) Horseshoes. It's tough duty -- somebody has to do it and I'm going to keep on, I don't care what they say about it. (Laughter.) But seriously, this is a multimillion dollar industry -- recreation industry -- not to be taken for granted.

But the people who can really get America moving are right here in this room. Working side-by-side, the public and private entities you represent under the slogan of GO*USA, and led by Bill Marriott, have managed to overcome the temporary lag in traveler confidence that was caused by the Persian Gulf War. And today, as we kick off phase two -- under the leadership of Jim Robinson -- I'm sure this coalition will be enormously successful stimulating travel to and within the United States.

In a moment, I'm going to turn this over to John Keller, the Under Secretary. But let me just simply reiterate my support for the agency -- a small agency that is critical to this country's international competitiveness in the global market -- and for GO*USA. I look forward to watching this partnership between government and private sector companies grow and prosper -- at home and abroad.

And as for me, although it is not exactly tourism in action, I will be leaving at 9:30p.m. this evening for Madrid. And I might just say one word about that. These are important meetings. This is historic, and I don't want to get peoples' hopes too high because there is a long, long way to go before we have the makings of or have agreement for peace in that troubled corner of the world -- the Middle East. But it's worth it. Believe me, it is worth it to reach out and it is only the United States -- it is only our country that can serve as this catalyst for peace. And so I'm looking

forward to this and I'm hoping that it will be a first step now, this conference, in bringing peace to this part of the world that has suffered too long from war and conflict.

So thank you again, once again, for all you're doing for this wonderful industry and thank you for the opportunity just to drop in and say hello. Thank you. (Applause.)

END 12:35 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release October 25, 1991

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
DURING ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND U.S. ADVANCED-BATTERY CONSORTIUM

The South Grounds

10:42 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all. And, Jim Watkins, thank you very much. You may want to sit there, this is fairly long. (Laughter.) May I salute not only Secretary Watkins but Secretary Mosbacher; and Bill Reilly, our Administrator; Chairman DeLand was -- here he is here -- Mike DeLand. And, of course, single out Senator Johnston and Senator Riegle with us today.

And I would like to thank the three representatives of the automotive industry who are with us and who have had such an important part to play in all of this. Welcome to the White House, all of you, and to an event that shows how America's genius rests on the timeless qualities of enterprise and ingenuity -- qualities which can make the next century the new American century.

When I first heard I'd be getting together with America's competing big three, I thought Jennings, Rather and Brokaw would descend on the White House. (Laughter.) So this is a very pleasant experience, and, actually, I think it's terrific that these three large motor companies were brought together in mutual cooperation.

Earlier today, I mentioned to one of my grandkids this idea that I'd be out here giving a speech about electric batteries. He said, "I hope it's not interrupted by that pink bunny with a drum." (Laughter.)

Six months ago, Chrysler, Ford and GM -- together with California Edison and the Electric Power Research Institute -- formed a consortium to develop improved batteries for electric automobiles. And they knew that widespread use of electric vehicles wouldn't become a reality until someone built more powerful, less expensive electric batteries.

And today, I am very proud to announce this agreement between this consortium and our Department of Energy, supported by utilities and battery manufacturers, to move us closer to that day. We've joined in a four-year research project to create a new generation of batteries. And the goal: nothing less than to make electric vehicles competitive by the year 2000.

This private-public partnership will employ market forces, as Jim mentioned, to protect natural resources and point us toward a cleaner, more prosperous fuel and future. And it will help us reduce dependence on foreign oil and help us reduce pollution. It will also create American jobs -- for engineers and scientists during this R&D period, and for battery manufacturers, and then the support industries as this project moves into commercial production.

You know, regulating increased fuel economy will not significantly reduce our dependence on uncertain sources of foreign oil. And to accomplish that, we need alternatives to gasoline, and the electric vehicle is one of the most attractive alternatives around. The development of a competitive electronic auto industry will do more to reduce oil imports than rigid fuel efficiency standards that risk jobs and public safety. And let's remember: senseless overregulation is always a one-way dead end.

But while batteries have brought us together today, batteries are not all that this day is about. The group gathered here points to a new way of doing business: combining industry and government's intellectual and productive assets to sustain our competitiveness in the whole international arena. Electric vehicles represent the next technology milestone in the auto industry. And we intend to beat our competitors to that milestone.

Today's agreement embodies an idea whose time has come -- that government and business can help America outthink, outwork, and outperform any nation in the world.

Earlier this year, I announced the administration's National Energy Strategy, a blueprint of powerful ideas for America's future. And I want to salute Senator Bennett Johnston who's been a key leader -- I don't want to say partner because that might make you all believe he believes in every detail we are emphasizing. But he's done a superb job up there in the Congress working with the Department of Energy and the White House. And I would like to take this -- avail myself of this opportunity to encourage support for our energy bill.

The agreement fits into the blueprint of America's future being strong. It reflects our commitment to diversify transportation fuels; I believe there's plenty of safeguard for the environment in it; advancing technology and increasing industry participation in research and development.

And that strategy is key to achieving for all Americans a secure, clean and affordable energy future. The U.S. Senate will soon consider a comprehensive energy legislation -- it's Senate bill 1220 -- incorporating many of the principles that shape our strategy. And I urge Congress to do its part by enacting strong energy legislation like Senate bill 1220. This legislation is environmentally sound. It does not threaten to throw a lot of automobile workers out of work by enacting excessive CAFE standards.

And it was once observed, "Our Union is river, lake, ocean, and sky." It is also people dreaming dreams of endless possibility -- caring, toiling, creating and achieving.

And let me thank you all for coming to the White House. And it's now my privilege to witness the signing of an agreement that reaffirms the spirit of America -- that tomorrow will be even better, brighter, and greater than today.

Thank you all very, very much. (Applause.)

END 10:50 A.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release October 3, 1991

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE
NATIONAL FRATERNAL CONGRESS OF AMERICA

Grand Hyatt Hotel
Washington, DC

1:59 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. What a wonderful warm welcome. Thank you so much, and thank you, Pat Donlin, for the kind words, the kind introduction. And may I salute Bishop Daily; it's an honor to be with you, sir; and so many, many friends here today.

Ladies and gentlemen, when America won its independence two centuries ago, our founders chose a national motto. And they decided upon e pluribus unum: out of many, one. And it symbolized the federal union of the 13 original states, and captured the new nation's spirit of openness, tolerance and liberty.

Early on, early America was not the ethnic and religious melting pot of today, but neither was it monolithic. A great religious diversity arose in our land from Puritan New England, through Newport and New Amsterdam's early Jewish settlements, through the Middle Atlantic communities of Dutch Calvinists and German Lutherans, through Maryland's Catholic colony to the southern states' Anglicans and Presbyterians.

Constitutional protection of freedom of conscience made the melting pot possible, even inevitable. E pluribus unum became a self-fulfilling prophecy. And true to our motto, America attracted Slovaks and Poles and Italians and Greeks and Cubans and Vietnamese, Chinese and Lebanese and Irish by the millions.

America became a beehive of community self-help, fraternalism. Fraternal benefit societies helped millions of immigrants make the economic and cultural transition from the Old World to the New. Fraternal societies -- they offered life -- life insurance and health insurance to Americans who might not otherwise have found those protections. Local lodges and councils of fraternal groups gave, and still give, millions of hours to voluntary social service.

Motivated by fraternal ideals, millions of your members bring cheer to residents of nursing homes, share friendship with retarded kids, give elderly neighbors rides to the store, to church, to the doctor. Your members' voluntary gifts contribute hundreds of millions of dollars to educational, medical and social institutions. The fraternalist tradition illustrates America's distinctive commitment to community service -- and voluntary service flourishes more in America than in any other Western society. Fraternal societies were the prime examples that I listed in 1988, when I first spoke of what Pat referred to -- of America's "points of light."

Today, we look to voluntary fraternalism to lead us back to our roots and away from a debilitating social experiment -- government paternalism with all its mandated benefits designed by some subcommittee on Capitol Hill.

MORE

Before the advent of the modern welfare state, voluntary associations -- usually religious or fraternal in character -- provided most social services. Fortunately, we still have a strong voluntary sector in social services. And as I look at the problems of this country -- and I've just come from a media association for fighting drugs -- media people come together to fight against drugs -- but as I look at social service, I see that we need this spirit of volunteerism more than ever in the history of our country. (Applause.)

I mentioned the media against drugs. And then just before that, I met with the Red Ribbon Campaign. These are family people -- the National Federation of Parents for Drug-free Youth -- coming together. Some of you may well be in it on this Red Ribbon Campaign -- people voluntarily coming together to work in their communities to help eliminate in this instance the scourge of drugs. Parents getting involved more actively now -- and family, with their kids who are threatened by this scourge. I cite it just because it's one more of many, many examples of what I am talking about here today and what you all understand so well.

Voluntary social service institutions-- they provide creative competition for government agencies and other voluntary groups. They offer not just aid, but also choice, to those whom they serve. They belie the dangerous notion that anything public must be governmental. I am not opposed to the government; I'm proud to lead the federal government. But everything has a proper place in our society and we must not allow the government to crowd voluntary groups out of the social services field. (Applause.) Nor should we let the government monopolize public education.

America needs to revise --we say renew -- actually, renew its thinking about public education. From the earliest times, Americans have sought to provide quality education as universally as possible. Historically, our schools have served the same public purpose, whether their organizers were Methodist pastors or Catholic nuns or county councils. Strictly speaking, any school that meets fundamental state standards and does not violate antidiscrimination laws provides public education.

But schools that aren't operated by government and funded by tax dollars are finding it harder and harder to survive on such an uneven financial playing field. Not many parents can afford both high tax levies and private or parochial school tuition. Surely many among you have wrestled with a "choice" that wasn't a fair choice. Maybe you wanted your son or daughter to attend a Christian day school or a Lutheran high school, but couldn't afford to.

Our America 2000 education strategy aims to restore real freedom for parents to choose schools for their children. (Applause.) We're confident that greater choice will encourage creative competition among private and parochial schools, improving education for everyone. At the same time, we want to foster imaginative new approaches to school organization and management. We're enlisting, incidentally, parents, innovative teachers, business leaders, churches and voluntary associations in the enterprise of creating what we call, and properly so, "New American Schools." We're not going to just patch over the old approach. We're trying to revolutionize the schools in this country.

I hope you will join us in working to renew American education. And you can help by getting the message to your members of Congress, your state legislators and your local school officials. And you can help by getting involved in your own schools. But as ambitious and promising as these financial and organizational reforms are, there's far more that we must all do to improve American education.

Schooling takes up just a small part of a youngster's time. It may surprise you how little time is taken. From kindergarten to high-school graduation, our children on an average spend only nine percent of their time in their school. That's just one-eleventh of the time. Our children spend the remaining 91 percent of their time at home, or playing with friends, or maybe out at a video arcade.

Here's the most shocking statistic: Children in one survey said that they spend just 15 minutes a day talking with their parents -- 15 minutes. And moreover, the U.S. Department of Education reports that our eighth-graders spend an average of more than 21 hours per week watching television, but fewer than six hours a week doing homework.

If these surveys actually reflect wider patterns, we could make our schools the best in the world -- and still find ourselves in deep trouble. Kids and parents have to talk, and parents have to take an active role in encouraging their children to learn and excel in school.

As I contemplate my job and the great problems facing our country -- and I talked to Barbara about this a lot -- we worry about the disintegration of the American family in our society. We want to see it strengthened so these kids today whose lives are threatened by this new scourge of narcotics will have the love and affection and caring from parents that can make a tremendous difference. (Applause.)

This may not be the government's business, but it's the nation's business. It's the business of our people and I would like to be more effective if I could find ways -- and I know Bar would, too, Barbara would as well -- to find ways to help strengthen the fabric of the American family.

So as our administration works for reforms to give parents more choice in schools, naturally we want parents to join us -- to speak up, to fight for their rightful freedoms. And we want you to join us in this cause.

Even more fundamentally, our kids' future -- our nation's future -- demands that parents responsibly use all the freedom and power they already have. Parents or guardians -- with some help from grandparents and pastors and good neighbors -- mold our children's moral character. And they supply the motivation and discipline that young people need.

Learning begins at home, whether the subject is math or science or literature or civic virtue. I hope that people haven't become so accustomed to a big government role in education that they forget that the real responsibility for education begins and ends at home. (Applause.)

De Tocqueville understood. "There is no country in the world," he wrote, "in which everything can be provided for by the laws, or in which political institutions can prove a substitute for common sense and public morality."

The framers of the Constitution understood. And so did the great men and women, a century later, who founded America's flourishing alliance of fraternal societies.

I am confident that you, too, understand and accept the responsibilities that accompany our most precious freedoms. It wasn't costly, an activist government that made America great. Our strength and generosity flowed from individual initiatives and voluntary associations. Personal faith inspires public progress.

The American promise that beckoned your fathers and forefathers to these shores reaches out to new generations, to new

waves of immigrants. With your numbers, with your strength of spirit, I know America's fraternal associations will form a great part in keeping this promise for generations to come.

It is a great pleasure to visit with you for this short time, to pay my respects, to urge you to stay involved in your wonderful, I would say, heroic work.

Thank you all and may God bless you. (Applause.)

END 2:15 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Detroit, Michigan)

For Immediate Release March 13, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN ADDRESS TO THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF DETROIT

Grand Manor Ballroom
Fairlane Manor
Detroit, Michigan

12:50 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Please be seated, and thank you for that warm Michigan welcome. Governor Engler, my friend, thank you, sir, for that kind introduction, and my congratulations to you for trying to bring fiscal sanity to this wonderful state. And it's a great pleasure to be met by your Texas wife, Michelle, who's with us today. (Laughter.)

And also it's a great pleasure to see another old friend, a great leader of the state of Michigan, Lieutenant Governor Connie Binsfeld, who was out there at the airport, too. Thank you for being there. Mike Guido, the Mayor, is with us. I salute him. And one last thank-you to Jerry Warren, a former banker and now the miracle worker that can produce such a fantastic crowd on such short notice. (Applause.)

Now, Jerry, if you want to go into the banking business again -- (laughter) -- there may be an opening in Washington, DC, on Capitol Hill. I think this guy could do it. (Laughter and applause.)

It's a pleasure to be back before this outstanding group. And four short days from now, Michigan faces a choice, and you'll make a decision that will really shape the way this country copes with the big issues: the issues that shape the world and the values close to home. And I am talking about jobs, I'm talking about family, and I'm talking about world peace -- and for ourselves and also for our children.

Right now, the most important issue facing Michigan and this country is clearly the economy. It's my number one priority -- jobs. Manufacturing -- you know it perhaps better than most -- has been the greatest generator of good jobs in American history. Take a look at the auto industry. I'm speaking not simply about the jobs created in the industry itself but the thousands upon thousands of jobs in supplier and spin-off businesses. Manufacturing is and always will be a basic strength of this country's economy. No nation will ever lead the world without a strong manufacturing base.

Fifty years ago, this great state of Michigan earned the proud title of Arsenal of Democracy. Industries centered here had no peers and practically no competitors anywhere on the planet. And, yes, today things are different. Michigan's manufacturers are not just competing with a few outgunned adversaries. They are up against tough, hard-nosed competitors in practically every developed country.

Today, the new reality is simply this: If we want to succeed economically at home -- we have got to compete economically abroad.

All we seem to hear on the news is gloom and doom. But let's not overlook some of the fundamentals that prove that we are poised -- not there yet -- but poised for a national recovery. Interest rates are lower now than at any point in the past 10 years. The prime rate is now 6.5 percent. Inflation, most would agree, is under control. Monthly retail sales are up 1.3 percent in February -- on top of a 2.1 percent rise in January. And then you know the story on housing starts -- they're up 5.5 percent since December.

And for all our troubles, America is still the world's dominant economy -- the one market other countries want to crack; the economy producing goods in demand in every country, every corner of the world.

Right now, nationwide, we're in the midst of a record export boom -- one that's driven the trade deficit down 35 percent in the past year alone. And American exports have doubled -- doubled since 1985. Not only do we export more than any other country, but we've been gaining ground, not losing it, to our competitors.

And I fully realize this has not always been true for our auto industry, but these are fundamentals that we can build on -- the raw material, if you will, to manufacture the solid, strong recovery that I am confident we will see.

It looks different here in Detroit. Michigan's been through some extraordinarily tough times. And there's no sense pretending that things are better than they are. But there's also no sense underestimating our strengths and exaggerating our weaknesses. The simple fact is, we face a future with both challenges and opportunities.

In the past three years, the United States has helped bring about change that has reshaped our world for the better. We're the country that won the Cold War, that drew a line on the sand and drove a dictator out of Kuwait. And we are the country that made sacrifices for freedom in four corners of the world, and because we did, right here at home, our children are less fearful of the threat of nuclear war and they sleep much more safely.

And, yes, American leadership has changed the world -- and now what I want to do is use that same leadership to change America.

I don't think there's anyone in this room who doesn't believe that the key to America's economic future is our ability to lead -- to succeed in the world economically, as we have politically. And that's what my economic plan is all about.

Back in January, 45 days ago today -- 45 days ago -- I sent Congress a specific short-term action plan to stimulate this economy, to spark a recovery as early as this spring -- a recovery that would increase auto sales and create jobs. And when I sent that plan to Capitol Hill, I set a deadline.

One short week from now: March 20th -- almost two months from the day I challenged the Congress. And you know the story. Congress barely gave my plan a glance before they got busy on their own agenda: a $90 billion dollar tax increase that will threaten our recovery and cost us jobs. Any economist worth his salt will tell you the last thing this economy needs is a massive tax increase. And you can count on this: If the Democrats send me that plan, they can get ready for a veto the minute it hits my desk. I am not going to accept it. (Applause.)

I believe that my plan -- I'm convinced of it, and I've talked to lots of business people and lots of economists -- I am convinced my plan will make America more competitive. It includes

seven things that we've got to accomplish to ensure a strong market for America and for the automotive industry.

We've got to reduce government spending and draw the line against new taxes. Deficit spending dries up sources of savings the private sector must have to invest, to grow and to create new jobs. And there's only one protection the taxpayer has against uncontrolled, what we call discretionary spending in Washington -- those spending caps that we got enacted a year and a half ago. That's the only protection the taxpayer has.

And guess what? You're right. The Congress wants to get rid of those spending caps now and go back to the days of unchecked spending. And I am not going to let that happen. We've got enough votes to sustain a veto to see that that does not happen to the American taxpayer.

We've got to put an end to excessive government regulation. Our companies can't compete if the government chokes them off in red tape. And we've got to stop counterproductive regulations that cripple your freedom of action and cost this country jobs. So I've ordered a 90-day review of all new regulation with this aim in mind: Whatever contributes to economic growth goes forward, and whatever stifles growth gets scrapped.

We're at midpoint in that review. But even now, you can see results. The sheer volume of new rules and regulations is down to 25 a week, from six times that amount just a year ago. That's progress. Already we've announced regulatory relief to benefit sectors of our economy from biotech to energy. And we're looking now for creative, new ways to use regulations to clean up our environment, using market forces where possible.

Times have changed since the day nearly two decades ago when CAFE standards came into existence. And we now know that CAFE can cost a lot of jobs -- and even lives -- on the highway. And right now, through my Department of Transportation, I've been working with the auto industry and the UAW to fight irresponsible legislation. And I will not sign CAFE legislation that will destroy the auto industry and cost American jobs. (Applause.)

We will take several regulatory steps affecting the auto industry in the near future. There is one that I want to announce today. For some time, the EPA has been considering a requirement to order that all new cars be equipped with these on-board canisters to catch and contain fumes coming from the gas pump. As a result of our regulatory review, we have decided against such a rule. The Department of Transportation determined that on-board canisters pose a real risk to safety, a risk we simply cannot impose on American drivers.

If we want to make America more competitive, we've got to move forward on civil justice reform as well. Too many businesses can't start up or keep going because too many lawyers and too many lawsuits get in the way -- 18 million lawsuits every year alone. (Applause.) Right here in Detroit, there are businessmen and women ready to expand, ready to hire new workers -- stopped cold by the fear of litigation. All told, when you add in indirect expenses, lawsuits cost this economy $300 billion a year. And it's time for reform -- time to replace the explosion of mindless litigation with a little common sense. (Applause.)

I have called on the Congress to pass reform in this area. It's a crime when you have people that don't dare coach little league baseball because they're afraid they're going to get sued or doctors unwilling to deliver babies because they're afraid they're going to get some malicious malpractice suit filed against them. (Applause.)

I know the business people here would agree with this one -- but we've got to keep our nation on the cutting edge of new technologies. That's why I've proposed record federal funding for R&D -- research and development. (Applause.) It's why we back initiatives like one I signed at the White House last October, to create a battery consortium to pioneer a new generation of electric cars, And in the global competition, it's going to come down to this: The best way to master new markets is to make them.

And if we want to be more competitive, we have got to encourage investment. That's why I've called on Congress to pass my investment tax allowance -- speech up the front-end depreciation so people can buy capital equipment and write it off faster. And additionally, Congress ought to cut the tax on capital gains so we can compete with foreign interest. (Applause.)

But political demagogues call that a tax break for the rich. Let me tell you something, you know what it is in Japan and Germany? Zero percent and one percent. And we're up there in the stratosphere somewhere.

We have got to provide our children, in addition, with a 21st century education -- today. And we won't have a first-class economy with second-rate schools. To have the best economy, you have to have the best educated work force. And that's the idea behind our wonderful program known as America 2000 -- America 2000 strategy: our plan to revolutionize, to literally reinvent, America's schools.

And finally, we've got to work to open markets around the world to American goods. Earlier this year, some of the people here today went with me to Japan. And we all took a little grief, a little flak in the press for that trip. But the fact is, that trip laid down a marker. The business community is beginning to understand this. It signalled to our trade partners that I am very serious about free and fair trade. Level the playing field, and American workers and American business can compete with anyone. And we'll keep pushing to open markets that for too long have been closed to quality American goods.

We've already seen a payoff: new markets for America in Japan's computer, glass and paper market, all as a direct result of that trip. And American access to the Japanese government mainframe computer market alone could mean an additional $5.5 billion in computer sales.

And we've seen positive steps in the automotive industry as well -- not everything we want, but we've seen positive steps. Japan's auto industry intends to purchase an additional $10 billion worth of US auto parts by 1994.

And the benefits won't simply flow to the Big Three -- Detroit Center Tool reports that its sales in Japan will jump 500 percent this year alone to $30 million. And that trip was the beginning of an important process that we are going to continue -- opening markets around the world.

And that also means, in my view, a successful conclusion to the Uruguay Round of GATT Round. It's absolutely essential that we open markets, reduce these barriers.

So far today, I've talked about my plan -- my plan to get the economy growing again and to get this country ready for the challenges of a new century. So let me repeat, here's what I'll do, and give it to you straight: I will veto mandates that pass the buck to business and hurt competitiveness. I will veto job-destroying tax increases and fight for job-creating incentives. And I will fight to open markets around the world to American products. And I will fight against the forces of isolationism who want us to turn our back and run away from the future. (Applause.)

That's some of what I can do. And here's what you in the business community must do. But if we're going to work together to make America more competitive, you've got to continue your commitment to train and retrain your workers, give them the skills they'll need to cope with a changing workplace. And to help workers adjust to new economic conditions, government can help, too. For example, last week a Department of Labor task force was here with the representatives of the UAW and GM on just that issue.

Also, you've got to continue to build on recent progress that has labor and management working as allies, not adversaries. No company can compete when it is at war within itself. And you've got to fight for foreign markets -- make the commitment for the long haul.

I, a long time ago -- and I hate to bring it up in a room of successful business people, like the one that's here today -- but was in a business, started the small business. And I think I know what it's like. I do know what it's like to sweat to make a payroll, to run risks, to succeed and to overcome setbacks, too. And we all know how to measure performance. Performance is measured -- performance is measured by performance improved: people back at work, assembly lines up and running, putting out a superior product, and bringing in a profit.

I want to close today, before taking a couple of questions here, by saying, I know when I decided to come here I was going to a great city -- been here many times. I've been privileged to be your guest at the Economic Club several times. Going to a state that's experienced hard times. But I came here for that very reason: To look you in the eye, and to tell you what we are going to do to turn this economy around. And I have too much respect for the people in this room -- too much respect for the men and women who work the assembly lines -- to expect you to settle for anything short of the truth.

And, yes, we're in an election year. We're in a highly partisan, shrill, not overly pleasant, election year. And when the rhetoric heats up, it gets tough separating the fact from the fiction. Well, I can tell you this: All the quick-fix schemes in the world will not get us where we want to go. Some of them have wonderful political appeal, but they're not going to get us where we want to go. And the plan that I've laid out today will help America take on the toughest competition -- and win.

And so let's not wring our hands, try to run away from a challenge. We've never done that. Let's do what America always does when challenge comes our way: Let's change America for the better.

If we can install ourselves through action and principle as the undisputed leader of the free world, a leader with newfound credibility around the world, we can do the same thing here at home. So I ask you to join me in this challenge. Join me in supporting these objectives I have spelled out, and we can and will change America and help the lives of every single American worker and business person in this country.

Thank you very much. And may God bless our wonderful country. Thank you. (Applause.)

GOVERNOR ENGLER: Thank you very much, Mr. President, for that wonderful address and that economic plan for our country. And now we have some specific questions that have been submitted by members of the Detroit Economic Club and some special guests. The first one actually -- I'm sure that Chris McAllister from J.R. King Elementary School, who says "grade six" at the bottom of the card is not a member, but may be a guest here today.

And he asks a question that's on the minds of a lot of people: President Bush, why did you choose a Texas plant over Willow Run? (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: Let me take that question very seriously because -- and I am reluctant to make it this definitive. I was told today, I hadn't seen it because I don't read too much of what Senator Riegle says, but -- (laughter) -- I was told today -- (applause.) I'm very serious about this because this is a challenge to my integrity as President of the United States, and when it gets on that basis I take it seriously. And I was told by the Governor and I was told by a congressman that I was accused by that Senator of intervening in the GM process, the private sector process.

And I'm standing here to tell you with everything I can muster that I made no such intervention. And I take it as a direct attack on my character to have a United States Senator say that. It is a bald-faced lie. And Bob Stemple is right when he said it is. (Applause.)

That 6th-grader is on to something. (Laughter.)

GOVERNOR ENGLER: The UAW AFL-CIO is actively working against your reelection. With times as tough as they are right now, what chance do you see of winning the rank and file worker in a state like Michigan?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I saw the UAW seems to be supporting Jerry Brown. (Laughter.) That may not be accurate; I don't know. Look, one, there's time for politics; two, there's time for trying to lead this country. These are good people. Their families are hurting. Some have a job today, not sure they'll have it tomorrow. And so my answer to them is, I want to change this economy.

And I tried to spell out here today, and I hope some of them heard it, a program -- a seven-point incentive program, plus a broader program that will, indeed, get this economy moving now and stimulate it, and then we'll also be sure that we are competitive into the future.

So I would like to address myself -- I know that the unions early on decided they were going to support somebody else for president. But for me, this transcends a political endorsement or political opposition. We have got to get the economy moving. There's a lot of families that are hurting out there, and I think what I've proposed here today is the answer.

GOVERNOR ENGLER: As a businessman running a 60-employee family company I must run a tight ship in order to survive in a difficult economy. What can be done to see that our federal government begins now to reduce America's $2 trillion debt so we can enjoy a prosperous economy in the coming years?

That's from David Keller, and related to that is another card that has a question: What is the status of the line-item veto?

THE PRESIDENT: The debt is an enormous worry. And for those who live and die by polls, really for the first time, the deficit and debt is about number one -- I believe it is number one in the polls. What we're -- I'll give you an example of what we're trying to do with it. One, I'm going to try to keep the caps on discretionary domestic spending. Government is too big and it spends to much.

And right now I'm in a big fight in the Congress. The 1990 budget agreement did place caps on all discretionary spending. It did not touch the part of the budget that's growing the fastest -- the entitlements -- but it did put a cap on domestic spending. And

And so I do not accept the wisdom of some that says that a free trade agreement is going to result simply in an export of jobs. It is not going to do that. And I believe that we ought to keep pressing for it. I don't care what the politics of it are. I think it is best, and I want to do exactly the same thing this NAFTA, this North American Free Trade Agreement -- I want to do exactly the same thing with the successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round.

And Michigan has a lot of agriculture and I believe that if we are successful, we will be opening up all kinds of markets abroad for agriculture. I think we can do better in property rights.

And so we have two major initiatives in international trade. One is the NAFTA, which is mainly with Mexico and Canada, of course. And then I want to follow it with opening trade south of there. And secondly is the Uruguay Round.

And the other point I want to make on this hemisphere is this. We look at the changes that have taken place in the former Soviet Union. And we look at the changes that are taking place in Africa, for example, South Africa and Zambia. But sometimes we don't look into our own front yard, the exciting markets of Latin America. And there take a look at what's happened. Military dictatorships have given way to democracies. Communist regimes, a la Nicaragua, have given away to democracies. And there's only one holdout against democracy in this hemisphere really, except for the problems in Haiti -- it's Cuba. It is Cuba. And democracy is on the move.

And what I want to do is help find ways to strengthen those economies so they can be not only perfecting their democracies, but be better markets for American goods and services. And it is an exciting message down there. We are doing a first-class job on working with these Latin American, South American countries. And we ought not to neglect it.

And while saying neglect, let me add this point -- too long an answer to a very simple question -- but it has been suggested that I turn my attention away from national security matters and foreign affairs. I don't think a president should do that. I think it's important to find the right balance between doing something for the domestic economy but recognizing that it's only the United States of America that can lead this free world. And I am not going to neglect my responsibilities overseas, but I darn sure am going to pay as much attention as it requires to get this economy moving. (Applause.)

GOVERNOR ENGLER: This is another question from a youngster -- Calvin Paines, I believe the name is, from J.R. King School in Detroit: Will their be jobs for black children in the future?

THE PRESIDENT: I hope there will and I think there will. And one of the reasons I'm so excited about America 2000 in which many of the business people I see sitting in this room are already assisting, is that our education program will result in just that kind of opportunity. I met with some people from the National League of Cities, and one of the things that concerned this -- this is a little addition to this guy's question -- they told me -- the mayors from big cities, small cities, Democrats, Republicans, liberal, conservative -- the thing that concerns us the most about the urban problems is the decline in the American family.

And the way -- we have appointed a commission led by Governor Ashcroft and former Mayor Strauss of Dallas to figure out what we can do, what legislation is diminishing the family. And underlying it all is the need for more education. And so I would say to this 6th-grader, I think you've got a whale of an opportunity.

And let me say this also: I have been disturbed by kind of an ugliness out there. When things get tough, one person losses his job to another, people are uncertain about the future, they've lost confidence in the country maybe in the President, certainly in the Congress I think, too. But, nevertheless, when that happens somehow an ugliness crops up. And let me say this: Let's leave this politics aside. Bigotry and discrimination and anti-Semitism have absolutely no place in America. And I'm going to continue to stand up for that principle. (Applause.)

GOVERNOR ENGLER: I have in my hands the last question. I was going to ask this one first, but it's unsigned. It starts out, Governor John Engler has done a heroic job -- (laughter) -- and it goes on. It could stop there but, no. Governor John Engler's done a heroic job working to stimulate growth in Michigan's economy by sponsoring the cut-in-cap plan for property tax relief. What can be done at the federal level that would have similar impact to Michigan's cut-in-cap?

And that will be the last question, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, give me another one because I think I answered it -- I hope I answered it in my remarks. And so it's not fair to take you over that turf again, so I'll take one more.

I believe the best thing we can do is to incentivize this economy. Control the government spending as best one can -- that means sometimes vetoing legislation -- lighten up on the regulatory front; and then, in a longer vein, more, better education. And I think that's the broad answer to this economy.

But give me one more because that's not fair. Maybe it's not --

GOVERNOR ENGLER: I just liked the question a lot. (Laughter.) We'll get to one more here.

THE PRESIDENT: What about the one that says Engler's screwing it up, we're not going to -- (laughter.)

GOVERNOR ENGLER: Passed over that one right away. (Laughter.)

We'll end on a political question here. (Laughter.) Assuming you will be nominated, overall, do you think Pat Buchanan's campaign efforts will hurt the Republican Party chances in November?

THE PRESIDENT: My answer to that question is, no. I am going to continue to try to run what I hope has been a high-level campaign. And I'm going to try to keep focusing on the issues. I'll say this, because it's not easy to find a balance in a competitive election year between how much time you devote to the campaign trail, how much time you spend in the Oval Office trying to help people and trying to solve the problems of this country.

Last week on Super Tuesday, we had eight states. And I felt I should at least make an appearance in each of the eight states so it didn't look like I was taking something for granted, turning my back on the people whose votes were very, very important in those states. And so I went to one and I think some drew the conclusion from that, that was a little frenetic.

Super Tuesday was very, very good to me. And we will now have our primary here and in Illinois on Tuesday. I think that we've found the right balance. I think in terms of a primary challenge, the thing I must do is not get after the opponent -- let him chart his course, make up his decision on what to do -- and let me now spend much more time -- Super Tuesday out the way; Michigan

and Illinois by Tuesday -- in trying to get these things done that I have outlined here.

And then we're going to be interacting overseas. Of course, Yeltsin's coming here; Helmut Kohl, I think, will be here next weekend. And there's a lot of things of this nature that I must attend to.

And so I can't fault somebody for challenging me. I feel very, very confident about winning this primary. But I think now I've got the proper balance as to how much -- and it wouldn't help a bit to try to assess for you the opposition. That's what the elections are about.

But I know these are nonpolitical gatherings, but if you're a Republican, please vote for me on Tuesday. (Laughter.)

Thank you very much.

END 1:30 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release March 10, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND DINNER

State Floor

7:30 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Well, welcome. Barbara and I are just thrilled to welcome all of you to the White House. And this will be short, because I remember Billy Graham's famous story he tells at the crusade about the speaker that went on and on. The guy sitting next to him picked up the gavel, threw it at the speaker -- missed, hit the woman next to him. And the woman, said, "Hit me again; I can still hear him." (Laughter.)

We're not here for all of this. Also, you'll forgive me if I'm a little nervous, it's a big election night out there. So if you see these little slips of paper coming in, forgive me.

Now, first let me thank Bill Gray and Andrea. And I've tried it both ways -- of being on the opposite side from this guy when he was in the Congress and being on the same side with him now that he's running the United Negro College Fund. And I like it better this way -- he was tough, strong and able. (Laughter and applause.)

To those of you who have benefited the United Negro College Fund and you don't know Bill Gray, you've got a wonderful leader. You've got a man of principle, a man of faith. And we are very fortunate to have him. I say "we" because I consider myself a part of this family, and so does Barbara.

I will say a word about Walter Annenberg in a minute because he has a very special role in all of this. I want to salute members of the Cabinet that are here -- Dick Cheney, Lou Sullivan, Jack Kemp; and our newest member, the Secretary of Transportation, Andy Card.

And I also want to thank Joe Williams, the outgoing chairman, for what he's done for this organization. And unless it smacks of a little too much family, I'd like to single out the incoming chairman, my brother, John. (Applause.) I think having the United Negro College Fund to a dinner in the White House is perhaps long overdue. And my arm is just twisted out of the sockets, but now it's back and all is well.

Let me just mention some good news for the UNCF. Together, a goal was set for Campaign 2000 of $250 million. And to get this campaign off to a fast start -- and now I get to Walter Annenberg, who does so much for so many -- the Annenberg Foundation made a $50-million challenge grant. And since the kickoff, donations large and small have poured in. And I'm delighted to note this evening that we're about halfway there -- $125 million raised so far. (Applause.)

And I look around this room and I see so many from corporate America -- points of light, all -- who were asked day in and day out to support worthy causes, who respond overwhelmingly but have come through for the United Negro College Fund in a profound and

wonderful way. And many of America's most successful corporations and business leaders are in this room with us tonight.

I've known many of you for more years than many of us care to count. And let me say to all of you what I've said to many in private conversations. Barbara and I really believe in the United Negro College Fund and we want to help in any way we can. And that goes for two that aren't with us tonight: the Secretary of Education, Lamar Alexander; and his able assistant, so well-known to many here, David Kearns, who is the Deputy at the Department of Energy. They believe in this, they want to support it, and so we've got a good team who believe in the work here.

The guiding mission of the Fund has not changed since the days when Barbara and I first came to the cause in '47, under the leadership then of a guy named Bill Trent, that some of you may know, now living in retirement in Greenville, North Carolina, I believe. But when so many despair about a bleak future, this organization gives tomorrow's great minds room to grow. And when so many repeat the all-too-familiar litany of crime and drugs and violence that does concern us all, the UNCF answers with education and opportunity and freedom for all.

So let me say tonight, may the noble aims of this organization guide this nation always. And once again, may I thank all of you for your support and for joining us here this special evening. And now may I ask Bill Gray, the only other and the final speaker to come up and just say a word in his defense.

Thank you all very, very much. (Applause.)

END 7:40 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release April 24, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN TELECONFERENCE WITH THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HISPANIC JOURNALISTS
IN ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

2:34 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Monica. And first, let me thank your President, Don Flores, for this opportunity to speak with you. May I salute the hundreds of Hispanic women and men who inform and enliven our great country through the press and through the broadcast media. I look forward to answering your questions.

A top priority of my presidency is to consolidate the peaceful revolution that's taken place in Latin America over the past decade -- the movement towards democracy and free markets. And yesterday I heard a solid endorsement of those goals in a meeting with hundreds of business and civic leaders and government leaders from around our hemisphere.

Democratic neighbors are peaceful neighbors. Experience teaches us that. And I am determined to keep working to promote and protect democracy in Latin America.

Recently, we've been working closely with our partners in the hemisphere to defend democracy under attack in Venezuela, Haiti, and Peru. In Cuba we envision a new birth of freedom and democracy, and that day cannot be far off. I expect one day soon, after the inevitable fall of the Castro dictatorship, to be the first President of the United States to visit the free soil of Cuba.

Also vital is liberating the markets of the Western Hemisphere. I want to create a North American free trade area to increase the levels of trade, investment and jobs in Mexico, Canada, and the United States of America. And I am thankful for the support from the Hispanic community that helped us win our great victory for fast track authority.

Some politicians don't share our views on the value of free trade. They want to address this issue from both sides of their mouths, and they suggest that we can hide in a cocoon of protection and still benefit from the fresh air of competition. Well, that is simply not possible. And you can pander to the protectionists, or you can promote free trade. You cannot have it both ways.

I will fight to tear down economic barriers with Mexico and throughout the hemisphere, and I'll oppose any special interest that tries to stand in our way.

And one other thing: We must not let election-year politics delay for one minute our getting a good free trade agreement and getting it approved. The North American Free Trade Agreement will increase our trade with Mexico and create thousands more jobs right here in the United States of America. And I'll keep working with my good friend, President Carlos Salinas, who is a bold and imaginative leader. Already, in just three years, I believe we've made U.S.-Mexican relations the best that they have ever been in history. And we're going to keep working to forge a new relationship

between our nations, based on free trade, open markets and mutual respect.

And we will not stop with Mexico. My Enterprise for the Americas Initiative will encourage open trade and job-creating investment from Alaska to Argentina.

The interests we share do not end with free trade. I'm committed to action on a full range of key reforms, and I want to mention just two of urgent interest to the Hispanic community.

On health care, I have put forward a comprehensive plan to open to all Americans access -- access to quality health care. And I'm also proud of my administration, as part of the public-private initiative called "Growing Up Hispanic," to improve the quality of health in your communities.

And on the vital matter of education, Hispanic support for America 2000 has been steady and strong. And I want to see every American family win the right to choose which school is best for their children -- public, private and religious.

But even the most ambitious reform effort here at home must go hand-in-hand with economic growth through open trade. And I've asked Congress repeatedly for funds to assist the brave reformers who are now leading many of the Latin American nations.

But Congress has done nothing. We must not stand for this lack of foresight. And if we can aid the transformation of the former Soviet Union -- and in my view, we must do that -- we can and we must also help our closest neighbors who are trying to consolidate their own revolution for freedom and prosperity.

And there are many, many other issues. But let me just say to you today before taking your questions, as I think of the Hispanic community in this country, I think of family. I think of family values. And Barbara and I are, I hope you know by now, dedicated to that concept. And every piece of legislation that comes my way, we're looking at it to see that it does nothing but strengthen the American family. That's one of the reasons I feel so strongly about choice that I just mentioned for education. We must strengthen the family values. And I will do my level best to do just that.

And now on to the questions. Fire away. And thank you so much for letting me drop in on you.

Q Why did your pro-statehood for Puerto Rico effort fail in Congress last year? What will you do about it if reelected?

THE PRESIDENT: I have remained strongly in favor of pro-statehood. And the first step on that is a referendum. And we are having great difficulty getting that approved by the United States Congress -- the part that has to be approved by Congress.

As you know, there's great divisions. It's divided in Puerto Rico by those who favor statehood, those who favor commonwealth, and then a tiny group of those who favor independence. That group has heretofore been considered one of the most radical groups.

My choice is for statehood. But I also say that the matter should be left up to the people of Puerto Rico. And so we will continue to push in a reluctant Congress to get them to come along and support Bob Lagomarsino's approach to support a referendum that will make the determination. And then we'd have to follow on with whatever is required after that.

But I have not changed my position. And I wish, Monica, I could tell you that this is the only area where I'm having difficulty with the Congress, but it's not. But I haven't lessened my intentions at all in favor of statehood for Puerto Rico.

I know you could get in a lively debate right out there at your meeting. But I think it's best, I think it's right. And I believe it's in the best interest of all Americans, all the members of -- all the people in the United States right now, citizens herein. So we'll keep trying.

Q Judges appointed by you and Ronald Reagan are more and more limiting access to fair treatment of U.S. Hispanics in such areas as voting rights, employment, housing and education. If reelected, would you change your emphasis on conservative philosophy and appoint more persons to the bench who understand the realities of inequality faced by poor people of color?

THE PRESIDENT: I think that people that I've appointed to the bench understand -- both the district bench, the circuit bench and the Supreme Court -- understand that. But I don't want people to legislate from the bench. Now, if the person that asked this question feels that we need judges that are going to set social policy from the bench, then we just have a philosophical difference. I have appointed people that care. And I have appointed people that I think are compassionate. And I have appointed people that I am confident will interpret the Constitution and not legislate from the bench. So I do not plead guilty to the charges in that question at all.

I think the way that you better the lot of all people is to have them have equal access, fair access to the law. And the people that I've appointed certainly agree with that concept.

So we'll continue to do this. We've got some fine Hispanic appointments -- and others -- to the various levels of the federal bench. But I am not going to change my view that what we need are people that know the Constitution and interpret it, and do not go into a bunch of social legislation from the federal bench. That is not what is required in my view of an independent judiciary.

Q Many people feel the 1st Amendment was violated with severe press restrictions imposed during the war. In subsequent conflicts will your administration continue with the limitations imposed on the media during Desert Storm, or will we be allowed to do our jobs?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you're allowed to do your job. After Desert Storm a review was taken. I do not believe that the constitutional rights of the press were violated in Desert Storm. And if you remember, one journalist who didn't play by the rules was kidnapped and taken prisoner, and we spent a great deal of time and an awful lot of anxiety in trying to help get that person released from jail because he didn't follow the guidelines of the military. And when you're in a war every correspondent does not have the -- should not have the freedom to go anyplace they want at any time. And that example proved it.

But I do think you're on to something because I think, as each incident of this nature takes place -- and let's hope there won't be another one for a long time -- we ought to review it. We ought to see if there's ways that we can guarantee more access for journalists to the front lines, or more access of journalists to the briefers, or whatever it is. So I don't think rights were violated. I do think we can learn from the Desert War pooling experience and from the Desert War coverage -- Desert Storm coverage -- and see if we can't do a better job on access for journalists.

Q President Bush, on behalf of the National Association of Hispanic Journalists we thank you for your time today.

THE PRESIDENT: Monica, thank you very, very much. And good luck to you out there. And we are -- I am one who, as you may know from my own family, is doubly blessed in a sense because of having three Hispanic American grandchildren. And so I hope I've been sensitive to your needs and to the things that bring you together. But I can guarantee you this, I'm going to keep on trying.

And when I talk of -- think about patriotism and service to country I know what I'm talking about when I say Hispanics have been in the forefront of that. And when I think about family values I know what I'm talking about when I say the Hispanic American families epitomize, more than most, the family values that Barbara and I, at least, hold so dear.

So I'll keep on trying, trying to do my best. And I might say in conclusion -- you don't need to hear me twice now -- but I might say in conclusion that the economic news is a little better. And as that turns around -- and I'm confident it will -- I think we'll see this country coming together; I think we'll see a return to a little more optimism. And certainly, I will keep dedicated and rededicating our administration to fair play for our Hispanic American citizens.

So thank you and thanks for letting me drop in. And good luck to each and every one of you. Thank you. (Applause.)

END 2:46 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release April 23, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AND JAPANESE AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES TAKAKAZU KURIYAMA

The Roosevelt Room

11:49 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: May I thank Ambassador Kuriyama for being here with us today -- Japan's Ambassador to the United States -- and also, Mike Moskow up here. Everybody knows him and we're grateful to him for his participation in all of this.

Today does mark a milestone for both the United States and Japan -- a ceremony representing another step toward our two countries becoming equal partners in trade. The agreement I sign today is an important, positive development, stemming from our January trip to Japan.

And I am pleased that, since January, American companies have begun to enjoy a more positive atmosphere for doing business in Japan. The broader commitment, which Prime Minister Miyazawa and I made during my visit, was the Tokyo Declaration. And an important part that was the Global Partnership Plan of Action, an agreement to strengthen trade between our two countries -- all part of our efforts to make the relationship between us a true partnership. This is a very important relationship. And that all will ensure that U.S. firms have the same degree of access to the Japanese market that Japanese firms enjoy in the United States.

The Paper Market Access Agreement will increase opportunities and sales for foreign firms exporting paper products into Japan. And hereafter, the government of Japan will encourage its paper distributors, converters, printers and major corporate users to increase imports of competitive foreign paper products. That official encouragement will open the way for America's paper industry to export its products into Japan's $27-billion market.

Today's action is good for all concerned -- good for the Japanese consumer, good for American industry, and good for the American worker. And it is also an important step forward in our large global trading system.

As William McKinley said back in 1897, "Good trade ensures goodwill." And the partnership between the United States of America and Japan ensures that the hallmark of the new globalization of trade will be world-class quality, competitive pricing and, of course, excellent service.

This alliance also recognizes that interactive partnerships like this one strengthen each of us and fire up the engine of economic growth. At the same time, it strengthens the relationship between us and makes the world a better, friendlier place for our children and grandchildren.

So I am delighted to be here. And I welcome all of you from industry and from the diplomatic corridors. And let me just say in conclusion, I view this relationship between the U.S. and Japan as very, very important. And I will do my level best as President of the United States to keep it on a stable, forward-looking basis. It is essential and it is in our best interest that it remain strong.

MORE

So, Mr. Ambassador, you are entitled to equal time, or should we -- why don't you go ahead, and then --

AMBASSADOR: Well, thank you very much, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you for being with us, sir.

AMBASSADOR KURIYAMA: Well, Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I am most pleased to be here to witness the first concrete result of our joint efforts on the common agenda, which is included in what we call the Action Plan of the Tokyo Declaration, which was issued as you, Mr. President, mentioned during your visit to Tokyo in January.

The measures to increase market access in Japan for foreign paper producers are the fruit of rather intensive consultations undertaken by officials of the two governments. And I would like to pay my deepest respect for those who put so much time and efforts in bringing about this document which Ambassador Moskow and I are about to sign. And my personal tribute goes to Mr. Ambassador Moskow and your colleagues who have made very important contributions to the further strengthening of our economic relations.

Mr. President, you may be rest assured that the Japanese government will implement in good faith the measures which are contained in this document. And I'm confident that this will be fully reciprocated by the American side as well. And with such mutual efforts, which include the efforts by the industries in the respective countries, will help us realize the objective of this document, which is to achieve a substantial increase in the market access in Japan for foreign paper producers; which in turn, undoubtedly, will contribute to further strengthening our mutually profitable trade relations, which is an important component of our partnership.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, sir, very much. Now I will witness if you all do the signing. (Laughter.)

(The agreement is signed.)

THE PRESIDENT: The deed is done. Thank you all very much. (Applause.)

END 11:55 A.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release July 20, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE AMERICAN LEGION BOYS NATION

The Rose Garden

9:32 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thanks for the welcome. (Applause.) Hey, listen, I came out here to welcome you guys to the White House. (Applause.) Well, thank you very much. And please be seated and let's get underway here. But I want to salute the National Commander of the American Legion, who's done a great job, Dom DiFrancesco, and an old friend. I am a legionnaire and have been for a long, long time -- lifetime member. And I have great respect for what Dom and Bob Turner, the past National Commander who is with us today, and also now the Assistant Director for Activities for Boys Nation do.

The Legion does a lot of good works, and I can't think of any of them that's better than what brings us here today. So let me first congratulate all 96 of the outstanding young leaders here today, representing 48 states. And I understand that some of you come from as far away as Anchorage up in Alaska, and as near as Falls Church across the river.

And Reagan DeMas, you absolutely have to tell me what life is like in a place called Boring, Oregon. (Laughter.) Where is he? We'll talk about that.

But anyway, for two of you, the journey has taken you even further -- all the way from communist Vietnam. And what a moving story is Won Lee's, Nhon Trong Nguyen. They have a great story to tell, leaving culture and country behind to start over, to start afresh here in the United States of America. And your presence here today reminds us all of America's meaning, of America's magic.

And we all know that Boys Nation's alumni often go on to do remarkable things. And it's no secret that two of America's great political leaders got their start in this organization, and I'm talking about a former governor, now our Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander; and I'm talking about a former congressman, now our very able Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney.

And I've held Boys Nation in high regard for many years. I remember -- maybe Dom does -- as Vice President about 10 years ago, I had the honor of greeting some of your predecessors right here in Washington. Many of you were young then, six or seven years old. But it's good to see that our younger generation continues to come forward with what the whole country sees as model citizens. And you've reason to be proud of your accomplishments. And I hope that you're going to continue to achieve great things for our country.

Right now the country is focusing on some big questions -- how America can compete and win in the global economy; how we'll educate our citizens and do it better, do it different, but educate our citizens for a new century; and how we'll open opportunity to all Americans and then preserve one nation under God. Big issues, every one of them. And we've got to realize that the solution for every one of these challenges literally starts close to home.

The question is this -- and I've heard this from the mayors of urban America; I've heard it from everyone -- can we stop the assault on the American family? Can we strengthen the family, help parents pass on the moral code and character that goes with it, and sustain us as a nation? And so today, when you're focusing on college and career, let me share a little advice from someone whose next experience with the teens won't come until I actually hold in my arms my 13th grandchild.

What will matter years from now won't be what you achieve, or how much you earn, or even what honors are showered on you along the way. What matters will be the kind of parent you've been, the kind of kids that you've raised. And it all comes down to family. And so today I want to salute the mothers and fathers who aren't here, every parent back home bursting with pride in you just because you're here, what you've achieved.

And I also understand that while you're here in Washington you're going to be participating in your mock congress. I won't touch that one. (Laughter and applause.) But whether you end up in congress or in front of the classroom as leaders in business, your efforts and your skills will be absolutely vital to our country's continued success.

George Washington once challenged us to raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. And as a nation, our crusade is this: We must continue to defend our nation's liberty and interest, and we must continually seek solutions to our country's ills, to refine this great democracy our forefathers created.

So let me urge you, maintain your commitment to our country. Find ways to serve your neighbors and solve the problems of your communities. It cannot be done entirely from Washington, D.C. Continue to spread the word about the benefits of our great system of democratic capitalism, and keep your eye on the greatest prize of all -- ensuring that our country remains out there on the cutting edge, that America continues to be the example the whole world holds in awe. And believe me, the whole world still holds us in awe.

America is now and always will be the one nation that the entire world looks to for leadership. And America is now and always will be a country whose purpose and values, whose global mission and economic success continues to be the success story of our time. And it's no secret why that's so. Throughout our history individuals, achievers, people just like you, have made it so.

America is now and always will be a rising nation. And we'll remain strong. We will succeed as long as young people like yourselves continue to support and advance the values upon which our success is based -- and really, upon which this wonderful program, Dom, is based.

So keep up the great work. Congratulations on what you have already achieved. But there's a great challenge lying out there ahead of each and every one of you. So good luck and may God bless you all, and may God bless our wonderful country. (Applause.)

Now, what I thought I do is take a few questions and then go -- how we're going to do this -- I never saw so many hands up.

Shoot.

Q Mr. President, was the primary reason that you vetoed the motor voter bill the fact that it would increase the number of poor and young voters, groups in which you have little strength? If not, can we have a brief explanation?

THE PRESIDENT: That had nothing to do with the veto of the bill. States have the right to set their own registration, everybody has a way to register. It has nothing to do with the poor and the young. Frankly, I think we're going to do very well with the young and, hopefully, with the poor. What it has to do, though, is with guarding against corruption of the voting process, and that's why I vetoed it.

Q Mr. President, my question to you is, throughout your term previous to the Rodney King verdict and the L.A. riots in particular, your support for Secretary Jack Kemp's programs in the areas of housing and urban development appeared to come very reluctantly. Yet you approved generous emergency expenditures to help provide relief in a desperate situation at hand. If elected to a second term, do you plan to increase government funding for the HUD programs?

THE PRESIDENT: The answer is, no, but the answer is I've been diligently for the program. The program is mine. I'm the President; I set the program. Kemp has been a superb advocate for homeownership, for enterprise zones, for the things that we believe really would have helped avoid some of the crisis in the cities. So I have been advocating it and supporting it and introducing it in the Congress all along.

Even after the riots we had the Mayor of Los Angeles here, Tom Bradley; the Governor of the state; Peter Uberroth, who is trying to bring jobs into the center city -- they all supported strongly the enterprise zones. And it took weeks to get that passed even in the face of the riots.

So, now, in terms of will I increase spending, I can't pledge that. I don't want to be in any false colors. I want these programs there to bring jobs in the private sectors into the city. I want our Weed and Seed program, which is weeding out the criminal elements and then seeding the areas with hope and opportunity, to pass. But there's another big problem facing this country and it is the deficit. And I know that this is the year when everybody promises, I'm going to do this for that, each little interest group, each big interest group being pledged and promised to, but I can't do that because I am determined to fight to get this deficit down.

So we've got good programs and I think they'd make an enormous difference in the cities and I hope you all can support them.

Q The economic plan that Bill Clinton unveiled at the Democratic National Convention last week is rapidly gaining support. What flaws do you see in his plan as you compare it to your own?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I don't think it's rapidly gaining too much support. What I see is a program that does not address itself to the deficit -- and I'll have a lot more to say about that later on. I think we've got to get the deficit down. I don't think you need to go raise taxes on people right now, I think that's a big mistake. I think it's counterproductive. And when you analyze the program, they have this expression around here, smoke and mirrors. You going to save it all by eliminating overhead, eliminating waste, and there's billions of dollars that is earmarked to do that, and I just don't think that's practical.

So when the campaign comes on there's going to be a very serious comparative analysis on our part. I don't think the program is gaining strength. He had one that was quite different a few months ago and now, just in time for the convention, out comes another one. But both of them result in taxing.

You see, I think the government is spending too much and that's why I had to answer this question here like that and I don't think people are taxed too little, I don't think that's the problem. And so we're going to have a big difference on the economic approach. And our economic incentives are out there, they're strong and they're good.

Q Regarding the United States and Mexico free trade agreement, don't you think that if it was passed that the standard of living in the Southwest United States will drop and it would also result in more unemployment? Also, what are the short and long-term goals you hope to achieve by having this free trade agreement?

THE PRESIDENT: I'm convinced that NAFTA is -- the North American Free Trade Agreement -- will increase the standard of living on both sides of the border. I am absolutely convinced that it will increase jobs for Americans. Look at what happened when we entered into the deal with Canada. Business is way up in both ways, trade going both ways. The same thing will happen in Mexico. And I am afraid that in the Mexican case there is some -- in some of the opposition there is some discrimination against our southern neighbor.

And I don't care whether it's good politics or bad politics, I'm going to work for free trade. I want to see the NAFTA agreement passed, and I am absolutely convinced that it will mean more jobs for Americans, and good jobs. The argument is, well, all the companies will flee to Mexico. That's not true, they could do that now. And there are many reasons that companies place investment where they do.

NAFTA is only going to increase Mexico's ability to import goods. It's going to increase their standard of living, which will bring relief to our borders out near San Diego where you have immigration going across the way. It will give them the wherewithal to have better environmental standards, and it will give more jobs to the United States because our exports, which have already gone up substantially, will go up more.

So I'm for free trade. I'm not for protection. I'm not for promising one thing out in Detroit and then trying to deny that it was said some other part of the country.

Q Mr. President, I would like to ask you with regard to education, do you think that a national standard achievement test at the lower grade levels would be a good way to gauge how well our education system is doing?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, and part of our program feels that a national system of volunteer testing would be good. That's part of our proposal. I emphasize the word volunteer because I still believe that your community should really control the curriculum and the hours and the teacher's pay and whatever it is.

Most people forget that about six percent, I believe it is, of funding on education is at the federal level, our level, and 90-some percent is where it belongs at the local and state level.

But this concept of testing is a good one. And I think kids need to know where they stand with others across the country; parents have the right to have that information. But I emphasize it should be on a voluntary basis.

Let's get in the back rows, back here. Oh, the man's bringing gifts -- yes, come right up. (Laughter.) (A gift is presented.)

Q I'd like to present this to you on behalf of Boys Nation. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Thanks a lot. Now we're talking. This is great. Thank you very much, Steve.

Q Mr. President, I'm a student of the middle class, and there's an ever-increasing problem with the students that I represent that we simply do not have the funds to attend the colleges of our choices to take the leadership roles in government. What can you tell the students of the middle class to affirm the fact that you are taking a lead, that the buck does stop here and you're taking a leadership position in our plight to have affordable college education?

THE PRESIDENT: I can tell them that the best thing that we can do there is to get the whole economic system moving. I can tell them we've increased funding for that kind of student loan program. And we've just got to keep doing it to support those that need scholarships. A big problem is, when you're operating at these enormous deficits, you can't go out and promise to increase spending beyond which we've already increased it. I'm the guy that has the plan. The buck does stop here. We have increased programs for the funding for student loans, contrary to some of the political -- I can't wait for this campaign to start to go after some of the things I'm hearing out there. But we've just got to keep going on it. And we will do our very best.

Way in back here. Yes.

Q Mr. President, I'd just like to commend you on your fine foreign policy. But the question I pose to you is this: Do you feel that the only way we can have a strong foreign policy is pumping the billions of dollars that we do into other countries economy? Being a visitor to Washington, D.C., we took a bus ride and we drove through the Capitol City and I saw some of the most depressed and poverty-stricken areas I've ever seen. Why can't we bring some of that foreign policy money home to where it belongs in our nation? (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I'll tell you, maybe you've missed the fact that we've cut the defense budget substantially. We can't cut the muscle of defense. We're not going to do that. What we -- I stood here with Boris Yeltsin and did something that affected the lives of everybody here -- everybody here. We worked out the most historic nuclear arms reduction package that's ever happened, thus reducing the fear of nuclear war that some of you guys may have grown up with when you were younger. The pressure has been bled off.

We have to keep a strong defense. We have cut the defense budget by billions of dollars, and we'll continue to look at it as the world changes. But we can't cut into the muscle of it.

Secondly, in terms of foreign aid, it's always been unpopular. There's always a guy that says, don't do that abroad, do it all at home. And that's a mood out there in this country. But it is in our interests -- humanitarian interest -- to help people abroad. It's the United States that always has taken the lead. And as long as I'm President, we'll continue to take the lead. But we are going to have to try to do these things that will forestall our need to use military action.

And that's the reason, rationale, for it. But listen, I understand the desire to have more at home, and yet, again, I'm not going to be in this -- please everybody by saying we're going to increase spending on one program or another. We've got a good budget. Spending has gone dramatically up. But we've got to hold the line on it now. We've got to get the deficit down.

Q Mr. President, I was wondering, isn't it disheartening that all of your actions are either maligned, belittled, or ignored by the national media?

THE PRESIDENT: Now we're talking here. (Applause.) Those back here are not smiling, those beyond those with the red and white shirts. Look, you've got to take it in life. Nobody ever said it would be a bed of roses. I found that over the years in politics or in business or whatever it is.

And I have a very quiet confidence when I take my case to the American people that things will work out. But to be very honest, it's not pleasant. It's not pleasant. The one I don't like the most is when they go after your family, try to make corruption out of a family that's been honorable and decent. I don't like it when they do that kind of thing.

But they've got their job to do; I've got mine to do. And I'm not going to be stampeded into anything by a lot of that kind of press. When we get into the campaign, I will try to draw the distinctions between myself and the opponents. I'll try to put out the positive aspects of our record: the war on crime; the fact that we've got a sound, revolutionary education program; what we're trying to do, in answer to your question, about bringing homeownership and hope into the cities; the fact that we've got the best health care reform of anybody up there, sitting right there, languishing, and the fact that we've got a program that if we could only get this Congress to work on it would do something for health care.

So we've got the programs. Now, the fact that that's not resonating and the press seems to be critical, that changes. I go back to '88 and I remember a great reporter for The New York Times -- I don't know what he's doing now, but I think he's gone onto great things -- saying, "dogged by Iran-Contra, the President landed in Iowa today." They've always got some kind of sensationalist thing.

But the facts are the programs are sound. I hope that I will pass the test of commitment to country. I am proud, as I told Dom earlier, of having served my country. I believe that what we've accomplished around the world is substantial, major, the ending of the Cold War. I think what we did with Yeltsin, getting rid of these ICBMs, I happen to think it's big, and you don't read a darn thing about it in the press.

I didn't listen -- I've got to confess to you guys, I did not listen to the Democratic National Convention. I was fishing. (Applause.) I suppose I could have turned on a radio, but I just didn't feel inclined to do it. But there was no mention, I am told retrospectively, of the major accomplishments that the American people and this administration has made in bringing peace to the world and standing up against aggression in the process, setting an example. So when I said in my remarks, people look to the United States for leadership, they do, but that has no resonance. I think it will. I think every family in America in their hearts know that we are in a less-threatened position.

And I loved it when I'm told that my opponent, one of them I guess, at the convention said, well we've changed the world now let's change America. Hey, a Democratic candidate dropped out of the race for plagiarism last year -- this is a comment that I've been saying. And now we're trying to get it done. We have changed the world, now let's change America. Use that same leadership.

And parenthetically, if you want to know what I think really needs to be changed it is the control of the House of Representatives. (Applause.) We have had the same control of Congress, same control in the House since 1956, maybe earlier. And they talk about institutions changing, presidents have changed,

different parties, the Senate has changed. And the one institution, those who know how to run the bank and the post office up there, haven't changed for 36 years. And we are going to take that case to the American people. (Applause.)

Q My question to you concerns us as young Americans. When we get out of college and university, how are we going to be assured as qualified Americans that there will be jobs for us to pursue our careers as citizens?

THE PRESIDENT: One, the economy is improving. Not near enough. It is growing. You wouldn't hear that -- I keep citing a statistic that 92 percent of the economic news has been negative as you analyze it. They've got this group that analyzes the new coverage. A tremendous percentage, 60 percent, think the economy's getting worse. A lot of people are hurting, but the overall national economy is growing -- not near enough.

What I want to do is stimulate it to grow more. And that was what was behind and still remains behind an incentive program that encourages buying homes; that encourages getting the deficit down; that encourages changing the -- this is technical -- but the IRA rules; that encourages an investment tax allowance to stimulate the investment in equipment that actually brings jobs. So jobs are being created, not fast enough.

And if our program -- if I can get the American people to give the strong support in Congress for the economic program, I believe that's the best guarantee of jobs for people. It is not going to be government-created jobs -- by the government getting into the private sector. I oppose that. And this idea of an industrial policy where the government should pick the winners and losers is wrong. What we ought to do is increase the R&D credits so you stimulate the research that has made this country a job-creating country.

So that's the program that I'll be taking to the American people.

Q Being that AIDS cases -- being so epidemic, do you have any national plans to inform the public and get the AIDS cases down so it doesn't keep rising?

THE PRESIDENT: The question is on AIDS cases being so epidemic. Absolutely. We're spending about $4.9 billion -- we asked for $4.9 billion. We've been spending at the rate of about $4.3 billion on AIDS. That's about 10 times as much as on, say, cancer, per case. We have got to educate the American people, and I'm trying to do that. We've got to demonstrate compassion. We have got to go against behavior that causes AIDS. Education. AIDS is one disease that can't be totally controlled by behavior but some of it can. Dirty needles, for example. So we've got to win that drug fight. And we have got the biggest and best research, by far, program of any country in the world.

And I had a couple of the top specialists in here the other day -- Dr. Fauci at NIH. And they are encouraged in what the research will bring. Some of you are -- well, none of you were alive when they discovered the Salk vaccine for Polio. But that's the line they're approaching it, our great research labs. And I am somewhat optimistic about achieving a major breakthrough in that.

But in the meantime, we've got to speak with compassion. We've got to demonstrate the concern that we all feel in our hearts about this. We've got to be sure that we do the utmost we can in research. And then we've got to all speak out in terms of the behaviors that cause AIDS, and -- in some cases. Not all, but in some cases. And I plan to continue to do that.

But it's a national problem. It's one where we really -- it's heartbreak hill. It's just everybody in one way or another has a friend that's touched with this. And we just simply have to win this fight. And I'm optimistic we will.

Listen, I gather they're telling me we're out of here. But we only got about four percent of the questions, I think. But thank you very, very much. And I wish we didn't have to go. (Applause.) Thank you all. And good luck to all of you. We're very, very proud of you. (Applause.)

END 10:00 A.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Warsaw, Poland)

For Immediate Release July 5, 1992

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT BUSH AND PRESIDENT WALESA
TO POLISH CITIZENS

Castle Square
Warsaw, Poland

2:15 P.M. (L)

PRESIDENT WALESA: Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen. We are receiving the great politician of our time, the President of the United States of America, Mr. George Bush, in Warsaw today. (Applause.) For many years as he has been taking an interest in our struggle, he has supported it and in the wake of a victory, has come forth with assistance for Polish reforms and for reforms in the whole region.

I was given the opportunity to learn about it when I was the leader of Solidarity. This is also happening now when I am the President. America has given us assistance in the struggle for freedom and democracy, and has helped to keep of our spirit even in the most difficult years. We are grateful to you, Mr. President. (Applause.)

We are grateful for your personal contribution to achieving the victory of democracy. This meeting at the gateway of the Royal Castle of Warsaw seems as though we're meeting the whole of Poland. All our fellow countrymen who are living here; likewise those people of Polish origin who are dispersed in the whole world. The Royal Castle is a special place for the Polish people. It is an epitome of the many centuries of national history and tradition. It is a symbol of our identity.

It is precisely at this very place that the Constitution of 3rd May was adopted over 200 years ago. After the American Bill of Rights, ours is the world's second modern-time fundamental law. It is also right in that same castle that Ignacy Jan Paderewski made his debut on the political scene and came to be one of the greatest of Poles. He has made his way to the National Pantheon. Today we are paying tribute to the great man.

Over half a century has gone by since the day of his death, but it is only now that we are able to fulfill his last will. He desired that his remains should be buried in a free Poland, and this has come true. The remains will stay forever in the Basilica of Poland, a place dear to all Poles and the hearts of the capital.

Ignacy Jan Paderewski was a patriot of great stature, and at the same time, an exponent of close bonds between our two nations. He was a statesman in the true sense of the word. Owing to him, decisions of great importance for Poland were made at the Conference of Versailles. This all became possible with the support of the United States. The great and well-set-in American democracy helped the young Polish democracy. Ever since then, and until now, America has been giving us numerous tokens of affection and friendship.

We have received them from many U.S. Presidents, including also yourself, Mr. President. Your present visit to Poland is taking place only a few days before the CSCE countries' meeting in Helsinki. It is taking place shortly before the

summit meeting of the leaders of the industrialized countries. The latter will be of great importance also for my own country since matters related to Poland and to her economy will be discussed there. The visit of the President of the United States of America to Warsaw, with these events just a few days away, is of great significance.

We regard it as yet one more indication of your interest in the process of Polish reforms. It shows your sincere will to support the reforms and to make it possible for Poland to develop successfully.

We highly appreciate your country's commitment to and sense of responsibility for the destiny of contemporary Europe and of the world as a whole. The United States' presence on the European continent is an indispensable factor of maintaining the balance as well as security.

Of great significance is the attention with which America follows the process of transformations in Central and Eastern Europe. I have already had an opportunity to convey to you, Mr. President, the expressions of our gratitude and acknowledgement of your deep understanding for the essential meaning of these problems.

It is with a great deal of effort but nonetheless quite courageously that Poland is going ahead with the cause of reforms. Through the process of change she is striving to achieve stability.

Some people are saying now that we are a high-risk country and that it is risky to become involved and to invest in Poland. This view is certainly not without any justification. However, we are building a new reality. We are taking the path which no one has ever trodden before. This is the trail of picneers. It is not easy because any change always brings along a certain measure of chaos. The new is becoming mixed with the old, but an order is growing out of this ferment, an enduring one as it is based on experience.

So we need more time. We want to use that time to learn democracy, to learn how to respect other people's views, to argue with each other and to know how to settle disputes. Changes of government, parliamentary turns of events, difficulties with making and enforcing laws -- all this means an arduous process of education about how democracy works. However, there is one stabilizing element in Poland. That is the office of president. The President was elected in a free election, and under his constitutional powers he can calm down the stormy and turbulent political scene.

Actually, the President is trying to accomplish just that. The people of Poland are now going through the process of change. Individuals are learning to take matters into their own hands. A new middle class is emerging. The private industry continues to account for an ever-greater proportion of the national economy. Private entrepreneurship is becoming an ever more powerful driving force in the economy of Poland. Once again, individuals are getting to know how to live in freedom and on their own account.

This notwithstanding, we continue to look forward to more assistance from the European communities. This is not only in our own interest, geography cannot be circumvented, neither can it be cheated. Business links are going to spring up in this region not merely to give benefit to just one single transaction or to last for a year only, they are going to be built for the benefit of future centuries. So the word long-term prospect should be added to the word profitability. Only then will they become fully meaningful.

MORE

Economic ties have been disrupted in this region. The point is that they have been established for the use of an empire that has now passed into history, for the use of the empire and its battled states. Now we are determined to build up new ties in a new shape and with a different purpose in mind. To make them rely on new principles coming to the forefront there is the process of our step-by-step integration with the European communities.

At the same time we are establishing links with our neighbors. This is why we have signed treaties on good neighborhood and friendly cooperation with nearly all of our neighbors, including Byelorussia, the Ukraine, the Federal Republic of Germany, Czechoslovakia. We have signed treaties also with France, Italy, Hungary, Latvia and Estonia. These states are close to us, though they are not our direct neighbors in terms of geography.

We are also involved in making arrangements for regional cooperation within the Vyshehrad Triangle. As has been shown, Poland is capable of coming to terms with the neighbors and with the other countries of the region. She is capable of establishing reciprocal relations with them. Poland can and should play a stabilizing role in the region. We are working together with others on the setting up of institutions that would enhance stability in it and that would be of service to it. They could exercise their functions both in the political and economic fields as well as in the military one.

I have often said that there is a need for a European peacekeeping force. In this regard, it is necessary to have more coordination between the CSCE, the United Nations, the North Atlantic Alliance and the Western European Union. The choice of an organization will depend on the circumstances. The peacekeeping force could be deployed for peacekeeping missions in particularly threatened places. The situation now prevailing in the Balkans keeps reminding us of such threats.

Mr. President, economic stability is the prerequisite of security. Prosperity is the guarantor of peace, while economic crisis fosters social unrest. I believe that the stabilization fund could play an enormous role in bringing economic stability to the region. It seems that the sooner it comes into operation the sooner it will bear fruit. At long last Europe is beginning to breathe in and out through both its lungs, the Eastern and the Western one. However, we should not allow any fetters to restrict its freedom to breathe.

It is worth the while to talk together about matters related to economics and security. Poland and her capital, Warsaw, would be willing to host any conference. It could be held as early as the autumn of this year. We would welcome the participation in a conference of this kind of the countries of this region as well as of those of the Fund. We hope to be able to make a proposal to this end, for one cannot pursue one's policies in isolation, even though this isolation may be limited to one region alone. With this in mind, I would like to invite you, Mr. President, to take part in it. (Applause.)

It is necessary to pursue policies on a global scale. But no global policies are possible without the United States of America. (Applause.) America has shown the world what a country of free people means and what opportunities it can offer. No other country but America has demonstrated how freedom can be matched with a sense of responsibility, how action can bring success and respect for the rule of law.

It has managed to set a pattern in which political freedom matches that in the field of the economy. Our two countries are situated on two different continents; they are set apart by the ocean. And yet our nations remain close to each other. The geographical distance is less important in view of

the shared understanding for the most crucial issues, the basic issues. Above all I have freedom in mind.

The people of Poland and of America have treasured it with particular dedication. We have always remained faithful to it. We have never failed to believe in its final victory. And we have won. With the help of God and with the goodwill of our friends, today we have a free homeland. (Applause.)

Today we have a free homeland. This freedom is a challenge and we have taken it up. We want to make it mean prosperity, well-being, a secure life and the happiness of the whole nation. Do not ask me if we can make it. Now that we are faced with so many difficulties, we shall overcome them. We shall certainly succeed. (Applause.) We shall certainly succeed. God bless Poland. (Applause.) God bless America and President Bush. (Applause.)

And now I would like to ask President Bush to honor the Polish nation. (Applause.)

PRESIDENT BUSH: Thank you, Mr. President, for those very kind words. And good afternoon to Mrs. Walesa. It's a pleasure to be back here. I'm pleased that the U.S. presidential delegation, headed by our own Secretary Derwinski, could be here today.

So hello, Warsaw -- and hello, Poland. Thank you all for this warm welcome. (Applause.) Barbara and I are honored to be come back once more -- to come home once more -- to the birthplace of the Revolution of '89. (Applause.) And I'm especially pleased to come here from America's 4th of July celebration of freedom -- and carry that same spirit to a free Poland. (Applause.)

This is truly a homecoming: the day Poland welcomes home a part of its proud history -- a great patriot and patron of freedom. You spoke eloquently of him. Through his long life, Ignacy Paderewski fought for a free and independent Poland.

When independence came, Paderewski served as Prime Minister of your new nation. When occupation came, he joined the exiled government. And when he died, America gave this great friend of freedom a place alongside our honored dead in Arlington Cemetery to rest, in the words of our President Franklin Roosevelt, "until Poland would be free." (Applause.)

Few knew then how many dark days would come and go -- how many lifetimes would pass -- until this day. When years passed without fanfare or ceremony -- when a small, simple marker took the place of a larger stone -- Poles understood. In five years or 50 years, Paderewski would one day come home to Polish soil.

Today, a patriot has come home. Today, Poland is free. And what a magnificent day this is. (Applause.) On this Sunday, from St. John's Cathedral to the village churches of Zakopane, the bells toll not simply the solemn requiem, but a new beginning, a new birth of freedom, for Poland and its people. (Applause.)

It's a new beginning not just for Poland, but for all of Europe and the world. It is proper that we mark this new birth in your country. It was here in Poland that the Second World War began. It was here in Poland that the Cold War first cast its shadow. And it was here in Poland that the people at long last brought the Cold War to an end.

I've said many times that in the deepest sense, the Cold War was a war of ideas -- a contest between two ways of life. The rulers of the old regime claimed they saw the triumph

of the totalitarian ideal written in the laws of history. They failed to see the love of freedom written in the human heart.

I recall my last visit to Poland: The fierce defiance and determination in the faces of the workers gathered in what was then called the Lenin Shipyard in Gdansk -- the warmth and the welcome for America made plain to Barbara and me by you, the good people of Poland. We'll never forget it. (Applause.)

Just think of the new world that's emerged these past three years: Europe -- whole and free. Russia -- turning from dictatorship to democracy. Ukraine and the other nations of the old Soviet empire -- free and independent. Look at this new world, and remember where that revolution began -- right here in Poland. (Applause.)

Today, Poland stands transformed. Your bold economic reforms have earned the world's admiration and support -- and what's more, they're working. Shelves that once stood empty are now stocked with goods. Gone is the old Communist Party headquarters -- now home to the Warsaw Stock Exchange and the Polish-America Enterprise Fund, providing seed capital to help Poland's private sector growth and prosper. (Applause.) Gone are the slogans and the sham reality. Everywhere, you hear new voices and new hope. Freedom has come home to Poland. (Applause.)

For all that is new, there are things that have not changed -- things that sustained you through the darkest days: Polish strength -- Polish spirit -- Polish pride.

Reaching your dreams will be difficult. I know the sheer volume of new voices can sometimes be deafening, but from the clamor of new voices must come democracy, a common vision of the common good.

Of course, in many places and for many people, there is more pain than progress. But we must take care to separate cause from consequence: Poland's time of trial is not caused by private enterprise, but by the stubborn legacy of four decades of communist misrule. Make no mistake: the path you have chosen is the right path. (Applause.) And as you say Mr. President, it is the path of pioneers.

Free government and free enterprise have helped Poland overcome a crippling past. Free government and free markets will bring Poland a bright future.

Poland is no stranger to sacrifice. Many times before, you were asked to do without for the greater good of the state. But today is different: This time, yours is a sacrifice blessed by freedom -- the sacrifice of a nation determined to make its destination democracy. (Applause.)

Poland has made great progress in its reforms -- moving this country to a new stage in its economic revolution. As always, the United States of America stands ready to help. (Applause.) In 1989, the United States worked with Poland and other to establish a $1-billion fund to help support a free currency for a free Poland. Now we need to consider new uses for that fund, to help Poland as it faces today challenges. That's why I am proposing that once Poland is back on track with the IMF that we make that fund available for other uses -- perhaps to finance Polish exports or to help capitalize banks to support new businesses. The U.S. contribution alone will amount to $200 million. This is a Polish and American idea that I will take to the Economic Summit at Munich. (Applause.) There, I will urge the leaders of the world's great democracies to join with us, to seek new ways to help Poland toward progress and prosperity. (Applause.)

Let there be no doubt: America shares Poland's dream. America wants Poland to succeed. And we will stand at your side until success is guaranteed to everyone. (Applause.)

We mark today not simply the memory of a great Polish patriot -- we celebrate the men of moral courage who sustain this nation: President Lech Walesa; Father Popieluszko; Pope John Paul II. (Applause.) But Poland could not have come this far -- Poland could not have won its freedom -- if only a few had the courage to stand up against the state. Freedom was won by the everyday heroes of the underground -- the men and women who kept faith when faith was forbidden, who spoke the truth against a wall of lies. The true heroes of democracy: the people of Poland. (Applause.)

Your strength of spirit drives away all doubt: Poland will succeed. Poland will succeed because Poles have made this journey before. (Applause.) In a strange new world called America -- in the stockyards of Chicago, in the steelworks of Cleveland, in a thousand towns thousands of miles from this land they love, Poles worked and worshipped and built a better life. Polish hands building the American Dream. Now at long last, Poles can build that dream right here at home. (Applause.)

As President of the United States of America, as a fellow democrat, as friend of a free Poland, I bring this message: America stands with you. (Applause.) America wants Poland to succeed and to prosper. America wants Poland -- now and forever -- to be free. (Applause.)

Thank you all for this warm welcome. And may God bless the free people of Poland. And may God bless both our great countries, Poland and the United States of America. Thank you, thank you very much. (Applause.)

END 2:55 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release April 21, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN MEETING WITH U.S. BUSINESS EXECUTIVES

The Rose Garden

9:33 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: I am very pleased to welcome to the White House this morning 16 senior American business leaders to discuss how the American private sector can help to meet the most important foreign policy challenge that faces us -- the transformation of the new states and the former USSR from command to market economies, and from authoritarian to democratic governments. We are determined to expand the volume of our trade and investment with them. And I would like to announce today a series of measures to meet these important objectives.

First, I have asked that current negotiations with all the new states on trade, bilateral investment and tax treaties be expedited and completed as soon as possible. These agreements will provide greater access for our companies and they will lay a new foundation for our future commercial relationships.

Second, I have also asked OPIC, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation; and the Ex-Im Bank, the Export-Import Bank, to negotiate new agreements and expand their operations in the former USSR. Another critical step so that American firms can compete equally and fairly for a share of the new markets there.

And third, I would like to reiterate my call to the Congress in a spirit of bipartisanship to pass, in time for my summit meeting with President Yeltsin in June, the Freedom Support Act, the landmark legislation that I announced on April 1st. We hope the business leaders here today and the larger American business community will support this bill which will lift Cold War restrictions on trade and investment.

And finally, I have requested that our Secretary of Commerce Barbara Franklin create new business development committees with Russia, Ukraine and other countries to eliminate the barriers that currently discourage trade with them.

All these issues will be high on my agenda when I meet with Presidents Kravchuk and Yeltsin. And I'm absolutely committed to giving American companies every opportunity to compete in these markets. The American private sector should seize this opportunity to do business with these countries. It's a vast and rich market and expanding our business ties will benefit the American people.

Increased trade means new markets for American goods, greater opportunities for American investors and more jobs for American workers. The U.S. increased its exports of manufactured goods to the USSR by nearly 40 percent in 1991. We should aim to do even better this year and the next.

This is a defining moment in this century. And, indeed, the private sector's role is absolutely critical. The need for capital, advanced technology and human expertise in these countries

during this decade and into the next century will be far too great for governments alone to meet. A great economic transformation to liberate the peoples of the former Soviet Union and benefit our own people will only occur if our private firms invest and trade to show them the way.

I thank those business leaders that are with us here today, many of them already involved in trying to do business in the CIS countries. And I pledge my commitment to this partnership with the American private sector.

And now we will go inside and discuss in detail the agenda that I've just outlined. Thank you all very much for being here.

END 9:37 A.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release April 29, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
ON REGULATION REFORM

The Rose Garden

2:00 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Well, a warm welcome to the White House for all of you. And first, I want to salute the three generals in the war for regulatory reform: our Vice President, Dan Quayle; Boyden Gray, and Dr. Michael Boskin. (Applause.)

We also have here some of the front-line troops actively engaged in this process -- members of my administration and Cabinet: Andy Card and Barbara Franklin, and Jim Watkins, and Lynn Martin, and Dick Darman, Pat Saiki, Bill Reilly, and many others out here that are working for these kinds of changes. I also appreciate all efforts for fundamental reform of government regulation. That's what brings us here today.

Regulation imposes what we see as a hidden tax on all Americans. This reform is one of the top priorities that I stressed in my State of the Union message, and it's a vital element of our national reform agenda.

Two hundred years ago our Founding Fathers championed a whole new way of thinking about man's relationship to government by unleashing forces of social and economic freedom. They made the United States a haven for the poor and the oppressed -- indeed, a land of opportunity.

Our system did not promise material well-being, but it guaranteed personal freedom. In just one century's time, millions of poor people came here from every corner of the Old World. And because America empowered them to use their God-given talents to the fullest, people who came to our shores with nothing but faith and imagination made us the strongest and freest nation on Earth.

Since the '30s, when a great economic shock hit the world, government has often turned to projects of social engineering. And too often, in my opinion, government embraced the notion that human actions, human choices, could be organized to good effect only through bureaucratic blueprints.

This posed a challenge to our precious heritage of limited government and the rule of law. It veered us away from the tradition of the accountability of citizen legislators. When Congress shirks the responsibility for leadership, it tends to embrace many premises of the command economy. For example, when Congress passes laws mandating Americans to dance to the tune of arbitrary social and economic goals, it leaves the details of this choreography to the bureaucracy. This is not right. The bureaucracy is not accountable in the same way a legislature should be or a President should be.

Over the years, many Americans have felt the growing burden of regulation's tax in disguise. And we learned some hard

lessons. We learned that lonely keepers of the flame of economic reform -- men like the late Friedrich von Hayek -- were right. The era of bureaucracy and regulation produced one example after another validating von Hayek's observation: Rule by bureaucracy undermines the true rule of law and runs headlong into the iron law of unintended consequences.

Let me tell you what this means in the real world. Take a common concern about safety: Inflexible safety rules can undermine safety in unforeseen ways: If government mandates make ladders more and more costly to consumers, just for example, more people will turn to cheaper substitutes. They'll climb on chairs or step-stools -- which are far less safe. Of course, regulators creating such a rule would not intend to make people less safe -- but that's just how it works in practice. That's what we mean by unintended consequences.

Consider another example, this time with environmental rules. Command-and-control environmental rules actually can harm the environment. Regulations under the old Clean Air Act, for example, required new power plants to install scrubbers to clean up air pollution. Not only did this increase the cost of electricity, but it also generated scrubber sludge to be disposed of in landfills. Now we have a much better, market-based program which provides companies more options in how they reduce pollution -- for example through our innovative emissions trading program, or through increased use of cleaner burning natural gas.

I could go on all day with examples of inflexible rules that impose hidden taxes and costs on society. I could cite any number of abstract rules in collision with how things actually work: How highway fatalities can increase and American auto workers can lose jobs when Congress tries to legislate the fuel efficiency of cars. How a regulation system, plump with noble intentions, can keep life-saving drugs and medical devices from patients who need them. And let me add a personally gratifying note: The speed-up of approval for new "breakthrough" drugs for AIDS and for cancer and other life-threatening diseases is the culmination of the work that I was active in, that I helped begin almost 10 years ago.

Reforming regulation is a huge and time-consuming task -- presiding over the Task Force on Regulation during the '80s was, for example, one of the most important assignments that President Reagan gave me when I was Vice President. And I've given a similar assignment to Vice President Dan Quayle and my Council on Competitiveness -- and I am very grateful for his leadership and for the work of the Council.

Today regulation is facing a heightened public concern, and a growing public impatience. Many times this manifests itself in the phrase, "Get the government off our backs." More and more people are sending Washington an unmistakable message: Over-regulation costs jobs. And thanks to this rising sentiment, we are able to accelerate needed reforms.

In my State of the Union Address, I lit a fire under our regulatory reformers, gave them 90 days to produce dramatic results. Today marks the 91st day -- and let me report our reformers have come through with flying colors.

From biotechnology to banking to energy, we've made achievements that will lower costs and increase choices for American consumers. We've carried out reforms that will create and preserve good jobs for Americans and help us stay competitive in the world. We estimate that the reforms we've set in motion

just since January 28th will save consumers about $15 billion to $20 billion a year -- that's a savings of $225 to $300 per year for the average American family. And this is just a down payment on savings to come.

Every agency that I asked to participate has responded with action. Some agencies already have accomplished important reforms, and all agencies have completed a reform agenda which they will carry out in the months ahead.

To help us move forward with our reform agenda, today I am ordering a 120-day extension of the moratorium on new regulation. (Applause.) And I am directing the Competitiveness Council to take the lead in implementing these reforms. Our objective must be to stop new rules that hurt growth while speeding up new rules to help our economy. During the next 120 days I expect many more gains for freedom and common sense.

And I'll ask the United States Congress to do its part. I'll be working with regulatory reformers in every federal agency to propose new legislation where needed to eliminate unreasonable regulatory burdens that are now mandated by statute. And Congress also should pass legislation that has been pending for three years to reauthorize the Paperwork Reduction Act.

And further, I'm putting Congress on notice: I will veto any bill that attempts to put excessive new burdens of regulation on the backs of our families, our consumers, our workers, and our businesses. There will be no -- and I repeat, no -- return to business as usual. (Applause.)

Let me be very clear about our aims: We cannot and will not abolish all regulation. I have responsibilities as Chief Executive to enforce sound regulations for the health and safety of the American people -- and I'll keep that trust. The best way to keep that trust is through a fundamental reform of our system of regulation. This is more than a three-month or even a three-year effort. This is more than an exercise in adjusting or fine-tuning the system. The economy is beginning to recover now. To ensure that recovery continues and is strengthened -- to ensure that we can create new jobs -- we must continue our course of regulatory reform.

Our campaign for regulatory reform meshes with our efforts for government reform -- like our proposal to limit the terms of congressmen and make them more accountable. It fits also with our crusade for reform of the civil justice system -- against the tyranny of these nuisance lawsuits that mock our time-honored traditions of justice. And it goes hand in hand with our efforts to reform American education -- by allowing parents, not governments, to choose their children's schools. In short, there's a common purpose linking the all of our efforts to renew the spirit and practice of limited government.

So let's take heart -- and let's get to work. We can see the future, and it is a freer future. There is no doubt in my mind: The day is coming when we will put the final wrecking ball to the discredited system of the social engineers. We will restore this country. We will build it back, sturdy in the radical faith in freedom that is the legacy of our Founding Fathers.

Now I'm going to have the honor and privilegve of signing the memorandum extending the regulatory moratorium. Thank you all very much. (Applause.)

END 2:12 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release April 30, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT THE GREAT AMERICAN WORKOUT

The South Lawn

7:04 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Welcome all to the White House. And let me tell you how much I appreciate this wonderful display of fitness, something so important to our country. May I start off by saluting Secretary Sullivan, who I don't see, who's going to be with us in a minute; Chairman Schwarzenegger, of course. Where's Lou? Over here, suited up. (Laughter.) And thank Barbara Mandrell and members of the President's Council on Physical Fitness and the National Fitness Leaders Association. And, of course, Milton Berle and Bob Saget; Mary Lou Retton, an old friend; Peter Vidmar; Chris Evert; Lauri Single, National Fitness Director of the Year; and on and on it goes.

Welcome to the White House and to an event which kicks off National Fitness Month. That's the third Great American Workout. And it's a special pleasure to be introduced by a friend, a man who embodies this event, the Chairman of the President's Council on Physical Fitness, Arnold Schwarzenegger, who literally has done a superb job, going to every single state in the nation on his own to take this message of fitness to everybody. We're very grateful to him. (Applause.)

As I told Arnold earlier, I am sorry to have to cut short my participation in this great event. I hope you can understand; I am going to be getting at 7:15 a.m. an update on the situation that troubles the whole country, the situation in Los Angeles -- meeting with the Attorney General and the head of the FBI. And then we'll be meeting with some of our outstanding civil rights leaders to discuss our common commitment to justice, civil tranquility and the rule of law.

But before I go, let me just say a few words about this important issue of fitness. Arnold, as I mentioned -- or didn't, maybe -- but yesterday he visited the 50th state out there in Ohio as Chairman. And he's spreading the word that each of us has a stake, a serious stake in making exercise a part of America's fitness, and fitness a part of each American day.

And when we see these workout stations, which I was privileged to participate in last year, you can understand it more clearly. Even a special workout to honor true heroes has been set up, and those are representatives of the Special Olympics. And we welcome them back to the White House again. They set a great example for kids around this country. (Applause.)

Part of his message is that we need balanced and nutritional diet. And we've got to avoid tobacco and drug use, avoid excessive alcohol use. And fitness really can enrich the human mind and body by lowering stress and blood pressure and cholesterol.

And we also have to act on another front by putting new emphasis on quality physical education in out schools. (Applause.) Arnold has pointed out to me that only one state, Illinois, gives

daily physical education for K through 12. And that's the only state giving it, thus, the priority that it really deserves. Now, we've got to change that. So let's make it 50, just as our Chairman has done by going to 50 states.

A man with us, a special man, knows all about fitness. He knows that an American that is physically and mentally fit is fit to take on the world. And at 83 -- sorry about that, Milton -- (laughter) -- Milton Berle still rides his stationary bike, he does a lot of walking, he punches a heavy bag, and he maintains a healthy diet. So no wonder he's just been named a special advisor to Arnold. And I welcome his leadership, showing that nobody, put it this way, is too old to stay fit. (Applause.)

And so to Milton and to Arnold and all of you, my thanks for what you've done. Thanks for showing the nation what fitness means. And I hope you enjoy the Great American Workout. I arranged for the weather here. (Laughter.) And I know you'll enjoy the program which follows on the main stage, starring the famous and wonderfully generous Harlem Globetrotters. We welcome them. (Applause.)

We have a basketball court down there. And I got a lot of laughs when I threw the basketball with Duke the other day. But the difference is these guys are funny on purpose. (Laughter.)

So thank you all. And, Arnold, once more, my heartfelt thanks for what you're doing in leading this country to new levels of fitness. And now I must leave, but Barbara's going to join in, so she will demonstrate the Bush family commitment to work out -- every station, 20 minutes at each one. (Applause.)

END 7:10 A.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release May 13, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN ADDRESS TO BALTIMORE COMMUNITY

Dunbar High School
Baltimore, Maryland

3:30 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Dr. Heyssel, for that introduction. I understand that you'll be retiring in a few weeks as CEO of Johns Hopkins Health System, after 20 years of building bridges with this marvelous community. And I got briefed on this. And I'm told that you'll leave a great legacy -- that new outpatient clinic which bears your name and opens for business on Monday. A well-deserved tribute to a great man.

We also have with us today my top advisor on health and our head of HHS, Dr. Lou Sullivan, who you -- where's Lou? -- right over behind me, who you met earlier on. But I just want to say what a joy it is to have him at my side as we try to come up with better answers for America's health care. He's doing a superb job there. And I want to single out also another that has been at my side all day and is an awful lot of the time that I have great respect for, and that's Governor Schaefer, the Governor of your state, who is with us here today. (Applause.)

We also have several members of the legislature, the City Council from Baltimore. I'm glad to see Mr. Winters, an old friend who's CEO of The Prudential. And, of course, I'm -- and he's been to the White House to discuss the future of our nation's health care with me.

And then, of course, Barbara Hill -- you'll get around her for about five minutes and you're semi-exhausted. The energy and the enthusiasm that she brings to this health plan is simply contagious. And I have a much better feeling what it's all about just by being around Barbara Hill. Thank you very much for a great day. (Applause.)

And I don't know whether it's appropriate or not to be discussing medical care here at Dunbar, the home of the Dunbar Poets, but nevertheless -- (applause) -- to all at Dunbar, my sincere thanks. And with their unbeaten streak, maybe Pete Pompey should become my advisor on health care as well as on fitness. (Laughter.)

But I was interested to hear about the school's cooperative health studies, with Johns Hopkins, which is not only on a summit in Baltimore, but is at the summit of medical excellence across -- for our whole country. And it's terrific that nearly 20 percent of Dunbar's student body is involved in this health studies program -- 20 percent. And I also want to recognize another institution that calls Dunbar home -- Sojourner-Douglass College, for its strong commitment to the Baltimore community. (Applause.)

Before sharing with you a few observations on health care, let me just touch on an issue that I know is of concern to all Americans -- everyone concerned about conditions, particularly in America's inner cities, with special reference in these remarks to

Los Angeles. In addition to FEMA, the emergency management, and to SBA, the Small Business Administration's assistance, the Federal Home Loan Bank System is going to make available $600 million to finance the rebuilding of housing and businesses in Los Angeles. These loans, made through the Community Investment Programs, are good news for the people who lost homes and jobs as well as the owners who lost businesses due to the unrest out there. And it's one way that we can underscore the fact that we are serious about helping Los Angeles recover.

I think the nation is focusing on how well all levels of government come to bear on helping in the recovery and the restimulation of the community there in Los Angeles.

Beyond our urgent emergency aid, we have got to take action to bring hope and opportunity to Los Angeles. But it's not just Los Angeles, it is to all American cities. And yesterday we had a good meeting with the congressional leaders -- Republican and Democrat. We outlined -- or I did -- a six-point plan for a new America: Our Weed and Seed crime initiative -- weed out the criminals, seed the neighborhoods so that you can have hope and opportunity there. Our HOPE initiative -- it's a housing, a homeownership, housing initiative. I think enterprise zones -- we've heard a lot of talk about, but when we were out in California, the community leaders all urged that we try this concept of enterprise zones to attract like a magnet -- draw business and opportunity into the communities.

Fourth -- and a little longer run answer -- is education reform. I'm kind of preaching to the choir right her in Dunbar on that one because there's an awful lot of innovation going on in Baltimore in the schools and in Maryland generally. But education reform is essential. Welfare reform, I think, is essential. And then, of course, a strong jobs program for city youth across the country.

So these are the ingredients or the tools that we are going to try to work with. And I must report -- I'd like to use this opportunity to report to the American people that yesterday's meeting put partisanship aside, and I am very hopeful that we can get something done for this country. I am pleased with the early reaction, as I say; but now the thing is to follow up and push ahead.

Now, to the reason that's brought us all together. I really had a wonderful experience here spending some time four blocks over in the East Baltimore Medical Center. It is a terrific example for the rest of the country. And the rest of the country can follow this example. It's based on a special kind of public-private partnership, and the kind that we've been advocating; in this case among Johns Hopkins, the Pru -- the Prudential Insurance Company, the state of Maryland and the federal government. It's that broad a partnership.

This problem-solving partnership advances what's known as coordinated care, the future of health care in this country. Thanks to this partnership, this is the largest -- the largest and fastest-growing HMO in Maryland. It was there, eight years ago, that Hopkins helped pioneer the concept of a Medicaid HMO. And it's great to see EBMC's success because it proves what I strongly believe, that we can meet the challenge of controlling health care costs while providing the finest quality service. And when I think of Johns Hopkins, I think of the quality of medical care, the quality of research. And we must not adopt a plan that diminishes the quality of American health care. So I congratulate you -- for while this HMO saves members, employers and government money -- health care stays first-rate. And it's a great example.

The key to this center's success, especially for Medicaid patients, is that coordinated health care makes creative approaches possible. It provides quality care at lower cost with an emphasis on -- and we saw it right there -- prevention.

It's just plain common sense -- we're better off keeping people healthy rather than treating them after they're sick. Just Monday, Lou Sullivan and I met with some leaders on our effort to improve infant health and immunization. There's nothing that makes the case for coordinated care like seeing these healthy kids. Preventive medicine improves the quality of life for patients and certainly saves a lot of unnecessary expenditures.

Coordinated care can work for all Americans. But it's especially important for Medicaid recipients. It ensures they get care when they need it, where they need it, and that they get it in a cost-effective way. EBMC proves this is a viable alternative to the opposite of coordinated care, that fee-for-service system.

It also means better care for a kid who steps on a rusty nail out on Orleans Street. Before belonging to a coordinated care center, he would have gone the emergency room -- gone to Hopkins emergency room. They'd be seeing him for the first time so they wouldn't know his background -- they wouldn't know if he'd had a tetanus shot or if he were allergic to some -- say, penicillin. They'd have to spend that time and money doing unnecessary tests, maybe double treatment. But now when he shows up at his center's urgent care unit, they just check his history and treat him, faster and at a fraction of the cost.

I am excited to see so many pieces of this comprehensive health reform program that we are promoting already successfully at work right here at EBMC. I introduced a plan February 6 to address the twin challenges of expanding access and of containing cost, while building on the strengths of this present health care system. I was determined to treat the root causes of our problems, not just the symptoms. And above all, our plan is inspired by the words of physiciasn Frederick Banting: "You must begin with an ideal and end with an ideal."

In the greatest, most technologically advanced nation on the face of the Earth, there is no rason that one of seven Americans has no health insurance. And what we must do is clear. We must guarantee every American access -- access to affordable health insurance. (Applause.)

Let's face it. We are in a peculiar year, in an election year, when all kinds of crazy things happen out there. And it seems like everyone's got a prescription for health care. And, yes, people want quality care they can afford and rely on. But we don't need to put the government between the patients and their doctors. And we don't need to build a whole new federal bureaucracy. We need common sense, comprehensive health care reform and we need to start on it right now.

Sure, the other approaches can sound great, but you've got to look at what you really get. National health insurance believe me -- means more taxes, long lines, long waiting lists and here's a matter of great concern to people that are in this area of excellence -- lower quality care. Their idea for cost control is flat out what you call "price fixing" -- an idea we know just simply will not work. Look at Medicare, which adopts set prices for many seniors' health services. But Medicare inflation far outstripped private health care inflation in the '70s and the '80s, and it is still growing at 12 percent. The national rate of inflation, thank heavens, is far below 12 percent. And cost containment is not its strong suit. Price fixing by Congress has never worked before; and in my view, it simply will not work.

The so-called -- we were talking about this coming in over in the car -- the so-called play-or-pay approach -- in my view many proponents admit that it will melt down into national health insurance within a few years. It does nothing to address the cost problem, where patients don't know or care how much health plans costs -- nothing, except to, once again, try to fix the prices. And it's a package full of empty promises.

Our comprehensive reform plan is based on these common-sense principles: Competition. Consumer choice. Quality -- I come back to that -- and efficiency.

Now while most people in this country are provided the highest quality health care in the world, millions of others are uninsured. And those are the ones we've got to worry about. They are the ones that must be covered. And we must make people aware of the costs and varying quality of care, so they'll be better consumers. But there will always be a limit to how cost sensitive we can make people. When a kid falls off a bike or cracks his head, not many parents question the cost of a CAT scan or an MRI: their kid's health is too precious to bargain over.

So the competitive answer must be to group our consumers together. We must combine small employers -- who often pay the bills -- and individuals into large, educated, informed purchasing groups that can drive efficiencies back into the health care system. These health insurance networks are going to pool -- what we call pooling. They will pool consumer information; they will pool risk; and they will pool purchasing power to make the system more responsive to the demands of the consumer. Our plan will dramatically reform our market-based system. It will ensure that quality care is within reach of every American family. And it will preserve choice. It will keep costs down, and we believe that it will keep access up.

First, the plan will cut the runaway costs of health care by making the system more efficient. We'll call for innovative approaches like the one we see here in East Baltimore. And secondly, it will wring out waste and excess. And third, it will control federal growth, since health care is the fastest growing part of the federal budget. And fourth, my plan will make health care more accessible by making it more affordable. We'll provide up to $3,750 in health insurance credit or deductions for low- and middle-income families -- they have to use that to purchase insurance -- and guarantee access to insurance for all low-income Americans. These credits, combined with market reforms, will bring health insurance to approximately 30 million now uninsured Americans.

Maryland is already getting on board this voucher approach with bipartisan legislation. The Maryland State House, I'm told, has outlined a standard health package to cover all low-income Marylanders through tax credits. The proposal to implement this tax credit plan passed the House a few weeks and is being reviewed in the legislature this year. Under my plan, this type of low-income credit would be available in all states -- and Maryland would have the ability and financial help it needs to make this reform into a living reality.

I've proposed the most comprehensive health care package out there. And now is the time to challenge the Congress and to see if it's interested in this kind of real reform. Ours is a plan that will fundamentally restructure -- and this is the point, restructure health care in America.

There are steps we can and must take right now. Part of our plan entails significant reform of the insurance markets, for which there is a strong bipartisan support. Senator Bentsen, Chairman Dan Rostenkowski of the Ways and Means Committee, Senate

Republicans, the House Republican Task Force all support very similar reforms that certain changes, some modification, can and should, be passed immediately. Congress must begin to move now. And even if all they do this year is just pass our insurance market reform -- we'll at least get a start on changing the system is unsound. Even many proponents admit that it will melt down into national health insurance within a few years. It does nothing to address the cost problem, where patients don't know or care how much health plans costs -- nothing, except to, once again, try to fix the prices. And it's a package full of empty promises.

Our comprehensive reform plan is based on these common-sense principles: Competition. Consumer choice. Quality -- I come back to that -- and efficiency.

Now, while most people in this country are provided the highest quality health care in the world, millions of others are uninsured. And those are the ones we've got to worry about. They are the ones that must be covered. And we must make people aware of the costs and varying quality of care, so they'll be better consumers. But there will always be a limit to how cost sensitive we can make people. When a kid falls off a bike or cracks his head, not many parents question the cost of a CAT scan or an MRI; their kid's health is too precious to bargain over.

So the competitive answer must be to group our consumers together. We must combine small employers -- who often pay the bills -- and individuals into large, educated, informed purchasing groups that can drive efficiencies back into the health care system. These health insurance networks are going to pool -- what we call pooling. They will pool consumer information; they will pool risk; and they will pool purchasing power to make the system more responsive to the demands of the consumer. Our plan will dramatically reform our market-based system. It will ensure that quality care is within the reach of every American family. And it will preserve choice. It will keep costs down, and we believe that it will keep access up.

First, the plan will cut the runaway costs of health care by making the system more efficient. We'll call for innovative approaches like the one we see here in East Baltimore. And secondly, it will wring out waste and excess. And third, it will control federal growth, since health care is the fastest-growing part of the federal budget. And fourth, my plan will make health care more accessible by making it more affordable. We'll provide up to $3,750 in health insurance credit or deductions for low- and middle-income families -- they have to use that to purchase insurance -- and guarantee access to insurance for all low-income Americans. These credits, combined with market reforms, will bring health insurance to approximately 30 million now uninsured Americans.

Maryland is already getting on board on this voucher approach with bipartisan legislation. The State House, I'm told, has outlined a standard health package to cover all low-income Marylanders through tax credits. The proposal to implement this tax credit plan passed the House a few weeks ago and is being reviewed in the legislature this year. Under my plan, this type of low-income credit would be available in all states -- and Maryland would have the ability and financial help it needs to make this reform into a living reality.

I've proposed the most comprehensive health care package out there. And now is the time to challenge the Congress and to see if it's interested in this kind of real reform. Ours is a plan that will fundamentally restructure -- and this is the point, restructure health care in America.

There are steps we can and must take right now. Part of our plan entails significant reform of the insurance markets, for

which there is a strong bipartisan support. Senator Bentsen, Chairman Dan Rostenkowski of the Ways and Means Committee, Senate Republicans, the House Republican Task Force all support very similar reforms that with certain changes, some modification, can and should, be passed immediately. Congress must begin to move now. And even if all they do this year is just pass our insurance market reform -- we'll at least get a start on changing the system. These reforms will go a long way toward curing the inequities in cost and coverage under existing health insurance practices.

And there's another bipartisan reform package out there. I't proposed by Senator Pat Moynihan and Senator Dave Durenberger, and that is in most respects consistent it is with my plan and would promote much greater use of coordinated care in Medicaid. East Baltimore knows that this works. We must make it easier for the rest of the country to follow your pioneering road to better health care. In fact, as part of our plan for comprehensive reform, I want to make coordinated care the norm, not the exception, for Medicaid. We must work together now to pass these reforms that will provide literally millions of Americans with affordable health coverage for the first time and then get a leg up on that overall -- that comprehensive reform.

Our plan does everything the government can and should do to ensure the quality of life of each citizen of this great land. It doesn't promise the moon. It does something more important: it really guarantees it promises the future. And reform is never easy, but in health care I think wherever you're coming from, I think everybody would agree health care reform is a must. And we will deliver what we say we can -- competition -- competition-driven, market-based reform -- and we'll deliver it proudly. And we will -- this is kind of a second unveiling of our overall program, but it seemed most appropriate to bring out these specifics here in Baltimore, an area where you've had so much innovation, so much excellence, so much success. So I just want you to know we're serious about this, we are going to continue to push for it and we must get started right now.

I have learned a lot today and I am very grateful to those who have shown me what is going on in this exceptional health care facility. I've always had great respect for what is going on in Johns Hopkins, this Institution of excellence in every category.

So as I conclude, let me say, I am not pessimistic about our ability to help those people who need help in terms of health care. We can get the job done. And I will now be trying to work with our hands extended in a nonpartisan or in a bipartisan mode to see if we can't make things a little better for the people, some of whom I saw here today.

Thank you all very much for listening. And May God bless the United States. (Applause.)

END 3:50 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release August 14, 1992

FACT SHEET

The President's Welfare Reform Legislation

The President has transmitted to the Congress by letters to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House four legislative proposals to implement those parts of his welfare reform strategy requiring legislative changes. The President announced his plans for further welfare reform on July 31, 1992, in Riverside, California.

The legislative proposals sent to the Congress today are the:

- "Welfare Employment and Flexibility Amendments of 1992" that would amend the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) statute;
- "Food Stamp Employment and Flexibility Amendments of 1992," making similar changes to the Food Stamp Act;
- "Housing Assistance Innovation Act of 1992" that would allow innovation in public and assisted housing programs on a basis similar to other welfare programs; and
- "Community Opportunity Pilot Project Act of 1992" that would authorize selection of five communities to redesign the delivery of Federal assistance to create increased opportunity in those communities.

The Problem

Flexibility

Federal public assistance programs are structured in fixed, categorical ways. This limits the ability of the State and local agencies administering Federal funds to meet local needs and conditions.

State and local officials seeking a greater role for work in welfare programs face unnecessary obstacles in implementing "workfare" with significant work requirements. Current law limits the number of hours each month that a recipient can be required to "work off" to the number of hours that results from dividing the amount of the AFDC benefit by the minimum wage ($4.25 nationally). A family household of $170 per month in AFDC would be limited to 10 hours per week. That family, however, may receive food stamps worth $210 per month and Medicaid that provides insurance coverage worth $300 per month, bringing the total value of assistance to $680 per month.

Also, Federal law limits the positions that can be used in "workfare" programs. Vacant positions in public or nonprofit agencies cannot be given to "workfare" participants. A public or nonprofit agency must create new positions to take on someone with a "workfare" obligation, either increasing the work done or dividing work among more workers.

more

(OVER)

Scope of Innovation

Since the President's State of the Union address, in which he pledged Federal cooperation with State efforts to reform welfare programs through expeditious consideration of requests for waivers of Federal law or regulations, six waivers have been granted to five States. All relate to AFDC and Medicaid program changes. The degree of flexibility currently available in the AFDC and Medicaid programs does not exist for the food stamp, rental assistance, or public housing programs.

The President's Principles

The President's fundamental goal for welfare reform is to create a system that will enable welfare recipients to leave the system at the earliest possible time, as economically self-sufficient and responsible participants in their community.

The President's Legislative Proposals

The President's four legislative proposals to promote work, personal responsibility, and flexibility sent to the Congress today are:

1. "Welfare Employment and Flexibility Amendments of 1992"

The legislation would:

- o Relax restrictions on the placement of "workfare" participants in jobs;

  -- For example, a vacant real job could be assigned to a "workfare" participant; it would not be necessary to create a new position or find new work to be done.

- o Allow States to determine maximum "workfare" obligations by aggregating the value of AFDC payments, food stamps, Federal housing assistance, and average Medicaid costs, up to a maximum of 40 hours per week. Current law allows only for inclusion of AFDC payments;

- o Emphasize job-search in welfare-to-work programs operating under the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) training program by removing limits on the period a person can continue to be asked to look for a job;

- o Allow States to distribute AFDC benefits after work and training assignments have been completed; and

- o Require that failure to provide promptly all information necessary to determine the father of a child would result in a partial loss of AFDC benefits for uncooperative mothers.

  -- AFDC payments are made because a parent, usually the father, is absent. The requirement in current law that mothers cooperate in identifying the father of her child, enforced by the potential for losing part of the welfare check, would be expanded to include all information necessary to determine who the father is.

2. "Food Stamp Employment and Flexibility Amendments of 1992"

The legislation would:

- o Apply provisions in the "Welfare Employment and Flexibility Amendments of 1992" that remove limitations on work requirements to the food stamp program; and

- o Expand waiver authority in the Food Stamp Act to make it comparable to that available for AFDC.

3. "Housing Assistance Innovation Act of 1992"

The legislation would:

- o Provide waiver authority for public housing agencies and resident management corporations so they could try new approaches to self-sufficiency and resident empowerment;

- o Allow waivers of Davis-Bacon wage requirements for residents of public housing or subsidized housing and the homeless for projects that improve the housing and community in which they live and that increase their ability to get jobs; and

- o Allow eviction of convicted felons from public housing without an administrative hearing where State eviction processes contain similar due process protections.

4. "Community Opportunity Pilot Project Act of 1992"

The legislation would:

- o Create broad authority to waive program rules that govern the use of Federal funds to allow "break-the-mold" approaches to creating opportunity and promoting self-sufficiency;

- o Provide authority to approve projects in five communities that would be selected after a nationwide competition;

- o Allow proposals to come from States, local governments, and nonprofit organizations; and

- o Evaluate the projects to determine their effect and the applicability of the projects' findings.

  - -- For example, ideas that emerge from the effort to rebuild south central Los Angeles and the Atlanta Project could be implemented, even if they are not consistent with the rules that currently govern Federal funds flowing to those areas.

  - -- A community could take Federal transportation, community development, food stamp, job training, and drug abuse treatment funds and devise a multi-year project for a group of youth that would provide them with drug treatment, transportation to jobs outside the community, and training for jobs the project would create in the home community. Compared to current law:

more

(OVER)

- The project and all its uses of several categorical funding programs for different purposes could be approved;

- All necessary waivers could be granted in a single action, without application to multiple agencies; and

# # #

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release September 26, 1991

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AND KING HASSAN OF MOROCCO
IN EXCHANGE OF TOASTS

State Dining Room

8:30 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Your Majesty, Barbara and I are truly delighted to have this opportunity to welcome you and your daughter, Her Royal Highness Princess Lalla Meriam, to the United States.

You know, the pomp and circumstance at dinners like these never grows old. As we were descending the lovely staircase this evening, I have to confess that Barbara and I felt like movie stars. To steal a line from Humphrey Bogart: "Welcome to Casablanca." (Laughter and applause.)

But, your Majesty, the friendship between our two countries stretches back more than 200 years -- back beyond even the autumn 1788, when the emperor of Morocco, Mohammed the Third, sent warm words of support and encouragement to the then-newly-elected President of the United States, a brand new President receiving these greetings back in 1788. And for me, the friendship between Morocco and the United States has been quite personal.

Of course, Barbara and I remember our visit. I fondly remember this visit to Morocco as Vice President in 1983 -- the crowds in Fez and in Rabat who welcomed us as we drove through those cities in an open car. And I recall your gracious invitation to put aside some of the pomp of state and inviting us to dine together along with many members of your family, surrounded by friends. It's something we will never forget.

And at critical moments in history, our two nations have acted in concert. Earlier this century, when 300,000 Moroccans fought with the Allies against the AXIS powers in World War II. And last year, when Morocco once again demonstrated its commitment to shared ideals by sending its troops to the defense of Saudi Arabia.

Just as we've worked together to frustrate aggression, so we can work together to promote peace and stability in the Middle East, in the Gulf, and in Western Sahara. It will be the work of old friends, building a new world order.

So let me ask all of you to stand and to raise your glasses to the health of King Hassan and his family, to a future blessed by peace, and to the common bonds of friendship that link the people of Morocco and the United States of America. Welcome, Your Majesty.

(A toast is offered.) (Applause.)

KING HASSAN: Mr. President and dear friend, Mrs. Bush, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen: I want first to ask you to pardon my bad accent, please. I am delighted to say that my present state visit in the United States of America will certainly be for me a memorable one; for not only was the welcome party very warm, but

the talks we had were suffused with that same openness and sincerity which have always characterized our contacts for the last ten years.

Mr. President, God's will has always been to grant you success in whatever position you held, and in all the issues you had to handle. This is certainly due to your personal abilities and qualities, but also due in part to Mrs. Bush, a God-given companion. Constant support and dispener of affection and serenity, so indispensable to any head of state. (Applause.) With Mrs. Bush here present, kindly accept the expression of my sincere consideration and admiration.

Mr. President, may the United States of America enjoy under your clairvoyant leadership an era of prosperity, and participate fully in the edification of harmonious and constant free cohabitation among the nations of th Earth.

As I thank you again for your gracious hospitality, I invoke, hoping you, Mr. President, the help of the Almighty, wishing you excellent health and full success in your endeavors. Long life to the United States of America. Long life for Kingdom of Morocco.

(A toast is offered.) (Applause.)

END 8:48 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(San Diego, California)

For Immediate Release February 7, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE SAN DIEGO ROTARY CLUB

Sheraton Island Harbor Hotel
San Diego, California

10:20 A.M. PST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very, very much for that welcome. And, Governor Wilson -- Pete -- thank you for that introduction, for being at my side in so many battles that I think affect this country. May I also salute Secretary Lou Sullivan, our distinguished Secretary of HHS who is sitting here, who came with me today. The Surgeon General, Surgeon General Novello is here somewhere out in the audience, sitting right over here. And next to her, Bill Roper, who is the head of the CDC, the Center for Disease Control, in Atlanta; and Dr. James Mason, who is our Assistant Secretary of HHS for Public Health.

So you are surrounded, literally surrounded by health experts -- our very best. And they are awful good and I'm proud to be working at their side as we come to grips with some of these problems facing our nation in health care.

May I also salute the members of Congress who are here: Representative Duke Cunningham, over here; Duncan Hunter I believe is with us, too. Bill Lowery and Ron Packard, somewhere modestly in the crowd. (Applause.) We've got a wonderful representation from this broad area in Washington, D.C.

And may I thank Craig Evanco, the President of this Rotary Club, for assembling such a distinguished group at an awkward time, I'm sure, for some. But in any event, I'm just delighted to be here. And let me salute all, ladies and gentlemen.

It's a pleasure to be in San Diego. I've always loved it; been here many, many times. This is where I set sail for overseas way back in 1944, and this is where I returned to from overseas. And ever since then I've been coming here a great deal. It's a truly American jewel. And thank you for the privilege of visiting this beautiful city on the Pacific once again.

I know that the eyes of the sailing enthusiasts are again on San Diego this year with the America's Cup competition. And if you run low on wind -- (laughter) -- no, we've got a surplus back in Washington and we'd be glad to help out. (Laughter.) But good luck on all of that.

Earlier today -- and I apologize for keeping you all waiting by some 15 minutes, I'm afraid -- but I visited a catalyst of caring; something that I'm sure everyone in this Rotary Club that believes in service is proud of -- the Logan Heights Family Health Center, founded by one Laura Rodriguez, one of what we call a Point of Light, one of San Diego's true Points

of Light. And I saw the families and the children and watched one little guy get immunized there. Later, I had a chance to talk with the parents and community leaders about how greater immunization can increase illness prevention.

This morning, like immunization, I will try to be brief -- and also like immunization, I will try to keep the pain to a minimum. I was so moved by that warm response to just being here that I'm sorely tempted to give a flamboyant political speech here today. (Laughter.) But I'm going to resist that because I think we've got a lot to get done for the country in health care, and I want to talk to you about that subject and discuss how prevention can achieve a priceless gift: good health in America. So let me begin, then, with an equation: Good health equals a change in the health care system plus a change in the way we act.

This country has the best health care system in the world -- the best. The quality of health care in America is unrivaled. You couldn't tell it from some of the political criticism, but it is unrivaled. So that's not the problem. Rather, the problem is, first, that too many Americans are excluded, leaving one-seventh of our people without health insurance coverage. And second, millions of Americans fear losing access to coverage when they change jobs or develop illness. This is absolutely unacceptable for the United States of America, and it's got to stop.

Finally, health care costs too much. And this year -- listen to this number now -- this year Americans will pay more than $800 billion for health care, one-tenth of all we spend. The health of our economy and the health of our nation cannot afford it. And we've got to do something about it. And now is the time to start. (Applause.)

Imagine. Let's say you're making do -- just getting by in your current job that offers health care for your disabled child. Let's say you get offered a better job with a higher salary. You want to take it. You need to take it. But you can't take the chance that it won't cover your child. That is not the American way. And I know we can do better, and my plan does. And we've got to roll up our sleeves and meet this challenge head on.

Affordability, access, portability -- these are the issues we've got to address. So yesterday in Cleveland, I announced a pioneering plan to do just that: to stabilize costs, ensure access, and free workers from the fear of losing coverage. My plan will preserve what works and reform what doesn't work. It consists of four points -- and I ask you to support this plan and help me make the best system in the world even better.

First, our plan will make health insurance more accessible by making it more affordable for millions of low-to-middle income families. For low-income families, I want a health insurance credit of up to $3,750 a year to help them buy insurance; for middle-income, a tax deduction up to the same amount. Second, we will cut health care costs by making it more efficient. Studies show that the larger the group being insured, the lower the cost per individual. So we will create what we call health insurance networks that help companies band together and cut administrative costs.

And the third point will also lower costs. We must reform medical malpractice litigation. (Applause.) Today we have too many malpractice suits driving up costs for a doctor, a nurse, or a hospital stay. And I might say parenthetically this

malpractice suit is just a symptom of what's happening all across the business spectrum in this country and in the eleemosynary area, like in the little league. We've got too darn many lawsuits out there, very candidly. (Applause.) A recent study found that -- listen to this one -- that in 1989 the cost of defensive medicine, just for physicians' expenditures to be over $20 billion, or nearly 18 percent of their total costs.

I don't want to get into trouble with the Bar Association -- (laughter) -- but I once quoted to someone that line, "An apple a day keeps the doctor away. He says, What works for lawyers?" (Laughter.) But this is a very serious point, and here's what will work for America: Let's spend as much time building a better health system as we do wrestling with our legal system. We'd do better caring for each other if we stop solving problems by suing each other. (Applause.)

And that brings me to point four. We will cut the outrageous growth of federal health programs -- growth, now -- listen carefully to what I've said -- we will cut the growth of health programs like Medicare so that we can protect the benefits. And our reform program will cut costs, ensure choice, and give everyone -- rich or poor, sick or healthy -- access to health care.

And yet there are those who, like an old dog, refuse to learn new tricks. Instead of a better health care system, they demand a nationalized health system. Very candidly, you want to call it what it is, that means a socialized system. Let me tell you straight. I will not allow those people to give American a prescription for failure. I am going to fight against a nationalized socialized medicine approach for this country. (Applause.)

Folks who want national health care are the same people who said that Tony Gwynn would never amount to much of a hitter. (Laughter.) Now, they can't see the future. They think socialized medicine -- everything provided by the government, totally government-controlled medical care -- is just the ticket for health care in America. And what they're not saying is it's also the ticket for treatment waiting lines.

Anyone who's spent months checking the mail for that income tax refund, or tried to track down a missing social security check, or wasted a day in line at the Department of Motor Vehicles is going to think long and hard before they let the government play doctor. (Applause.) Some say nationalized health care would serve everyone. Sure, it would -- yes, just like a restaurant that serves bad food -- but in very generous proportions. (Laughter.)

Look at countries where socialized medicine violates the number one rule of the medical profession: "Do no harm." They can tell you, nationalized health care is a nationalized disaster. And it's true, socialized medicine plans have increased exports to our country. But what are the exports? I'll tell you: patients coming here for prompt surgery and the finest care in the world. Doctors coming here for better working conditions.

And as long as I am President, we are not -- again, I want to repeat it -- we are not going to go down the road of nationalized health care. And nor will we jump from the frying pan into the fire. I oppose the other government-takeover plan. They call it pay or play, where employers are forced either to

accept a health insurance plan or pay a payroll tax and join the government plan.

The play-or-pay choice costs jobs and money. And it reminds of the guy with the gun in your back, who says your money or your life. Jack Benny used to respond by saying, "I'm thinking, I'm thinking." (Laughter.) Well, we'd better think long and hard about a pay-or-play plan that would make us pay, and pay, and pay -- and drive a lot of small businesses out of work, out of business in the first place. And I'm not going to let Congress try to cure America's health care ailments by binding wounds in red tape.

I have proposed a plan that is sensible and really it will work. And I ask you to help, too. One of the best ways is keeping people healthy -- keeping them healthy. So let me talk just a minute about how we must also change the way we act. And in this field I again salute Dr. Sullivan, our Secretary of HHS who's been way out in front of the power curve on this concept. If you'll forgive me for altering an old saying -- Pete used it a minute ago -- "A pound of prevention is worth a ton of cure."

My good friend, Lou -- Dr. Sullivan -- has said, better control of fewer than 10 risk factors could prevent up to 70 percent of premature deaths, one-third of all cases of acute disability and two-thirds of all cases of long-lasting disability, and, yes, many, many AIDS cases. And if you exercise and eat right and don't smoke or abuse drugs and drink less and avoid risky sexual behavior, you live longer. And America will live better. And let's change the behavior that costs society tens of billions -- this is no exaggeration -- tens of billions of dollars in lost earnings and productivity, treatment related programs, accidents and certainly crime.

Maybe I am a little old-fashioned, but I believe personal responsibility has a lot to do with making America a better country. (Applause.) And now let's also act through another prevention measure, immunization. With health care costs stretched to the limit, we can't afford not to immunize our youngest children.

And last June, Secretary Sullivan and I announced our administration's Immunization Initiative. And our goal was simple, to bring immunization to every American child. This effort pays huge dividends. Every $1 spent for immunization now for measles, mumps, and rubella saves an estimated $14 later on.

Consider two facts. Two years ago, measle cases soared to a high of 27,000. In 1989 to '90 alone, measles caused 130 deaths, 60 percent of which were children under five years of age. Because of our Immunization Initiative we now have a national blueprint to bring this needless and tragic story to a speedier end. We're also working on immunization's equivalent of putting a man on the moon -- the one-time, all-in-one vaccine that immunizes a child against all vaccine preventable childhood diseases.

You know, since September of 1991 there's not been a single reported polio case in the Americas. Now, that's an extraordinary immunization accomplishment. We've got to do better. And that's why we've more than tripled the dollars for federal immunization efforts since I took office in 1988 -- '89, January -- (laughter) -- from $98 million to $297 million for 1992. And our work will only be complete when we eradicate these terrible diseases not only from our neighborhoods, but from the world's as well.

Let me tell you a story about a family right here in San Diego. Michael and Barbara Baines had always watched closely over the health of their children. And last year they were preparing for the holidays but they were not prepared for the news -- their two littlest stricken by whooping cough. Thank God, two-and-a-half year old Kensington has now left the hospital and little 18-month old Colleen has stabilized. And as Michael and Barbara prayed they asked that other parents would not make the same mistake. And said Michael, "You can't fight something you can't see. You've got to have them immunized, give them as much protection as you can as early as you can."

It's because of families like the Baines that I put forth this message: We need improved immunization. We also need earlier immunization -- not merely of school-age kids where immunization approaches 100 percent, but of our smallest victims, where a year of wait can be a year too long. Kids need to be completely vaccinated in the first and second years of life. Yet immunization rates at two years of age are only 50 percent in many states and often as low as 10 percent in some of the inner cities. We have to change that and I am determined that we will.

It won't be easy to immunize every child. And yet the government will do its part. And the private sector needs to do its part as well. We need to help it try creative ideas like one-stop shopping for health care, and escorted referral for express lane immunization at the clinics. And finally I ask each of you -- mothers, fathers, spouses, friends -- call your health official or physician. Join groups which encourage childhood immunization. Please, please, make sure your child is immunized.

I have outlined today a reform program to make health care accessible and affordable. It's a program which rejects outright the dead end of government-controlled, of socialized medicine -- a program which will be good medicine for the American economy and the American people. And so please help me take this message to the Congress: "He who has health has hope, and he who has hope has everything." I need your support. I need you to be involved. And let's bring quality health care to every American.

You know, when I was little, I read a quote by Saint Francis of Assisi. "Give me a child until he is seven," he wrote, "and you may have him afterward." Through a better system and better behavior, we can ensure that the future will have our children afterward -- hoping, building, dreaming -- as Americans always have and as Americans always will.

Thank you very, very much and may God bless the United States of America. Thank you. (Applause.)

END 10:43 A.M. PST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Cleveland, Ohio)

For Immediate Release February 6, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE GREATER CLEVELAND GROWTH ASSOCIATION

Stouffer Tower City Plaza Hotel
Cleveland, Ohio

12:36 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much for that welcome back to Cleveland. And first let me thank Dick Pogue, the Chairman of the Greater Cleveland Growth Association, and all who made this wonderful forum possible. I'm pleased to be back here in Cleveland, the capitol city of the North Coast.

Hello to Bob Horton, who I understand not only warmed up the crowd but made it very difficult for me to come on as the next speaker. I salute what he and so many other business leaders in this community have done and are doing. You always get this feeling of cooperation between the business community and the government of Cleveland, the city government. I had that when I first came here and Mayor Ralph Perk was in office -- and particularly, did I get that feeling when George Voinovich came in as your mayor and energized this place to a fare-thee-well, and business pitched right in. And you have this wonderful community spirit that this organization really epitomizes, Dick. And I am grateful to be here.

And so let me get on with just saying I'm very pleased to have been introduced by George Voinovich, the great Governor of this state now. And may I salute Mike DeWine, who is over here, the Lieutenant Governor. We've got some other friends with us, too. I know that Bob Taft is out here, the Secretary of State. Three distinguished members of the United States Congress came with us -- Ralph Regula, Mike Oxley and Dave Hobson. And I'm sure I'll forget somebody, but nevertheless I see our State Senate President Stan Aronoff sitting over here. So that takes care of it. We've got good representation from Ohio's government; we've got representation from the wonderful congressional delegation; and we have outstanding representation here from the medical community and, of course, from the business community at large.

Good things are happening here for the Cleveland Cavs. (Laughter.) In fact, I told the Governor I was going to be speaking today about the number one health issue on every Clevelander's mind. He said, "Mr. President, Mark Price's left knee is just fine." (Laughter.)

People who know northern Ohio know that this region's on the move. In addition to the world-renowned Cleveland Clinic -- now the city's number one employer -- Northern Ohio is also home to some of the most innovative approaches to health care. COSE and Cleveland Health Quality Choice are pioneers. Communities across the country can follow your lead to create workable solutions to health care challenges. And I had a briefing in Washington from the leaders of these organizations and that really is why I've chosen to come to Cleveland this morning to address the health care crisis in our country and lay out my four-point program for comprehensive health care reform.

Reform is urgent for more reasons than one. Right now, far too many Americans are uninsured and those who are insured pay

too much for health care. And we're going to do something about that.

The one thing this crisis isn't about -- and I was reminded of this in my visit to the hospital just now -- the one thing it is not about is the quality of care. American health care is first-rate. It is the best in the entire world. And right now, the vast majority of Americans have access to that health care system. But the cost has skyrocketed: from $74 billion in 1970 to $800 billion today. And if we keep going at the same rate, that $800 billion will double to $1.6 trillion by the year 2000.

These numbers alone would make the case for reform. They tell us there's a connection we simply can't ignore between what we pay for health care and the long-term health of our economy. But cold statistics don't show us the worry that people feel; the all-too-familiar fear about what happens to their health care if they change jobs, or worse still, if they lose their jobs. And in these hard times, we simply cannot accept the fact that one in every seven Americans is uninsured.

There's a better way. And my plan puts the emphasis on expanding access while preserving the choice people now have over the type of health care coverage and health care they receive. My plan will give Americans a greater sense of security -- help ease the fears that so many Americans have that changing jobs will cost them their health coverage. And the key here is portability -- changing the system to ensure people that they will always have access to health insurance no matter where they work. And finally, my plan will cut costs. It helps us make health insurance more affordable, and more affordable means more accessible.

And my plan will preserve what works and reform what doesn't. And above all, it will ensure every American universal access to affordable health insurance.

We stand at a crossroads. We can move forward dramatically to reform our market-based system or we can force ourselves to swallow a cure worse than the disease.

Some people have scribbled out a prescription for disaster. They want to nationalize our health system: put government in control of the system, let government control the prices, let government ration the kind of health care people get, let government tell people looking for care how much they'll get, what kind, and when.

Nationalized systems cover everyone. But keep in mind the drawbacks that come with a nationalized system: long waiting lists for surgery; shortages of high-tech equipment responsible for so many of the miracles of modern medicine. Let me cite just one example for you. The Cleveland Clinic performs 10 coronary bypass surgeries a day, I'm told; high tech, high quality surgery without any wait. But if you live in British Columbia, the wait for coronary bypass surgery is six months. It's no wonder so many people from abroad come to American hospitals for surgery.

When you nationalize health care, you push costs higher, far higher. Some studies estimate that nationalized health care would cost the average American family a huge new tax burden. For the nation, a staggering $250 billion to $500 billion a year in new taxes. Such a massive tax increase is simply unacceptable and the American people should not be asked to accept it. And for that price, you get the worst of both worlds -- no one has an incentive to control costs and everyone pays.

But there are other proposals out there that sound simple, but are every bit as harmful. One's called play or pay. Each employer must play, meaning, provide insurance for employees, or pay a payroll tax to finance government health coverage. Businessmen and women tell me horror stories about health care costs spiralling out of control. Well, play or pay will leave a lot of small businesses -- businesses struggling on the edge of survival right now -- with a tough choice. They can cut workers' wages to pay for mandated health care, they can fire some workers to cover the workers they keep or they can raise prices and pass along the cost to the consumer. Some studies put the cost in jobs lost under play or pay as high as half-a-million or more. Lower wages, lost jobs, higher costs: anyway you look at it, that's the wrong choice for America.

Step away from the rhetoric -- strip it out of there and play or pay just creates a back-door route to nationalized health care. And it encourages employers to stop offering benefits, throw the problem in the government's lap, and dump millions of fully-insured workers into a public plan like Medicaid. And because the new employer taxes in play or pay don't pay for the program, the American taxpayer will obviously foot the bill. And I am not about to let that happen.

You won't hear this from the people pushing play or pay. Ask them about the side effects of their proposal, and they'll say, take two aspirin and call me after the election.

I don't believe people want to be shoveled into some new health care bureaucracy. They want good health. A large part of the answer is prevention. And every one of us can make changes in our behavior to reduce the risk of disease and illness. And pardon me for being just a little bit old-fashioned but what we're talking about is behavior -- drugs, alcohol abuse, risky sexual behavior, you know what I'm talking about. And there's nothing wrong discussing that, trying to do better in this field. Tomorrow, in San Diego, I'll focus in more detail on the ways prevention can help people live healthier lives and help keep our economy healthy, too.

But today, I want to focus on the health care system -- on this comprehensive, market-based reform plan I have. The fact is, we do not have to create a new government bureaucracy to give Americans access to affordable, quality health care. We need a system that delivers, a system that works for America, a system that puts quality care within reach of every American family.

Our system should be built on choice, not central control. It should keep costs down and open up access. But above all, it should allow all Americans to rest secure when it comes to health care, to ease their worry that if they change jobs, if they or their kids develop serious health problems, they'll still be able to count on the coverage they need.

Now, my comprehensive four-point plan meets every one of these common-sense tests. And here's how it works. Point one, we will make health care more accessible by making health insurance more affordable. For low-income individuals and families, I propose a health insurance credit -- up to $3,750 dollars a year to guarantee people, even people too poor to file taxes, the ability to purchase private health insurance. That will give these families a certificate or voucher to be used strictly for health care worth more than $300 dollars a month. They can use it to buy into the plan their employers offer but they could never afford or they can shop for whatever private plan suits them best. That's the American commitment to choice at its best.

For middle-income individuals and families, I propose a health insurance tax deduction of $3,750. American families with incomes under $80,000 will receive new help from either the credit or the tax deduction. Let me tell you what that means -- new help to purchase health insurance for 95 million Americans. And once again, this insurance will be portable -- people who change jobs would have insurance regardless of their health -- and this is important -- or regardless of their family's health.

But best of all, my plan will bring health care coverage to almost 30 million uninsured Americans -- security to people who for far too long have had to do without.

That's the first point in this four-point plan, access. Point two, we will cut the runaway costs of health care by making the system more efficient. Today, I'm asking you to learn a new acronym -- HIN -- Health Insurance Networks. Insurance costs obey the law of large numbers. The larger the group being insured, the lower the cost per individual. Pooling, pooling lowers insurance costs and significantly cuts administrative costs. HIN s will provide incentives for small companies to do what Cleveland's COSE group has done, when it brought 10,000 small businesses together to make a joint purchase of health care. The nation should listen and follow.

Another way to drive costs down, make everyone a better health care consumer. Right now, most people pay more attention to the price of toothpaste than the comparative costs of health care. People don't waste much time thinking about the costs of their care but in the end, we all pay the price.

We need to follow the lead of initiatives like Cleveland Health Quality Choice -- programs that give people shopping for health care a kind of blue book for medical costs. Innovations like these will help all of us keep the costs of quality health care as low as possible.

Point Three, we will wring out waste and excess in the present system. We've targeted medical malpractice for reform. It is time to put an end to these astronomical, sky's-the-limit lawsuits. You shouldn't have to pay a lawyer when you go to the doctor. (Applause.)

And our doctors, the most able and dedicated in the world, shouldn't be living in fear of these outrageous lawsuits. And high malpractice premiums mean higher doctors' bills, higher hospital costs, costs passed along not only to the patient, but to every American taxpayer.

Now, I have challenged the health insurance industry to cut red tape, to share common forms, to simplify and speed up claims processing. And here's a challenge for the next four years -- there is no reason almost all health insurance claims can't be processed electronically. That single step would eliminate a mountain of health care paperwork and pare back costs. We've got to attack the excesses of mandated benefits. When states now order health insurers to cover 1,000 different types of treatment, something's gone wrong. -- covering manicures for Millie. It's gone too far. And I think everybody knows it and we should challenge the states to do something about the excessive mandates that shoot these costs right up through the roof.

Fourth and finally, we will get the growth in government health programs under control. Right now, government health care programs can claim a dubious distinction, they are the fastest growing parts in the federal budget. For those of you interested in history, go back and listen to what was said about these programs at their inception. Go back and hear the rhetoric on the floor of the United States Congress. And now compare that to what actually happened to the costs. This year alone -- this year alone, let me

repeat that -- Medicaid costs will increase by 38 percent. We will not, repeat, not cut benefits. We can make real savings simply by reducing this huge rate of increase. We must bring runaway costs under control. Smart, sensible efficiencies will help our reform plan pay for itself.

The federal government should also give states the flexibility to design these new universal access programs for the poor -- programs that will provide quality services to all their citizens. I've just met with Governor Voinovich and the rest of the governors. Regardless of party, Democrat or Republican it doesn't matter, they want flexibility. And we must give it to them. Right here in Ohio, your Governor has proposed health care reforms that will do for this state what we want to do on the federal level. States should be able to use new federal resources to design programs that work -- not some one-size-fits-all solution imposed by Washington.

Providing affordable care, efficient care, wringing out excess and waste and controlling federal growth. These four points will create the kind of market-based reform plan that will give Americans the kind of health care they want and deserve and put an end to the worry that keeps them awake at night.

Remember what people want. People want quality care, care they can afford and care they can count on, care they can rely on. I keep coming back to what works for this country. Think about the challenges we face as a nation. Anyone who is concerned about competitiveness has to see controlling health care costs as key to a healthy economy. We've got to make certain our reform corrects our weaknesses without destroying our strengths. When we talk about health care, we're talking about matters of the most personal nature -- in some cases, literally, life and death and decisions that go with it. We don't need to put government between patients and their doctors. We don't need to create another wasteful federal bureaucracy. As President I simply will not let that happen.

We need common sense, comprehensive health care reform and we need it now. And my plan I really believe is the right plan -- a plan that meets our obligation to all Americans by putting hope and health within their reach.

Cleveland has led the way. Your hospitals, COSE, citizens in this community way out front for these principles. And it's most appropriate that I give this speech to the nation on health care reform right here in this city that is leading the way.

Once again, my thanks for this warm Cleveland welcome. May God bless you all, and the United States of America. Thank you very, very much. (Applause.)

END 1:00 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release February 3, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN MEETING WITH THE NATION'S GOVERNORS

The East Room

11:15 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: I hate to interrupt your former colleague and now mine, Bob Martinez. I heard a little of that, and I think there is some room for optimism, but I also think, when John said, well, we've got a long way to go. I want to just make some opening comments about the overall policies I spoke about the other night. And then I understand we'll have a Q&A session which I hope will be statements and positions from you as well as inquiry of me. I've learned from these sessions. But let me just make some remarks on where we are in our overall economy.

I salute the members of the Cabinet that are here, but especially our visiting governors. It seems that everyone in this country agrees on two things: first, that we need to get the economy moving, and second, that our people are up to the challenge of remaining number one in the world. I do not believe for a minute this is a country in decline. If you doubt it, go talk to any single world leader.

Last Tuesday, I really made a challenge to the Congress to pass what I feel is a common-sense growth package and do it by March 20th, and pass a long-term series of growth initiatives without delay. So we have to provide a short term and long term.

The package relies on some common-sense objectives. It encourages investment. It protects the value of basic investments, like a home. And it does not raise federal taxes. It does not increase the federal deficit. And it doesn't employ short-term gimmicks that create long-term trouble.

Now, we all know the political process, particularly people sitting around this table. And you know that in an election year of this magnitude, bipartisan goodwill is in basic short supply. But we really cannot afford politics as usual. I think we have a realistic window here of opportunity to make -- a chance to make real progress and to do it now. And maybe I'm a little optimistic on this one, but I do sense that members on both sides of the aisle on Capitol Hill want action now. I've watched it and listened to the debate in the last few days, and that's my feeling.

Inflation and long-term interest rates are at their lowest level in two decades. That's good in terms of the recovery that inevitably is going to ensue. And I think more and more we're beginning to hear people say this sluggish economy is turning around. And certainly the American people are ready for action.

John Kennedy once wrote, "Any system of government will work when everything is going well. It's the system that functions in the pinches that survives." Well, it's pinch time. And I have proposed a way in which all of us can rise to the occasion.

In the State of the Union address, I outlined a short-term growth package that does take care of the essentials. And it encourages investment which allows us to expand businesses and create new ones. And I'm talking here mainly about creation of new small business. It strengthens the real estate industry, which historically has led us out of recessions in troubled times. And it encourages risk-taking and investment by cutting the tax on long-term capital gains and by some other stimulative procedures. It also reforms government. We're going after a bunch of pork-barrel projects. It holds the line on spending while moving money out of unnecessary programs and into vital ones.

And here's what I think it means for you: A 13-percent increase in money available for highway funding; a 158-percent increase from last year in land and water conservation fund grants; record amounts for education, a 15-percent increase from last year; and a 27-percent increase in Head Start -- these proposals will make every four-year-old eligible for Head Start, every one.

I believe the budget puts the money where it does the most good.

Now, some complain, clearly, that it doesn't do much. I am proud of what it does. It lays out a blueprint for growth. And for some of the things it doesn't do deserve some credit. It does not violate the budget agreement, which is the only constraint in existence on discretionary federal spending. And it doesn't raise taxes. And I think the program will work. And so while you're here, my pitch would be to visit the congressional delegations and urge them to move by March 20th. I really believe that deadline should be met.

Just a word about the long-term proposals. If you think back to this moment -- think of this moment in history, after the Cold War, right in the middle of the information revolution where we are, something becomes crystal clear. We've got to retool America to meet the challenges of a new age. And that's an age of international competition. Cold War policies just simply are not going to get the job done.

Now, businesses have begun retooling for competition in the world economy. State governments have adopted innovations that let them provide better services for less money. And I believe that it's time the federal government becomes part of that solution, too. So let's start with one long-term goal that will make a huge difference in your lives.

For years and years we in Washington have talked about cutting the deficit. And I really believe we must get that deficit under control. The federal government is too big and it spends too much. And what that leads you to then is real budget discipline. And the long-term plan and the short-term plan provide that discipline. And I simply cannot let the Congress bust the spending caps that now exist.

I want the Congress to do what I believe you want, transcending party lines, and that is to stop showering the states with these mandates -- unfunded mandates. For businesses or for states, mandated programs and benefits too often mean mandated deficits. And I've told Congress if you pass mandates onto the states, pay for them and don't do it by raising taxes on all the Americans -- on the American people.

I want Congress to give me something that you have. I'm not naive about this, but I'd like to have that line-item veto. And I understand the legislature's urge to please a constituent by putting something in the budget -- I was there. I was a member of this Congress -- a Congress. And I also know that that practice of

bending to the constituents' will on every project enrages taxpayers across the country -- as well it should. So I will keep repeating that a line-item veto lets a president or a governor say something that's very hard to say, and that is, no.

I want the Congress to let the states supply their own resources to important social programs, apply their imaginations. And too often we have this one-size-fits-all blueprint that just doesn't fit outside of here, outside of this beltway.

Jefferson called the states laboratories. We referred to that at the summit -- educational summit. Well, it's time we let the states do this R&D, get going on innovation. And I want to give state and local governments greater flexibility in administering services. And that's why we propose a revised $14.6 billion block grant. And that grant will provide the states with needed flexibility to administer education and health and social services and the drug program, some of which I guess Bob Martinez was talking about.

I want to focus the federal policy on crucial issues like welfare reform. And the key to that lies in one real simple word, and that is responsibility. Now, many states are in the innovation business, beginning to reform welfare with that responsibility. And they believe that when healthy adults receive government assistance, they have responsibilities to the American taxpayers who fund them -- seeking work, learn fair or education, job training.

I see Tommy Thompson -- I had a long talk with him not just about the experience in Wisconsin, but about what other states are doing in these areas. And we support that innovation. Clearly, we have responsibility to those in the social safety net. And we have a responsibility to ensure that welfare is a temporary net, not a guaranteed lifestyle.

So we're going to do what we can to help reform the systems. That leads us to waivers. If you need a waiver of federal regulations to reform, we'll get you a waiver as quickly as we can. And I want the federal government at another point to redouble our efforts for the most fundamental building block of a home, a school, a neighborhood, a city, our nation -- and I'm talking about the family.

Several weeks ago -- I mentioned this in making the State of the Union -- a group came in from the National League of Cities -- Democrats, Republicans, large cities, small cities -- urging me to appoint this Commission on the Urban Family. The decline and disintegration of the family was at the very heart of the problems that they spelled out. And it was without exception, they agreed on this unanimously. And, of course, I'm very grateful to Governor Ashcroft and the former Mayor of Dallas Annette Strauss, who agreed to lead this commission.

I believe our plan looks at the fundamentals. It gives much-needed support to those raising families by increasing that personal exemption on the federal income tax by $500 per child. I wish it could be more, but that's all that can fit into this budget that will not bust the ceilings. That's all we can afford right now.

We give families a greater stake in health care and education. And it proposes IRA reforms and tax changes that help people pay for these basics.

A final issue, and one where you all have literally starred in an exemplary bipartisan manner, and that's education. The governors have helped unleash a long-overdue and much-needed revolution in education. And I want to commend the works of Governor

Romer and Governor Campbell on that report of the National Council on the Standards and Testing.

The Senate has indicated unanimous support for the recommendations and our new budget injects new funds for research, statistics and assessment funding that would be used to help implement these recommendations.

So now we must take the work that we began together and take it further. And we must revolutionize these American schools. I don't know if Lamar has had a chance to bring you up to date, but clearly, I hope you will ask him where it stands if he hasn't.

I'd like to urge you to help me send this message to Congress, to literally join in this revolutionary crusade for American education and to pass the strategy, pass the America 2000 strategy. We have got to give every child full and fair opportunity to learn. We believe educational choice is the way, the clear way to help do that. Choice serves as a cornerstone in our America 2000 program. Thirty states have already embraced America 2000. And we can assure just around this table that every state joins the march, that every community becomes an America 2000 community, that every kid is prepared for the competitive world of the 21st century.

So our education revolution, and I use the term "our" advisedly. Governor Nelson chided me last night because I said "my" educational program. I was taken that up to Congress because, very candidly, they have a different approach there. But I accept that because it is "our" educational program. And that revolution is ours. It started in Charlottesville more than two years ago. It shows what can be done when we lay down our partisan swords in service to a higher cause. And I hope that you all will serve as an example, an inspiration for all of us in Washington during the next six weeks.

In sum, I don't want a partisan fight over our education program or, indeed, over this growth package. And I really want us to do what's right. And my eyes are open in terms of the partisan political year. But, again, we have this time frame now in which we can lay aside our partisan ambitions and get something done for this country, both in the educational field and in terms of growth.

So I guess the bottom line is I need your help. I'd like to ask for your help to talk to the Congress about these initiatives. And certainly I would solicit your -- earnestly solicit your help to see us move this country forward to try to revolutionize education for the generations coming.

Thank you all very much. In just a second we will be alone and able to take a few -- hear a few suggestions or answer a few questions. (Applause.)

GOVERNOR ROMER: Mr. President, let me just begin by thanking you for your firm and steadfast leadership in the world during this time of rapid change. We're grateful for your budget initiatives to stimulate economic growth. And your partnership with governors is a significant one in federal-state relations, especially in the city, that this -- we appreciate the fact that you think of us as partners.

Especially we appreciate the opportunity of working with you in national education goals, child care legislation, and increased funding for Head Start.

Could I ask the press not to leave yet?

For clean air legislation, the U.S.-Canada trade treaty and national transportation legislation, all of those things. We're

here today to say to you that we appreciate your cooperation and pledge our cooperation with you as we share this opportunity to bring America into the 21st century.

Excuse me, we need a new format here. I come as a part of a nonpartisan organization in GA. I'm the incoming chairman and I think there are a lot of things that we need to discuss with the administration. And unfortunately this format is not a good one it's kind of structured, they're assigned questions. But there are things --

THE PRESIDENT: Ask me anything you want.

Q But I think that there are things that we do have a bipartisan program on and there are some things that we honestly differ, Mr. President. And I before the press left wanted to say that on the main issue that is on your mind and that is the economic recovery program and the budget I think that there are some very feelings about that issue from governors. And I think that we hopefully can arrive at a bipartisan answer to it.

However, there are a couple points that you made that I think have partisan implications. And I just, frankly, want to answer them before the press leaves the room and it is in reference to your budget proposal. I also want to get gimmicks out of that budget. I don't think they're out yet. I think there's a $12 billion gimmick, which is an astrict which was not yet identified as to where the money is going to come from. And I think there is a $28 billion dollar gimmick in there in terms of a cruel accounting of anticipating things of the future.

Now, I want this to be settled if we can by honestly working through the options. But I honestly believe that we ought not pose this meeting with the governors of how can we as governors help you go to Congress and convince them that your approach alone is the only approach. I think there are other approaches and we ought to as governors recognize that and to say together that we need to take these differences and work at them.

Positively, I just hope that whatever solution we come by, if we do not in the short-term solutions dig ourselves holes where we do not have long-term economic growth available to us. And I just wanted to lay out that issue because it was an honest issue among some Democratic governors that we want to communicate to you that we're concerned about the budget that you've laid out. We're concerned that it does not provide the revenue to do what is anticipated there and we're concerned that some of those may end up on our backs, particularly, the $12 billion undesignated source.

THE PRESIDENT: But if it doesn't provide the revenue are you all suggesting a tax increase now at the federal level?

Q Well, I think that the approach that many Democratic governors are taking is the following: That we ought to take the peace dividend, whatever size it is $50 to $100 billion over five years and have it directed toward economic stimulation of the country. Secondly, that we ought to take the issue of tax fairness and adjust it between the middle-class and those in the upper brackets as Congress and you may jointly decide. But I think that I'm worried about trying to take the peace dividend and to make the economic tax adjustments that you suggested with figures in the budget that I do not yet believe balance.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me get to the defense budget. Is it the Democratic governors taken a position that it ought to be a $100 billion of defense cut? I have said to the nation I think it ought to be $50 and the joint chiefs of staff think it ought to be $50 and I have a responsibility to the national security and to

foreign policy. And in my view, $50 billion based on recommendations from the joint chiefs and from the Secretary of Defense is right.

Now, are we saying -- we're getting to specifics here. Do you want it to be $100 billion and if so what bases do you want to close? What areas do you want to shut down? What weapon systems do you want to knock off right now? Where do you want to lay off the people? We've got a program. We're testifying on it everyday.

Now, I'd like to know what your suggestion is specifically, while we have the press here?

Excuse me, we need a new format here. I come as a part of a nonpartisan organization in NGA. I'm the incoming chairman, and I think there are a lot of things that we need to discuss with the administration. And unfortunately, this format is not a good one; it's kind of structured, there are assigned questions. But there are --

THE PRESIDENT: Ask me anything you want.

GOVERNOR ROMER: But I think that there are things that we do have a bipartisan program on and there are some things that we honestly differ, Mr. President. And I, before the press left, wanted to say that on the main issue that is on your mind, and that is the economic recovery program and the budget, I think that there are some very strong feelings about that issue from governors. And I think that we, hopefully, can arrive at a bipartisan answer to it.

However, there are a couple points that you made that I think have partisan implications. And I just, frankly, want to answer them before the press leaves the room, and it is in reference to your budget proposal. I also want to get gimmicks out of that budget. I don't think they're out yet. I think there's a $12-billion gimmick, which is an asterisk which is not yet identified as to where the money is going to come from. And I think there is a $28-million gimmick in there in terms of a accrual accounting of anticipating things in the future.

Now, I want this to be settled, if we can, by honestly working through the options. But I honestly believe that we ought not pose this meeting with the governors of how can we as governors help you go to Congress and convince them that your approach alone is the only approach. I think there are other approaches and we ought to, as governors, recognize that and to say together that we need to take these differences and work at them.

Positively, I just hope that whatever solution we come by, that we do not, in the short-term solutions, dig ourselves holes where we do not have long-term economic growth available to us. And I just wanted to lay out that issue because it was an honest issue among some Democratic governors that we want to communicate to you that we're concerned about the budget that you've laid out. We're concerned that it does not provide the revenue to do what is anticipated there, and we're concerned that some of those may end up on our backs, particularly, the $12-billion undesignated source.

THE PRESIDENT: But if it doesn't provide the revenue, are you all suggesting a tax increase now at the federal level?

GOVERNOR ROMER: Well, I think that the approach that many Democratic governors are taking is the following: That we ought to take the peace dividend, whatever size it is -- $50 billion to $100 billion over five years -- and have it directed toward economic stimulation of the country. Secondly, that we ought to take the issue of tax fairness and adjust it between the middle class and those in the upper brackets as Congress and you may jointly decide. But I think that -- I'm worried about trying to take the peace

dividend and to make the economic tax adjustments that you suggested with figures in the budget that I do not yet believe balance.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me get to the defense budget. Is it the Democratic governors taken a position that it ought to be a $100-billion defense cut? I have said to the nation I think it ought to be $50 billion and the Joint Chiefs of Staff think it ought to be $50 billion. And I have a responsibility to the national security and to foreign policy. And in my view, $50 billion, based on recommendations from the Joint Chiefs and from the Secretary of Defense, is right.

Now, are we saying -- we're getting to specifics here. Do you want it to be $100 billion, and if so, what bases do you want to close? What areas do you want to shut down? What weapon systems do you want to knock off right now? Where do you want to lay off the people? We've got a program. We're testifying on it every day. Now, I'd like to know what your suggestion is specifically, while we have the press here.

GOVERNOR ROMER: Let me answer that. The reason I got into this is that I recognized in your presentation and before the press was to leave was an identification of these governors to go to Congress and argue for the budget message that you made. And I simply am trying to say there is an alternative point of view that ought to be put on the table. And that alternate point of view is, first of all, in the size of the military peace dividend --

THE PRESIDENT: Right.

Q -- there is a debate over whether it's $50 billion or $100 billion. And I don't know the answer to that because I don't sit in the halls of Congress. But I think that debate ought to go forward. Secondly, there is a debate as to whether or not the tax structure is fair and that debate ought to go forward. And I think that the governors ought to be able to participate in both parties in that debate and --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let's discuss it. What do you think we ought to do? What level do we have of defense spending? We're testifying every single day for the details of this program. But if you've met and you want to say something in front of the press about -- I ask you to be specific with me. I think that's the way we ought to approach it.

GOVERNOR ROMER: Well, the specificS that I'm really concerned about, about the budget -- and I'll be detailed about it -- is there's a $12-billion asterisk that I think hangs over the head of governors because it may be state programs that are cut. There is accounting -- accrual accounting in future receipts that concern me. There are implications of tax revenues loss in the IRA treatment in years ahead that may produce additional deficit. And in the course of the two days that I have been in town, I find that there is a considerable point of view, at least among some Democratic governors, as to what that's going to mean in terms of how we settle on the economic recovery package.

Now, Mr. President, I'll, frankly, trying not to make this any more partisan. I'm just saying that I want to have an opportunity that we can come to the table, we as governors on both parties, have this discussion in detail so that whatever this economic package is, it's going to fit with the states when we get it passed.

THE PRESIDENT: I think, you will recall, at the opening of my remarks, I invited that kind of suggestion. Now, inasmuch as you raised a couple of specifics, I think you're entitled to an

answer. And I'd like Dick Darman who has testified to respond to those two points.

DIRECTOR DARMAN: Thank you, Mr. President.

The accrual accounting point is really quite arcane. But for those who are aware of the issue to which the Governor referred, let me clarify a couple of things. First of all, the budget numbers that we published and the deficit numbers we published do not -- do not -- include the effect of the accrual reforms. In other words, the number that -- it's an unattractive number for Fiscal Year '92, which we published -- $399.4-billion estimated deficit with our program does include the effect of the accrual accounting reform we recommend. Point one. In other words, the premise is wrong.

Second, the accrual reforms which we proposed, we proposed in June of last year before the growth package. They are independently desirable. We were asked by the Congress to make a recommendation. We made that recommendation. The Congressional Budget Office was also asked. They made the same recommendation, that insurance programs should be subject to accrual accounting.

The independent -- two different independent accounting organizations, outside CPAs made the identical recommendations. And, in fact, many states followed the same approach and are ahead of the federal government. Some have argued that had we had accrual accounting in the past, we would have seen the adverse effect of the S&L crisis in advance and it would have taken the appropriate preventive action in advance.

So I think that that point is not quite apt as a criticism. In fact, it's a useful reform we're recommending, but it is not used in the deficit numbers that we published at the lead of the budget.

On the IRA scoring issue, again I'm afraid there's a little bit of confusion. We actually scored the IRA proposal as losing money. But we, nonetheless, propose it because we think it has a favorable long-term effect on growth. There are some in Congress who have proposed IRA reforms which they score positively. We did not adopt those. We adopted -- and it explicitly over five years shows revenue losses, small gain in the first two years, substantial decline in the third, fourth and fifth year, with the declines increasing in exactly the manner you suggested, Governor Romer, but we did it above board and we financed it.

On the point about the asterisk -- sorry for going on so long, Mr. President, this is all rather arcane -- I believe -- this one is extremely technical. I believe what you're referring to shows up in Fiscal Year '94 and '95. And it's the only thing that I can think of that would qualify as related to the numbers you've mentioned.

What we have done is we have proposed a budget authority freeze -- Fiscal Year '93 relative to '92. Every single program cut fully identified above board, with every program termination fully identified, and with all the increases identified. That's what the law asks us to do. That's all we have to do in the federal elimination process -- one year.

For the outyears we extended the budget authority three forward, '94 - '5, '6, '7. The outlays that are associated with that you can't know at this stage, you don't know until the Congress has made the decisions on Fiscal Year '93. And you have to assume an outlay ratio. We did, but they've hit the cap. So we made an allowance adjustment to make it consistent with the law on the

outyears at the same time as we proposed to amend the caps to make it conform correctly.

But none of that has effect on the actual appropriations process. For the appropriations process for this year every single line, every project, every proposal is specified in detail -- there is no magic asterisk.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: While the press is here, did the Democratic governors meet and is there any feeling that we shouldn't press to try to get something done by March 20th? Is there a spokesman on that point? Because what I would like to suggest, not that you have to sign every "t" and "i" but that we all urge Congress to move by that date. If that date isn't good, what date? Is there feeling on that one?

GOVERNOR RICHARDS: I don't believe, Mr. President, that there was any question that the Democratic governors as well as the Republican governors are anxious to have Congress move expeditiously. There was no discussion of a magic date, but I suspect that the Congress is going to move very quickly, not only because we're going to urge them to do that because it's the right thing to do, but because we are very cognizant that it is an election year. It is time for Congress to get its budget proposals out there.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think most agree, people in the country agree that it can move. It moved very fast on, and properly so, on these extended benefits, and I think it can. And I just hope that that's an area that we can have common -- make common ground here because it's important.

While the press are here, are there any other -- Jim, yes.

GOVERNOR FLORIO: Mr. President, I'm authorized to ask a question that I think is on the minds of many of the governors. As we try to put together our budget problems, there are two areas that sort of jump out that are extremely difficult for us to deal with. One is health care in general, Medicaid in particular. And the other is the welfare situation that you've talked about.

We are all trying to, in the best federalistic tradition, frame our own packages to be able to be cost-effective and we are doing it -- at least some of us are doing it in ways that are not, policy-wise, universally afforded; it is tough. I was pleased to hear in your State of the Union message the discussion about waivers, and today again I was very pleased.

I guess what I would urge, and I think I urge it on behalf of everyone, is that the departments, particularly Health and Human Services and, of course, OMB -- which gray eminence -- which always plays a particular role here -- look at these waiver requests with the -- I'm hesitant to use the word -- the most liberal interpretation capable in order to let us put these programs into play in the way that we think our localities will be able to deal with them.

And then, and most importantly, expeditious. There has to be some review of these things quickly as opposed to -- and I was talking with the Governor of Massachusetts who was lamenting the fact that it took a year for something that he has an interest in. So that if there's a way that you can, in accordance with what you've expressed already, communicate directly with some of your folks that this is a high priority, it would help us; I suspect it would help the nation. And I just want to lay that out as a very important initiative that the administration can take.

THE PRESIDENT: I think we've got agreement on that one. And I can assure you that's what we will be trying to do. I hope it doesn't require -- we were just talking about this when I was talking to the Director before coming over here -- as to whether legislative changes are essential in any of this waivering and waiving of authority and control. And I gather we can do a lot without that.

But, Dick, do you want to address yourself to that one?

DIRECTOR DARMAN: Only to say, Mr. President, that this is one where I do think we are in complete agreement and are anxious to make sure that the waiver process moves more quickly and also that, in applying it, we're more flexible than we have been in the past -- both of which I think have been subjects of legitimate complaint by the governors. That is that we've been too slow and that we've been too, if you'll pardon the word, illiberal. So I would think under the President's direction you'll see a visible and discernible and prompt change on this subject.

GOVERNOR: I'd just like to ask a more particular follow-up question after the President of the Office of Management and Budget, and that is, can that be interpreted to go into the provider payment in which the OMB had a contrary position that was more limiting on states just several months ago and has worked out a temporary compromise, I believe, with the Congress? Can we interpret that with that type of philosophy that we will be able to utilize that in the -- that's something that affects our budget of potentially $25 million. Some other states a couple of hundred million. And that's the type of interpretation I think that has caused us some concern.

DIRECTOR DARMAN: Are you referring to the Medicaid agreements we reached -- excuse me, Mr. President, may I?

THE PRESIDENT: No, please.

DIRECTOR DARMAN: The Medicaid agreement we reached at the tail end of the Congress and then legislated? We propose to honor that 100 percent notwithstanding the interest in reforming the health system -- and some have advocated going back at disproportionate share and other things and reopening that agreement. We propose to stick with that agreement, honor it and live within it. It, I think, is a stable and mutually agreeable place to move forward.

THE PRESIDENT: Any others?

GOVERNOR THOMPSON: Mr. President, let me compliment you on your leadership as trying to get through GATT -- If we're going to get our economy moving it's got to be done with a lot of exports. I was wondering if you could give us an update as to how the GATT is proceeding as well as NAFTA, which is very important to states such as Wisconsin and Texas. And I want to compliment you on your leadership --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, NAFTA, as you know, is getting a little caught up in politics. We are not going to take a bad agreement to the Congress. We are going to push for a North American free trade agreement. I talked to the Prime MInister of Canada yesterday on it; been in touch with Salinas of Mexico, who's doing a superb job down there. And I've told them we are not going to pull back one inch, politics or no politics.

This expands job opportunity for Americans. And the argument that it takes American jobs away is just not true. Just in recent history, the exports to Mexico have dramatically gone up and that's very, very good for American jobs. So on that one, we're

pressing forward. I'm going to try to set aside any political timetable on it, but move it to completion.

We are being fought by the unions strong. They are wrong and those of us who believe in expanding markets and in a more prosperous Mexico is good for the United States -- whether it's their ability to do something about their environment, or whether it's their ability to buy more American goods, that's sensible trade policy. So we're going to press for it. Whether we'll get it, Governor Thompson, in time or not, I don't know.

The GATT, which in a sense is broader because it puts us in -- gives us problems in Europe, is extraordinarily difficult. The major stumbling block is still agriculture. It is not the only stumbling block. I had a chance to visit with President Mitterrand up at the United Nations on Friday. We've agreed to talk again in a bilateral meeting on this subject. The Germans are involved and they tell me they're trying to be helpful. But I don't want to misrepresent it to the governors, we still have some big problems on bringing this one to conclusion.

And it is essential that it get done because if it doesn't get done, what we're going to do is see the world start dividing up into trading blocs. There's one out in Asia that makes some sense: the ASEAN bloc. But if you add to that Japan and try to make a Pacific trading bloc, that would not be good for free trade worldwide. I, similarly, went to great ends to tell them that the NAFTA, the free trade agreement, was not an effort on the part of this hemisphere to divide into a trading bloc. And I think I've made that point, I hope convincingly, to the EC and to the Europe.

But it is important we get that deal done and get it done so the Congress can approve it. We're not going to take a bad deal up there. It isn't simply agriculture. We've got intellectual property rights, we have market access, we have some other ingredients, but we've got good people working this problem. There's Ed Madigan here today -- he's handling the agriculture end and can expand on that. But Carla Hills, doing a superb job. It isn't easy right now, because it's much more European politics than it is U.S. at this time. Because the common agricultural policy there is highly -- one of high subsidization.

And the last thing I'd say, for those who are doubtful about it or unclear, the best way to help countries that need help the most is through a successful conclusion of the GATT Round. The Third World countries would benefit there more than any others.

But, Ed, do you want to add a word to that? Because I know a lot of people around this table are vitally interested in the agricultural component of this.

SECRETARY MADIGAN: Mr. President, the Director General of GATT, Arthur Dunkel, has made a proposal for the solution to the Round and that proposal is regarded by the United States as being a very acceptable framework for bringing the negotiations to a close. And as you point out, the Europeans will not accept it. So Mr. Dunkel has begun meeting unilaterally with the Europeans this week to see if he can work out something with them that he would then propose to the rest of us. We don't know the status of those talks at this point.

GOVERNOR WILSON: This is coming back on Jim Florio's point. I think that there should not have been a governor listening to the State of the Union who didn't cheer. And you have made the point that you did and that you repeated this morning about labor -- if there should be bipartisanship on anything, at least among the governors, it's on that point. I can't think of a governor here who has not at some point or another given voice to the complaint that we

are being compelled to spend state taxes in accordance not with our own priorities, but really with the agenda of the congressional committee chair. And it does distort priorities, it does distort our spending, not just at the state level but I would suggest that most of the distortion is linked to federal spending.

And so I would say that we have reason to be not only grateful but also, as we seek the waivers, I think we're all well aware that the waiver is temporary relief. God knows we're grateful for it and we are very grateful for the speedy action that you're bringing about.

The real answer is that Congress passed these laws and Congress should repeal them. And I think we ought to help one another. I think, frankly, that those of us who have complained so loud and long have an obligation to ourselves as well as to you, not only to federal taxpayers but to those common constituents who are state taxpayers as well, to go up there and really start changing the laws. Now, that's going to be hard to do because committee chairmen enjoy the power of the purse. They love that generalized prescription.

But this may not be the perfect season in which to do it, but after your reelection, to venture a partisan comment, we ought to go up there, bipartisan, and say to these committee chairmen, we've had enough, you are distorting the whole process.

THE PRESIDENT: Would it be possible to get agreement amongst Democrat and Republican governors as what legislative changes would be enacted, whether we could get together on that, whether the Governors Association might get together and suggest legislative changes? Because if that came up there in a bipartisan way I believe it would make a tremendous impact on Congress -- far better than, say, the administration taking it up with the backing of some governors.

GOVERNOR ROMER: I think that there is the possibility for us to do some bipartisan work in that area and I think it would be very helpful for us to sort that out. And, Mr. President, I appreciate this conversation. This is what I was hoping that we could do, is to identify those things where we bipartisanly really can go together, but also to identify that there are some times and some places in an election year that we do have differences. And I appreciate your giving us the opportunity to raise these differences this morning.

And the reason I did it in an abrupt way I just did not want us to be in the posture of endorsing only the one economic approach which was in your State of the Union message. There is more than one and I appreciate you giving us the opportunity to expound that this morning.

THE PRESIDENT: All I was doing was appealing for an endorsement, not suggesting you endorse it -- (laughter) -- I've known you too long.

GOVERNOR BRANSTAD: Mr. President, first of all, I want to thank you for your assistance in trying to open some markets for us. Something that was done two years ago, opening the market for beef in Japan, is really making a difference in my state. And I heard -- (inaudible) -- say recently that 80 percent of the new jobs created last year were as a result of exports. We can't afford to go into protectionism. We have to continue to fight for access to those markets. And I just want to encourage you to continue to lead that effort for access.

We're being discriminated against in the European Community because of the hormone issue, which is a false issue to

many -- and we need to continue that. And I know that's a stickler -- that's an issue in the GATT negotiations, but I just want to encourage you to continue to take a strong stand on that. It's very important to us, especially in agriculture. Given an opportunity to compete in a fair playing field, we can compete in the world.

THE PRESIDENT: You want to respond, Ed?

SECRETARY MADIGAN: I think, Mr. President, in the Dunkel text, the standards on sanitary and phytosanitary issues have been well-regarded by the wheat producers in the United States because they would deal with that hormone issue in Europe. That's one of the things that all of our producers seem to like about the Dunkel text.

THE PRESIDENT: Governor Sinner had his hand up.

GOVERNOR SINNER: In this whole area of trade I get very nervous about us putting ourselves in a continual, vulnerable position on energy. I can see why other countries have the same feeling about food. You and I had a long talk about energy when you were Vice President and had been over to the Middle East. And I remember then that you shared my concerns that we sit here totally vulnerable to a Middle East tyranny. And I want the free trade, but I think when you get into the area of energy and food, we have to understand that the people of Europe have been hungry and they aren't going to forget that. And we have been through a horrible war, $100 billion we spent, a couple hundred thousand people dead to protect our energy resources. I want to say that I think we have to be extremely careful and not euphemize free trade as though there weren't some other considerations because it is not magic, it's not in the Constitution -- what we are bound to do here is protect the people's needs.

The second thing, you asked a while ago if any of us were for tax increases. And I don't speak to anybody but myself. But my children and your children and the children of all the people around here are going to face one hell of a debt. And I for one say my answer to your question, yes, I would favor that. I think it's time we go back and tax some of the wealthy people. I'm not super-wealthy, but what I pay in income taxes isn't very much really, compared to what people in low income brackets pay. I think you could tax the wealthy a lot more.

And the fact is if we continue into this sewer of debt our children and the families that are suffering today, that's nothing compared to what the families of tomorrow will suffer. So I just want you to know that I for one would stand up and say, yes, I do think we should raise taxes.

THE PRESIDENT: My problem on that is that the percentage of the GDP, GNP taken by taxes is inching up and it's too high. But anyway, we have a difference on that one.

I don't think we've got a difference on energy. I do not see any -- one, you and I do agree, I think, that there is a risk in becoming ever more dependent on foreign oil in this country. And one of the reasons I strongly support the ANWR is because, one, I think it's environmentally compatible and secondly, most importantly, I think that offers us a chance to at least turn around this increasing dependence on foreign oil.

And I think it's about time that we make that case, for those of us, Democrat or Republican, who believes in our national energy strategy as outlined, we ought to fight for it. So I don't think we have a difference. And what I'm getting at, though, is I don't think that there's anything in these free trade agreements that is going to adversely affect development of domestic energy. I just

don't believe that there's anything -- if we've got a NAFTA or we've got a good GATT agreement, that either one of those would make us more dependent on foreign oil at all. I don't see the connection on that one; maybe I've missed it. But I certainly don't want to see us become more dependent on it and I don't think we have to.

GOVERNOR SINNER: -- that free trade will somehow or other -- totally dependent on something called free trade amenities. That's the point I wanted to make.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, unfortunately, we're becoming because of failure to move forward with safe nuclear power, which I think we can do -- we'll get a lively debate on that one around this table, I'm sure -- or getting more technology going. I think we've got a problem on energy dependence and I'd like to see it reverse. And that's we've tried to do in our National Energy Strategy, which we have not gotten through the Congress. Again, I'd make an appeal for you people that are interested in the energy side of things to take a look at it and support it where you can. I see Jim over there, who's done a superb job on our overall energy requirements, trying to make us less dependent.

I cannot certify that our program -- and, Jim, correct me -- will make us independent of foreign sources of all energy. It won't. But it will move us in the right direction. Is that about right?

SECRETARY MADIGAN: Yes, that's right. The bill stripped down will come to the floor this afternoon at 2:00 p.m. It will then go through a debating period and come up for a motion to proceed. Whether there's going to be a filibuster I don't know. That should happen on Wednesday and we should be underway on debate. Unfortunately, it does take out the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, it takes out the CAFE standards, which we were going to get all the way along. Nevertheless, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, as you mentioned properly, is part of the growth package. It is worth about 500,000 jobs over the next 10 years; it's worth about $200 billion in reduction of our trade deficit. Those monies always go offshore.

The movement of that particular refuge will not only be worth that 8.5 billion barrels, but will also carry along with the residue of the -- (inaudible) -- another billion barrels. Now, that's good for the economy of the United States and so that's why you include it as part of your growth package and encourage them to pass this bill, which is filled with natural gas, expedition movements to the private sector, to industry, to business. It's good, it's clean. You've got a very balanced program there and I'm hopeful that the 14 titles that remain, that we will see an expeditious address by the Congress.

And I hope that we can continue the fight for bringing back the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as part of your growth package, if nothing else. You can't get in the energy bill. Keep it in the growth package. It is real growth.

We need revenues to find the alternatives to oil, which is the very thing we're trying to in getting alternative fuels. You have the most powerful alternative fuel package that's every been put together in this country -- to go in all directions -- it will help many governors around this table with the ethanols, the methanols, the electric car. The opportunity to drive those electric cars with the off-peak loads in our industrial plant today. We have plenty of electrical power for 120 million of those vehicles. We can get off this oil in our transportation sector. And we still need the oil -- our own oil.

And so we can move in the direction that stabilizes that increase in imports. And I think your bill not only does that, but

your bill is a very powerful growth package for both jobs and revenue for the country.

GOVERNOR DEAN: We've been tossing around huge numbers. I want to talk about a much smaller number, just about $500 million. In your budget last year, you recommended the cutting of the low-income human assistance program. It's a small program, it's $1.5 billion this year. It's principally used in the northern states to help people get through the winter with fuel assistance. We had to put some state money up. Of course, we had to level-fund our state budget this year, so that meant we had to take the money from somewhere else.

In your budget this year, Mr. President, it's recommended that you cut the program again by 33 percent. And we could barely handle last year's cuts. I would ask that you might reconsider and possibly level-fund that, which I think would be consistent with your own budget goals. It would mean a great deal, particularly to those over 65 and living alone and who really depend on this program in the northern states for keeping themselves warm throughout the winter.

THE PRESIDENT: Does anybody got available the figures on home-heating oil price, say, two years ago compared to what it is now?

GOVERNOR DEAN: Well, this year, Mr. President, you're correct. This year we were able to --

THE PRESIDENT: It's less now.

GOVERNOR DEAN: It's much less now and that's one of the reasons we were not hurt as badly by the cuts this year. But I don't expect the home-heating oil price to go down another 33 percent next year. And also, of course, there are great many, at least in Vermont, that heat with other fuels such as wood or natural gas, and the price has not dropped commensurately.

So this -- I'm not so much complaining about last year's cut, which we did deal with, but if we were to lose 33 percent of that program -- small program, though it is -- we would be devastated.

THE PRESIDENT: Dick, do you want to comment on it? I can't remember the exact numbers, but I -- go ahead.

DIRECTOR DARMAN: The governors will perhaps remember, Mr. President, -- it's all a question of perspective, I suppose. The standard proposal for this program, which is known colloquially as -- (inaudible) -- the standard proposal has been zero in the past from the administration. And this year, we're at a billion dollars. So we look at it as a billion dollars more than some might have recommended and proposed, and you look at it as half a billion dollars less.

The way the appropriations process works, as you know, these things are still subject to adjustment within the caps. And so if this goes up 500, something else has to go down 500. This is not one that we would, I think it's fair to say, bite and die over. We though $1 billion was a lot more than zero. I can understand why you think it's less than $1.5 billion.

GOVERNOR ROMER: I want to thank the President for his willingness to exchange these views with us on such a candid level. And I appreciate his welcome to the White House that he has consistently extended to us as governors.

And even more importantly, I appreciate the fact that we've been able to work together in a true federalism partnership which has made it possible for us to be more productive.

Some of the questions today even reflected the way in which we've been able to work out differences. The one about the medicaid settlement was a very serious problem to a number of us. We worked together through the months of October and November in the fashion which included they-said-it-couldn't-be-done type activity. And the Congress, because the President had worked so arduously with us toward reconciling those differences, agreed and we were able to stabilize the situation which was highly volatile for our own budgets and for the federal budgeting process as well.

So, Mr. President, thank you very much for your special welcome to us, and your kindness to us, your cooperation with us, and your willingness to exchange these views with us. We're deeply grateful to you.

THE PRESIDENT: Listen, I enjoyed having you. I see John Sununu. I think those of you, as we tried to get through that medicaid problem, you had an inside voice here. (Laughter.) And I really think he deserves credit for the fact we were able to reach agreement that brought some relief and, I wouldn't say joy, but at least less concern to the governors around the table. I'm very grateful to him and Dick also. But it required some skill up on the Hill, too, which he demonstrated.

But in any event, thank you all very much. And I appreciate the spirit of this visit, and look forward to doing this again. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END 12:15 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release January 30, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

The Washington Hilton
Washington, DC

9:10 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Heflin, for such a lovely introduction. To Dan and Marilyn, the Vice and Mrs. Quayle; to the members of my Cabinet here; to the members of Congress, all so many here in faith; to General Powell; especially to our host Ted Stevens; to our dear friend Billy Graham; and to all gathered.

Let me first just say a special greeting to Prime Minister Ratu Mara of Fiji. This is not his first time here. I'm sure it won't be his last, but he's an inspiration to all of us that know him and consider him a friend, as I do.

May I salute our other guests from overseas. And though sometimes you might feel like it, we don't consider you overseas, those who serve in the state legislatures, and we're glad you all are here. (Laughter.)

Four principles -- four ideas, really -- inspire America. And I think they're all here this morning reflected in one way or another: freedom, family, and faith, that Dan Quayle talked about, and to that I would add fellowship.

So many people brought together by a shared spirit, the simple joy of praying to God. Slava, that was a tremendously moving story and one of the most dramatic moments in recent history. And if sound -- you referred to sound -- if sound has anything to do with entry into heaven, I believe you can choose the fluffiest, most generous cloud in the firmament up there when you get there. (Laughter.) And thank you for your inspiring message. (Applause.)

But I think you reminded us all of the powerful role that prayer has played in the unprecedented events of the past year. Since we last met, nations have been reshaped and the lives have been restored throughout the land and throughout the entire world. And the force that unites them, as we've heard here today from the Vice President to General Powell, is faith in God, the link they share is prayer.

And when I last stood here, as Colin reminded us, we were at war, compelled by a deep need for God's wisdom, we began to pray. And we prayed for God's protection in what we undertook, for God's love to fill hearts, and for God's peace to be the moral North Star that guided us.

Abraham Lincoln said, and we remember it, everyone in this room would remember it: "I've been driven many times to my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I have nowhere else to go." And in his example, we came together for a special National Day of Prayer. And Americans of every creed turned to our greatest power to bring us peace -- "peace which passeth all understanding." And at

the end of the war, we prayed as one during our National Day of Thanksgiving.

Let us pray that as a people we will continue to bring the power of prayer to bear on all the challenges we confront. And let us pray that we will strengthen the values that this great land was founded on, that we will reverse any threat of moral decline, and that we will dedicate ourselves to the ethic of service -- being what I call a Point of Light to someone else, someone in need.

And in this work, we are not without inspiration. We need look no further than the handful of men who became heroes by their courage, their strength and above all their faith -- last of whom returned in December. I'm talking about our hostages. And in brutalizing conditions, as we've heard this morning, they prayed together daily in what they called the "church of the locked door." They unwove floor mats in order to make rosaries. These men, who every day lived the story of Job, treasured their first book, the Bible. When Terry Anderson was released, one of the first things he did was to thank strangers across the world who had prayed that he be set free. "Your prayers made a big difference," said this man who imprisoned, had rediscovered the faith that sets and keeps men free.

There's another story from last year's news that tells of the transformation of faith. While it's a story familiar to all of you, it's intensely personal to Barbara and me and to others in this room. We lost a dear friend last March -- Lee Atwater, a restless, fiercely driven, fun-loving good ol' boy from South Carolina who rode life as hard and fast as he could. But he also lived a kind of miracle because his illness reintroduced him to something he'd put aside, his own faith.

And in his last months, he worked intensely to come to grips with his faith. And through reading the Bible and through prayer, he learned that, as he put it, "What was missing in society was what was missing in me, a little heart and a lot of brotherhood."

He was so right. Prayer has a place. Not only in the life of every American, but also in the life of our nation for we are truly one nation under God.

May God bless this very special gathering. For those of you who have come from overseas, for those of you from across our land, for those of you right here in the nation's capital, thank you for participating in this celebration of faith.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END 9:16 A.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release January 28, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

The U.S. Capitol

9:07 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Speaker and Mr. President, distinguished members of Congress, honored guests and fellow citizens. Thank you very much for that warm reception. You know, with the big buildup this address has had, I want to make sure it would be a big hit, but I couldn't convince Barbara to deliver it for me. (Applause.)

I see the Speaker and the Vice President are laughing. They saw what I did in Japan and they're just happy they're sitting behind me. (Laughter.)

I mean to speak tonight of big things, of big changes and the promises they hold, and of some big problems -- and how, together, we can solve them and move our country forward as the undisputed leader of the age. (Applause.)

We gather tonight at a dramatic and deeply promising time in our history, and in the history of man on Earth. For in the past twelve months the world has known changes of almost biblical proportions. And even now, months after the failed coup that doomed a failed system, I'm not sure we've absorbed the full impact, the full import of what happened. But communism died this year. (Applause.)

Even as President, with the most fascinating possible vantage point, there were times when I was so busy managing progress and helping to lead change that I didn't always show the joy that was in my heart. But the biggest thing that has happened in the world in my life, in our lives, is this: By the grace of God, America won the Cold War. (Applause.)

I mean to speak this evening of the changes that can take place in our country now that we can stop making the sacrifices we had to make when we had an avowed enemy that was a superpower. Now we can look homeward even more, and move to set right what needs to be set right.

I will speak of those things. But let me tell you something I've been thinking these past few months. It's a kind of roll call of honor. For the Cold War didn't "end" -- it was won. And I think of those who won it, in places like Korea, and Vietnam. And some of them didn't come back. Back then they were heroes, but this year they were victors. (Applause.)

The long roll call -- all the G.I. Joes and Janes, all the ones who fought faithfully for freedom, who hit the ground and sucked

the dust and knew their share of horror. This may seem frivolous -- and I don't mean it so -- but it's moving to me how the world saw them.

The world saw not only their special valor, but their special style -- their rambunctious, optimistic bravery, their do-or-die unity unhampered by class or race or region. What a group we've put forth, for generations now, from the ones who wrote "Kilroy was Here" on the walls of the German stalags, to those who left signs in the Iraqi desert that said, "I Saw Elvis." What a group of kids we've sent into the world. (Applause.)

And there's another to be singled out, though it may seem inelegant. I mean a mass of people called The American Taxpayer. No one ever thinks to thank the people who pay a country's bill, or an Alliance's bill. But for half a century now, the American people have shouldered the burden and paid taxes that were higher than they would have been to support a defense that was bigger than it would have been if imperial communism had never existed.

But it did -- doesn't anymore. (Applause.)

And here's a fact I wouldn't mind the world acknowledging: The American taxpayer bore the brunt of the burden, and deserves a hunk of the glory. (Applause.)

And so now, for the first time in 35 years, our strategic bombers stand down. No longer are they on 'round-the-clock alert. Tomorrow our children will go to school and study history and how plants grow. And they won't have, as my children did, air raid drills in which they crawl under their desks and cover their heads in case of nuclear war. My grandchildren don't have to do that, andwon't have the bad dreams children had once, in decades past. There are still threats. But the long, drawn out dread is over. (Applause.)

A year ago tonight I spoke to you at a moment of high peril. American forces had just unleashed Operation Desert Storm. And after 40 days in the desert skies and four days on the ground, the men and women of America's Armed Forces, and our allies, accomplished the goals that I declared and that you endorsed: We liberated Kuwait. (Applause.)

Soon after, the Arab world and Israel sat down to talk seriously, and comprehensively, about peace -- an historic first. And soon after that, at Christmas, the last American hostages came home. Our policies were vindicated. (Applause.)

Much good can come from the prudent use of power. And much good can come of this: A world once divided into two armed camps now recognizes one sole and pre-eminent power: the United States of America. (Applause.) And they regard this with no dread. For the world trusts us with power and the world is right. They trust us to be fair and restrained; they trust us to be on the side of decency; they trust us to do what's right.

I use those words advisedly. A few days after the war began, I received a telegram from Joanne Speicher, the wife of the first pilot killed in the Gulf, Lt. Commander Scott Speicher. Even in her grief she wanted me to know that some day, when her children were old enough, she would tell them "that their father went away to war because it was the right thing to do." She said it all. It was the right thing to do.

And we did it together. There were honest differences right here in this Chamber. But when the war began, you put partisanship aside and we supported our troops. This is still a time for pride, but this is no time to boast. For problems face us, and we must stand together once again and solve them, and not let our country down. (Applause.)

Two years ago I began planning cuts in military spending that reflected the changes of the new era. But now, this year, with imperial communism gone, that process can be accelerated. Tonight can tell you of dramatic changes in our strategic nuclear force. These are actions we are taking on our own because they are the right thing to do.

After completing 20 planes for which we have begun procurement, we will shut down further production of the B-2 bomber. (Applause.) We will cancel the small ICBM program. We will cease production of new warheads for our sea-based ballistic missiles. We will stop all new production of the Peacekeeper missile. And we will not purchase any more advanced cruise missiles.

This weekend I will meet at Camp David with Boris Yeltsin of the Russian Federation. I've informed President Yeltsin that if the Commonwealth, the former Soviet Union, will eliminate all land-based multiple warhead ballistic missiles, I will do the following: We will eliminate all Peacekeeper missiles. We will reduce the number of warheads on Minuteman missiles to one, and reduce the number of warheads on our sea-based missiles by about one-third. And we will convert a substantial portion of our strategic bombers to primarily conventional use.

President Yeltsin's early response has been very positive, and I expect our talks at Camp David to be fruitful.

I want you to know that for half a century, American presidents have longed to make such decisions and say such words. But even in the midst of celebration, we must keep caution as a friend. For the world is still a dangerous place. Only the dead have seen the end of conflict. And though yesterday's challenges are behind us, tomorrow's are being born.

The Secretary of Defense recommended these cuts after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And I make them with confidence. But do not misunderstand me: The reductions I have approved will save us an additional $50 billion over the next five years. By 1997, we will have cut defense by 30 percent since I took office. These cuts are deep, and you must know my resolve: This deep, and no deeper. (Applause.)

To do less would be insensible to progress, but to do more would be ignorant of history. We must not go back to the days of "the hollow army". We cannot repeat the mistakes made twice in this century, when armistice was followed by recklessness, and defense was purged as if the world were permanently safe.

I remind you this evening that I have asked for your support in funding a program to protect our country from limited nuclear missile attack. We must have this protection because too many people in too many countries have access to nuclear arms. (Applause.) And I urge you again to pass the Strategic Defense Initiative -- S.D.I. (Applause.)

There are those who say that now we can turn away from the world, that we have no special role, no special place. But we are the United States of America, the leader of the West that has become the leader of the world. And as long as I am President I will continue to lead in support of freedom everywhere -- not out of arrogance, not out of altruism, but for the safety and security of our children. (Applause.) This is a fact: Strength in the pursuit of peace is no vice; isolationism in the pursuit of security is no virtue. (Applause.)

And now to our troubles at home. They're not all economic; the primary problem is our economy. There are some good signs: Inflation, that thief, is down; and interest rates are down. But

unemployment is too high, some industries are in trouble, and growth is not what it should be. Let me tell you right from the start and right from the heart: I know we're in hard times, but I know something else: This will not stand. (Applause.)

In this Chamber -- in this Chamber, we can bring the same courage and sense of common purpose to the economy that we brought to Desert Storm. And we can defeat hard times together.

I believe you'll help. One reason is that you're patriots and you want the best for your country. And I believe that in your hearts you want to put partisanship aside and get the job done because it's the right thing to do.

The power of America rests in a stirring but simple idea: That people will do great things if only you set them free. Well, we're going to set the economy free, for if this age of miracles and wonders has taught us anything, it's that if we can change the world, we can change America.

We must encourage investment. We must make it easier for people to invest money and create new products, new industries, and new jobs. We must clear away the obstacles to growth -- high taxes, high regulation, red tape, and, yes, wasteful government spending. (Applause.)

None of this will happen with a snap of the fingers, but it will happen. And the test of a plan isn't whether it's called new or dazzling. The American people aren't impressed by gimmicks; they're smarter on this score than all of us in this room. The only test of a plan is, is it sound and will it work?

We must have a short-term plan to address our immediate needs and heat up the economy. And then we need a longer-term plan to keep combustion going and to guarantee our place in the world economy.

There are certain things that a President can do without Congress, and I'm going to do them. I have, this evening, asked major Cabinet departments and federal agencies to institute a 90-day moratorium on any new federal regulations that could hinder growth. (Applause.) In those 90 days major departments and agencies will carry out a top-to-bottom review of all regulations, old and new -- to stop the ones that will hurt growth, and speed up those that will help growth.

Further, for the untold number of hard-working, responsible American workers and businessmen and women who've been forced to go without needed bank loans, the banking credit crunch must end. (Applause.) I won't neglect my responsibility for sound regulations that serve the public good, but regulatory overkill must be stopped. (Applause.) And I've instructed our government regulators to stop it. (Applause.)

I have directed Cabinet departments and federal agencies, to speed up progrowth expenditures as quickly as possible. This should put an extra $10 billion into the economy in the next six months. And our new transportation bill provides more than $150 billion for construction and maintenance projects that are vital to our growth and well-being. And that means jobs building roads, jobs building bridges, and jobs building railways.

And I have, this evening, directed the Secretary of the Treasury to change the federal tax withholding tables. With this change, millions of Americans, from whom the government withholds more than necessary, can now choose to have the government withhold less from their paychecks. Something tells me a number of taxpayers may take us up on this. This initiative could return about $25 billion back into our economy over the next 12 months -- money people

can use to help pay for clothing, college, or to get a new car. Finally, working with the Federal Reserve, we will continue to support monetary policy that keeps both interest rates and inflation down.

Now, these are the things I can do. And now, members of Congress, let me tell you what you can do for your country. (Applause.) You must pass the other elements of my plan to meet our economic needs. Everyone knows that investment spurs recovery. I am proposing this evening a change in the alternative minimum tax, and the creation of a new 15-percent investment tax allowance. (Applause.) This will encourage businesses to accelerate investment and bring people back to work.

Real estate has led our economy out of almost all the tough times we've ever had. Once building starts, carpenters and plumbers work, people buy homes and take out mortgages. My plan would modify the passive loss rule for active real estate developers. (Applause.) And it would make it easier for pension plans to purchase real estate.

For those Americans who dream of buying a first home, but who can't quite afford it, my plan would allow first-time homebuyers to withdraw savings from IRAs without penalty and provide a $5,000 tax credit for the first purchase of that home. (Applause.)

And finally, my immediate plan calls on Congress to give crucial help to people who own a home, to everyone who has a business, or a farm, or a single investment.

This time, at this hour, I cannot take no for an answer: You must cut the capital gains tax on the people of our country. (Applause.) Never has an issue been more demagogued by its opponents. (Applause.) But the demagogues are wrong -- they are wrong and they know it. Sixty percent of the people who benefit from lower capital gains have incomes under $50,000. A cut in the capital gains tax increases jobs and helps just about everyone in our country. (Applause.) And so I'm asking you to cut the capital gains tax to a maximum of 15.4 percent. (Applause.)

And I'll tell you, those of you who say, oh, no, someone who's comfortable may benefit from that, you kind of remind me of the old definition of the Puritan who couldn't sleep at night, worrying that somehow someone somewhere was out having a good time. (Applause.)

The opponents of this measure -- and those who have authored various so-called soak-the-rich bills that are floating around this Chamber -- should be reminded of something: When they aim at the big guy they usually hit the little guy. And maybe it's time that stopped. (Applause.)

This, then, is my short-term plan. Your part, members of Congress, requires enactment of these common-sense proposals that will have a strong effect on the economy -- without breaking the budget agreement and without raising tax rates. (Applause.)

While my plan is being passed and kicking in, we've got to care for those in trouble today. I have provided for up to $4.4 billion in my budget to extend federal unemployment benefits. And I ask for congressional action right away. (Applause.) And I thank the committee. (Applause.) Well, at last.

And let's be frank. Let's be frank. Let me level with you. I know and you know that my plan is unveiled in a political season. (Laughter.) I know and you know that everything I propose will be viewed by some in merely partisan terms. But I ask you to know what is in my heart, and my aim is to increase our nation's good. I'm doing what I think is right; I am proposing what I know will help. (Applause.)

I pride myself that I'm a prudent man and I believe that patience is a virtue. But I understand that politics is, for some, a game -- and that sometimes the game is to stop all progress and then decry the lack of improvement. (Laughter.) But let me tell you: far more important than my political future -- and far more important than yours -- is the well-being of our country. (Applause.) Members of this Chamber are practical people, and I know you won't resent some practical advice. When people put their party's fortunes -- whatever the party, whatever side of this aisle -- before the public good, they court defeat not only for their country, but for themselves. And they will certainly deserve it. (Applause.)

I submit my plan tomorrow, and I'm asking you to pass it by March 20th. (Applause.) And I ask the American people to let you know they want this action by March 20th.

From the day after that, if it must be, the battle is joined. And you know, when principle is at stake I relish a good fair fight. (Applause.)

I said my plan has two parts, and it does. And it's the second part that is the heart of the matter. For it's not enough to get an immediate burst, we need long-term improvement in our economic position.

We all know that the key to our economic future is to ensure that America continues an economic leader of the world. We have that in our power. Here, then, is my long-term plan to guarantee our future.

First, trade: We will work to break down the walls that stop world trade. We will work to open markets everywhere. And in our major trade negotiations I will continue pushing to eliminate tariffs and subsidies that damage America's farmers and workers. (Applause.)

And we'll get more good American jobs within our own hemisphere through the North American Free Trade Agreement, and through the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative. But changes are here, and more are coming. The workplace of the future will demand more highly-skilled workers than ever -- more people who are computer-literate, highly-educated. We must be the world's leader in education. And we must revolutionize America's schools. (Applause.)

My America 2000 strategy will help us reach that goal. My plan will give parents more choice, give teachers more flexibility, and help communities create New American Schools. (Applause.) Thirty states across the nation have established America 2000 programs. Hundreds of cities and towns have joined in. Now Congress must join this great movement: Pass my proposals for New American Schools.

That was my second long-term proposal, and here's my third: We must make common-sense investments that will help us compete, long-term in the marketplace. We must encourage research and development. My plan is to make the R&D tax credit permanent, and to provide record levels of support -- (applause) -- over $76 billion this year alone -- for people who will explore the promise of emerging technologies. (Applause.)

Fourth, we must do something about crime and drugs. (Applause.) It is time for a major, renewed investment in fighting violent street crime. It saps our strength and hurts our faith in our society, and in our future together. Surely, a tired woman on her way to work at 6:00 a.m. in the morning on a subway deserves the right to get there safely. (Applause.) And surely it's true that everyone who changes his or her life because of crime, from those afraid to go out at night to those afraid to walk in the parks they

pay for, surely these people have been denied a basic civil right. (Applause.)

It is time to restore it. Congress, pass my comprehensive crime bill. (Applause.) It is tough on criminals and supportive of police, and it has been languishing in these hollowed halls for years now. Pass it. Help your country. (Applause.)

And fifth, I ask you tonight to fund our HOPE housing proposal and to pass my enterprise zone legislation, which will get businesses into the inner city. We must empower the poor with the pride that comes from owning a home, getting a job, becoming a part of things. (Applause.) My plan would encourage real estate construction by extending tax incentives for mortgage revenue bonds and low income housing. (Applause.)

And I ask tonight for record expenditures for the program that helps children born into want move into excellence, Head Start. (Applause.)

Step six -- we must reform our health care system. (Applause.) For this, too, bears on whether or not we can compete in the world. American health costs have been exploding. This year America will spend over $800 billion on health, and that is expected to grow to $1.6 trillion by the end of the decade. We simply cannot afford this.

The cost of health care shows up not only in your family budget, but in the price of everything we buy and everything we sell. When health coverage for a fellow on an assembly line costs thousands of dollars, the cost goes into the products he makes and you pay the bill.

We must make a choice. Now, some pretend we can have it both ways. They call it "play or pay", but that expensive approach is unstable. It will mean higher taxes, fewer jobs and, eventually, a system under complete government control.

Really, there are only two options. And we can move toward a nationalized system -- (applause) -- a system which will restrict patient choice in picking a doctor and force the government to ration services arbitrarily. And what we'll get is patients in long lines, indifferent service, and a huge new tax burden. (Applause.) Or we can reform our own private health care system, which still gives us, for all its flaws, the best quality health care in the world. (Applause.)

Well, let's build on our strengths. My plan provides insurance security for all Americans, while preserving and increasing the idea of choice. We make basic health insurance affordable for all low-income people not now covered, and we do it by providing a health insurance tax credit of up to $3,750 for each low-income family. And the middle class gets help, too. And by reforming the health insurance market, my plan assures that Americans will have access to basic health insurance even if they change jobs or develop serious health problems.

We must bring costs under control, preserve quality, preserve choice and reduce the people's nagging daily worry about health insurance. My plan, the details of which I will announce very shortly, does just that.

And seventh, we must get the federal deficit under control. (Applause.) We now have in law enforceable spending caps and a requirement that we pay for the programs we create. There are those in Congress who would ease that discipline now, but I cannot let them do it, and I won't. (Applause.)

My plan would freeze all domestic discretionary budget authority, which means no more next year than this year. (Applause.)

I will not tamper with Social Security -- (applause) -- but I would put real caps on the growth of uncontrolled spending. And I would also freeze federal domestic government employment. (Applause.)

And with the help of Congress, my plan will get rid of 246 programs that don't deserve federal funding. (Applause.) Some of them have noble titles, but none of them is indispensable. We can get rid of each and every one of them.

You know, it's time we rediscovered a home truth the American people have never forgotten: this government is too big and spends too much. (Applause.) And I call upon Congress to adopt a measure that will help put an end to the annual ritual of filling the budget with pork-barrel appropriations. Every year, the press has a field day making fun of outrageous examples -- a Lawrence Welk museum, research grants for Belgian endive. We all know how these things get into the budget and maybe you need someone to help you say no. I know how to say it and I know what I need to make it stick. Give me the same thing 43 governors have, the line item veto, and let me help you control spending. (Applause.)

We must put an end to unfinanced federal government mandates. These are the requirements Congress puts on our cities, counties and states without supplying the money. If Congress passes a mandate, it should be forced to pay for it, and balance the cost with savings elsewhere. After all, a mandate just increases someone else's burden and that means higher taxes at the state and local level.

Step eight, Congress should enact the bold reform proposals that are still awaiting congressional action -- bank reform, civil justice reform, tort reform, and my national energy strategy. (Applause.)

And finally, we must strengthen the family because it is the family that has the greatest bearing on our future. (Applause.) When Barbara holds an AIDS baby in her arms, and reads to children, she's saying to every person in this country, family matters.

And I am announcing tonight a new Commission on America's Urban Families. I've asked Missouri's Governor John Ashcroft to be Chairman, former Dallas Mayor Ned Strauss to be Co-Chair. You know, I had mayors, the leading mayors from the League of Cities in the other day at the White House, and they told me something striking. They said that every one of them, Republican or Democrat, agreed on one thing: that the major cause of the problems of the cities is the dissolution of the family. They asked for this commission, and they were right to ask, because it's time to determine what we can do to keep families together, strong and sound. (Applause.)

There's one thing we can do right away, ease the burden of rearing a child. I ask you tonight to raise the personal exemption by $500 per child for every family. (Applause.) For a family with four kids, that's an increase of $2,000. This is a good start, in the right direction, and it's what we can afford.

It's time to allow families to deduct the interest they pay on student loans. (Applause.) I am asking you to do just that. And I'm asking you to allow people to use money from their IRAs to pay medical and education expenses -- all without penalties. (Applause.)

And I'm asking for more. Ask American parents what they dislike about how things are going in our country, and chances are good that pretty soon they'll get to welfare. Americans are the most generous people on Earth. But we have to go back to the insight of Franklin Roosevelt who, when he spoke of what became the welfare program, warned that it must not become "a narcotic" and a "subtle destroyer" of the spirit.

Welfare was never meant to be a lifestyle; it was never meant to be a habit; it was never supposed to be passed from generation to generation like a legacy. It's time to replace the assumptions of the welfare state and help reform the welfare system. (Applause.)

States throughout the country are beginning to operate with new assumptions: that when able-bodied people receive government assistance, they have responsibilities to the taxpayer. A responsibility to seek work, education, or job training; a responsibility to get their lives in order; a responsibility to hold their families together and refrain from having children out of wedlock and a responsibility to obey the law.

We are going to help this movement. Often, state reform requires waiving certain federal regulations. I will act to make that process easier and quicker for every state that asks our help.

And I want to add, as we make these changes -- we work together to improve this system -- that our intention is not scapegoating or finger-pointing. If you read the papers or watch TV you know there's been a rise these days in a certain kind of ugliness, racist comments, anti-Semitism, an increased sense of division. Really, this is not us. This is not who we are. And this is not acceptable. (Applause.)

And so you have my plan for America. And I'm asking for big things, but I believe in my heart you will do what's right.

And you know, it's kind of an American tradition to show a certain skepticism toward our democratic institutions. I, myself, have sometimes thought the aging process could be delayed if it had to make its way through Congress. (Laughter and applause.) You will deliberate, and you will discuss, and that is fine. But, my friends, the people cannot wait. They need help now.

And there's a mood among us. People are worried. There's been talk of decline. Someone even said our workers are lazy and uninspired. And I thought, really? You go tell Neil Armstrong standing on the moon. Tell the men and women who put him there. Tell the American farmer who feeds his country and the world. Tell the men and women of Desert Storm. (Applause.)

Moods come and go, but greatness endures. Ours does. And maybe for a moment it's good to remember what, in the dailiness of our lives, we forget: We are still and ever the freest nation on Earth, the kindest nation on Earth, the strongest nation on Earth. And we have always risen to the occasion. (Applause.)

And we are going to lift this nation out of hard times inch by inch and day by day, and those who would stop us had better step aside. Because I look at hard times and I make this vow: This will not stand. (Applause.)

And so we move on together -- a rising nation, the once and future miracle that is still, this night, the hope of the world.

Thank you. God bless you, and God bless our beloved country. Thank you very, very much. (Applause.)

END 9:59 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release January 27, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
DURING THE DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY MEETING

Room 450
Old Executive Office Building

2:05 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very much. And let me single out those gentlemen with me. Governor Bob Martinez; the Attorney General, Mr. Barr; Secretary Sullivan; and Secretary of Education Alexander. It is a pleasure to be with all of you, and I am especially happy to welcome the Ambassadors of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru and Venezuela -- neighbors with whom we are intensifying our cooperation in the fight against drugs.

And ladies and gentlemen all, thank you. I've been briefed on what kind of a prestigious audience -- an important group we have here with us today. All of us are here today to give you an update on America's war against drug abuse. And first, let me say it is a real war.

This isn't a headline writer's hype of some sort. The poison of drug abuse and the violence it breeds have left a trail of death and destruction in our cities. And anyone who lives in a big city knows of places close to home that look like war zones, with the neighborhoods burned and scarred, tyrannized by gangs -- by drug gangs. Gang violence is claiming the lives of kids who get caught up in drugs, and the drug gangs' gun battles are even stealing the lives of innocent bystanders.

We haven't won this war yet, but I'm determined that we will. Everybody that is working the problem is determined that we will win this war. It is imperative that we put more resources into our fight. Accordingly, I'm asking the Congress for Fiscal '93 to provide $12.7 billion to wage this war on drugs. If Congress approves my request, funding for the war against drugs will have increased by 93 percent to nearly double the level of just three years ago when I took office.

We start by taking our federal dollars to the front lines; more than one quarter of our proposed federal budget for drug control. More money than ever before will go to a state and local government in their drug control programs -- treatment and prevention programs, working to reduce the demand for drugs -- would receive over $4.1 billion dollars in 1993. We will expand programs to help high-risk groups like adolescents and pregnant women. We'll increase emergency grants for drug-free schools and communities by 100 percent. And we'll increase by 15 percent the federal funding for community partnership grants in the fight against drugs.

Community partnership grants help good neighbors like the volunteers who brought about the demolition of more than 800 crack houses in Miami. And we're continuing the excellent HUD -- H-U-D -- Drug Elimination Program where we've increased annual funding from $8.2 million to $165 million since '89. This HUD program has helped such citizens as the men and women of Chicago's Cabrini-Green housing project, in their efforts to get those drug gangs out of their buildings.

As President, I am determined that our federal authorities offer all the support that they possibly can to the

communities that make this full commitment. You have my word: I will demand an equal commitment from the Congress: No American, young or old or in-between, should have to live in fear.

We've made real progress in this fight against drug abuse, drug use. Between '88 and '91, current overall drug use dropped by 13 percent, while among adolescents drug use dropped by 27 percent. Cocaine use tells the same story. While current use of this deadly drug among the general population decreased by 35 percent -- 35 -- among teenagers it dropped by 63 percent.

Now, think about that last one, that last statistic. Compared with four years ago, almost two-thirds fewer of our kids are falling for the temptation of cocaine. Our young people are getting the message. Millions and millions more of our kids now are listening to good advice and saving themselves from the lives of addiction and misery. Of course, one life sacrificed to the demons of drugs or drug abuse violence is one too many. Saving those lives has got to be everyone's mission -- from federal officials to county prosecutors and cops on the beat.

We cannot gain total victory without the strength and the resolve and the dedication of countless volunteers. Every time an individual parent or teacher or clergyman motivates a young person to say no to drug abuse, we as a nation move much closer to our goal. So let me say as clearly as I possibly can: Success in the drug war depends crucially on our churches and synagogues, our schools, our service clubs, and young peoples' organizations. Most important: American families strenghtened by the virtues and bonds of love and honor and just plain strength. American families -- that's the key.

Before I turn the program over to Governor Martinez, who is doing a superb job in this field, let me mention again something that we announced last week -- namely that he and I will be meeting next month with the presidents of Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, Venezuela and Ecuador and Mexico. This will be the second regional drug summit. We must work more effectively than ever with these nations in fighting the spread of drugs. And I'll drive home the message that there are no half measures.

I will also convince those world leaders, leaders of those countries that we are tackling the demand side of the equation. I remember Cartagena, and I remember there was some doubt on the parts of those presidents as to what we were doing at home on the demand side. I think now we have a good record with real progress to report to them. It makes a difference to how they can go about using their resources in their countries.

Now I'd like to turn the podium over to Bob Martinez and the other briefers who are working so hard to win this drug war. And I really do thank each of you for your commitment and for your effort. I will single out just one group here -- the Partnership against Drugs, where we have this marvelous media effort going on now. It's about $1 million a day being spent on pro bono advertising to get that message to the young people. And that is not government, that is volunteers taking that message to the people of this country.

And there are so many wonderful stories of that nature, and I know many of the programs that work are represented by people right here. So I do thank you for your commitment and your effort, and let's continue this fight until we can say, each one of us, that we have conquered the scourge of drug abuse.

Thank you very much for letting me pop in.

END 2:13 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release January 27, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE NATIONAL RELIGIOUS BROADCASTERS
ANNUAL CONVENTION

The Sheraton Washington Hotel

11:59 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you for that wonderfully warm welcome. And to President Dave Clark, may I thank you, sir; Brandt Gustafson, the Executive Director. And let me salute your leadership of the NRB. I understand that former Secretary Dole was to be here; I don't know that she is. I know FCC Chairman Sykes is. And I see, of course, two good, respected friends, Jim Dobson and Billy Graham. And ladies and gentlemen.

This marks the fifth time that I've had the honor of addressing the Annual Convention of the National Religious Broadcasters. (Applause.) A year ago we met in the first week of a struggle to protect what is right and true. And I came before you to talk of what was not a Christian or Jewish war, not a Moslem war. It was a just war. And in the Persian Gulf we fought for good versus evil -- it was that clear to me -- right versus wrong, dignity against oppression. And America stood fast so that liberty could stand tall.

And today, I want to thank you for helping America, as Christ ordained, to be "a light unto the world." Your support honored the finest soldiers, the finest Sailors, Marines, Airmen, and Coast Guardsmen that any nation has ever known. (Applause.) And what they did in war, let us now do in peace. Just as our forces fought to defend all of what is best about America, we need you to help instill the traditional values that make life and liberty worth defending.

Let me begin with some good news for modern man. According to Gallup, the Gallup surveys, no society is more religious than the United States of America. Seven in 10 Americans believe in life after death, eight in 10 that God works miracles, nine in 10 Americans pray. And more than 90 percent believe in God, to which I say, thank God. I wish it were 100 percent.

Now, I know this is an election year. And I don't know about Damascus -- but this primary season, we're seeing a lot of conversions on the road to New Hampshire. (Laughter and applause.) But I don't want this to be a partisan speech and I appreciated so much what David Clark said about values. I want to speak of the values that I know you all believe in. Values which sustain America, values that are always in fashion.

The first value is not simply American, but universal. And I refer to the sanctity of life. I will stand on the side of choosing life. (Applause.)

And next comes a value which gives each life meaning: The self-reliance central to the dignity of work. Go to the barrios of San Antonio or the suburbs of St. Paul and there you will find people who ask for only what our forefathers had: the same opportunity which helped us brave independence, push back the wilderness, win two world wars, and create the highest standard of living in the history of man.

The Bible reminds us: "By thy works shall ye know them." What we must do is give working Americans that level playing field to keep us as rich in goods as we have been blessed in spirit.

Tomorrow, I'm giving a speech. (Laughter.) A State of the Union address will detail how we can nurture creativity as old as 1776, harness it to the needs of a new American century. Remember, to this day, the only footsteps on the moon are American footsteps. The only flag on the moon is the stars and stripes. The knowledge that put it there is stamped, "Made in USA." (Applause.)

And, yes, the world looks to us to lead, and lead we will. Americans can outwork, outproduce, outcompete any nation in the world. And we must do all we can to further that end. And I will do my level-best. And I need your help.

The next value I speak of must be forever cast in stone. I speak of decency -- the moral courage to say what is right and condemn what is wrong. And we need a nation closer to the Waltons than the Simpsons. (Applause.) An America that rejects the incivility -- the tide of incivility and the tide of intolerance.

We see this tide in the naked epithet and in the code words that play to our worst prejudices. We see it when people ridicule religion and religious leaders -- like the group which desecrated communion hosts on the steps of St. Patrick's Cathedral. We see this tide of incivility and intolerance in bigotry, in discrimination and anti-Semitism. Have they no decency? Have they no honor? Have they no respect for the rights of others? I will continue to speak out against these apostles of hate who poison our kids' minds and debase their souls. (Applause.)

There is no place -- whatever our views, there is no place in America for religious prejudice, for anti-Semitism or racial prejudice. This, then, brings me to a fourth value crucial to America: a belief in family -- the foundation of our strength. Take my kids, for example. Having helped put them through college, I remember receiving letters from them. Barbara does, too. And there would always be a P.S. at the bottom. It was those three words that said so much about the bond between parents at home and kids at school. "Please send money." (Laughter.)

But this one is true. The other day I was visited by the leaders of the National League of Cities -- mayors from big cities and small, liberal and conservative, Republican and Democrat. And they were unanimous in their view that the major underlying problem in our cities is the decline of the American family. And they are right. Too often the family is under siege. Each one of us -- parents, preachers, politicians and teachers -- must do our part to defend it. I do not want one single action that I take as President to weaken the American family. And I want to strengthen it in every way that I can. Every law that is passed should guard against weakening the family. (Applause.)

And that is why I insisted that the child care bill that I signed in 1990 allow parents -- not bureaucrats -- to decide how to care for their children. I refused to see the option of a religious-based child care restricted or eliminated. Our national education strategy -- we call it America 2000, and it is an exciting program -- helps the family by enhancing parental involvement in education, insisting that choice include both private and public schools. I do not believe it is unconstitutional for schoolkids to have the same choice that I got under the GI Bill or that college kids now get under the Pell Grant or that ex-servicemen now get under the Montgomery Bill.

Last week, I announced another policy to strengthen the family -- expanding the preschool program to serve all those four-year-olds who are eligible -- the largest funding increase in the history of Project Head Start. And when this is enacted, we will be much closer to achieving one of our six national educational goals -- that every schoolchild should start school ready to learn.

And finally, families will stay together only if drugs do not drive them apart. Winning the war on drugs means waging a war on crime. Now, we've made the commitment. And altogether, the new federal budget that I'll introduce two days from now will increase spending to combat crime by $1.2 billion -- to a total of almost $16 billion. Now, that's nearly 60 percent higher than when I took office in 1989.

My new budget will provide $.5 billion for an initiative that we call "weed and seed" -- not enthralled with the name, but listen to what it does. (Laughter.) Today, our very able Attorney General, Bill Barr -- point man in this new operation -- is spelling out all its details. But let me say this much right now: "Weed and seed" works this way: First, we join federal, state and local forces to weed out the gang leaders, the violent criminals, the drug dealers who plague our neighborhoods. And when we break their deadly grip, we follow up with part two: We seed those neighborhoods with expanded educational opportunities, job training, health care and other social services. But key to the "seed" concept will be jobs-generating initiatives such as enterprise zones -- to give people who call these neighborhoods home something to hope for.

There is more to do to win the final victory in our war on drugs. We are making progress; we are winning. Over the past four years, marijuana, crack and cocaine use has definitively declined. And what's more, today kids aged nine to 12 are the most antidrug group in America. The highest at-risk group remains 13 to 17-year-olds. But last year, for the first time, 13-year-olds mirrored the behavior of preteenagers.

Drugs affect a multitude of issues. They contribute to AIDS; they contribute to homelessness -- shattering families and futures, hopes and dreams. And that's why, literally, we should thank God for the drug use decline. The drop in use doesn't just prove we were right in our assault on substance use, it shows how we can achieve drugs' unconditional surrender.

We will triumph through tough enforcement and through education -- increasing awareness of the damage drugs do. And in that spirit, let us resolve to treat the victims of AIDS and drug abuse with compassion and caring. Let us redouble our efforts to help with treatment and with education. That will help eliminate the risks involved.

Over the last four years, more kids talked about drugs with their parents and teachers. Another reason for drug use decline has been America's print and electronic media -- the major source of drug information and the primary "influencer" on drug use, especially among the young. Together, they have helped reawaken America's conscience -- which, in turn, inspires America's greatness.

Later today, I will unveil our fourth National Drug Control Strategy to build on these beginnings. It will say no to drugs. It will say yes to life. But it cannot just be done by the government. To stop drug use will require caring, and community -- above all, abundant love.

Let me tell you -- remind you, for some of you -- tell you, others, a story. Once, a great First Lady, Pat Nixon, toured a medical center. And she stopped to embrace a little girl that was blinded by rubella. And for a few minutes, she talked to the girl

and held her close. And then later, someone told her that the child was deaf as well as blind. And Pat answered that she had known that. "But she knows what love is," Mrs. Nixon said. "She can feel love."

America's love is conveyed in many ways. In what we oppose: injustice and tyranny. In what we support: the inalienable rights that include the freedom to think and dream and worship and, yes, vote as we please. To preserve our liberty, America once deposed a king, fought a great Civil War and five times in this century sent Americans into major battle.

And yet, freedom is not ours alone -- it is our most treasured export. If you doubt freedom's victory, look to the Persian Gulf. Look to the former Soviet Union, where those once oppressed crowds reopened churches and synagogues. Look to Eastern Europe where Christmas carols warm the bright winter chill. It is written, "In the beginning was the Word." Here is the word for 1992: Today, the times are on the side of peace because the world, increasingly, is on the side of God.

I remember an early trip to the Soviet Union by our friend, Billy Graham. He came back and he reported that faith in God was very much alive in Russia. And some hardliners ridiculed him. Some even thought he shouldn't go. Today, we see that he clearly was right.

This brings me, then, to the ultimate value that sustains America and the values I have already cited: A belief in prayer. (Applause.) Obviously, no country can claim a special place in God's heart. Yet we are better as a people because he has a special place in ours.

I once asked one of my grandkids how he felt about prayer. And he said, "Just try getting through a math test without it." (Laughter.) In Sunday school, children learn that God is everywhere -- but in public school they find that he's absent from class. And I continue to believe -- as do the overwhelming majority of Americans -- in the right to nondenominational voluntary school prayer. (Applause.)

The values I have spoken of remind us of the truth that comes on one's knees. And I believe with all my heart that one cannot have this job, cannot be America's President, without a belief in God, without a belief in prayer.

The poet Walt Whitman, once asked what made America America, and he replied simply, "It's religion. Otherwise there is no real and permanent grandeur." Let that be our essence as a people -- and our message as a nation.

Thank you for this occasion. And may God bless this most wondrous land on Earth, the United States of America. Thank you very, very much. (Applause.)

END 12:19 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

January 24, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE YOUNG ASTRONAUTS COUNCIL

Room 450
Old Executive Office Building

3:00 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very much. Please be seated and thanks for that warm welcome. The Vice President and I are just delighted to be with you. And, of course, I might say I'm so proud of the leadership that the Vice President is giving in this all-out effort to support the space program, strengthen it, build on it. And this is a great day.

Let me say to Wendell Butler, the CEO of Young Astronauts, we appreciate all your good work. I am also so proud that Dick Truly is here -- Admiral Dick Truly, the first astronaut to serve as Administrator of NASA. All told, well, you've seen them, there are 23 veteran astronauts here today. And I'm told this is one of the largest gatherings of space explorers ever at the White House.

Our thoughts also are with seven other astronauts who right now are orbiting the Earth in a space shuttle mission. We're proud of all these men and women. They take risks, they do it with great courage and they do it with great determination and dedication.

I'm also glad to see so many boys and girls here, from kindergarten through 9th, in this Young Astronauts program. And as President, I've set a goal that involved you young people, and my goal is for young Americans like you who are in grade school right now to travel to Mars someday.

New travels in space will give us answers to some of the things that children wonder about -- I might add, many adults who contemplate our great universe wonder about these same things, too. The other day I heard what one five-year-old wonders about. One of my staff members asked his five-year-old kid if we should build new spaceships and send people to the Moon again. And the kid said, yes, of course, we should. His father said, well, why, why should we send them to the Moon? He said, "That's easy," the kid said. "It's to see if there's any Martians there." (Laughter.)

Well, we can chuckle about that, but the kid got it about right. As most of you young astronauts know, we've challenged America to go back to the Moon to stay, and then onward to Mars. And sending people back to the Moon for more experience in an environment different from ours is the first step on the journey to explore the gigantic rift valleys and mountains of Mars.

When we break through barriers of the unknown we not only help ourselves, we learn a lot more about ourselves. And when we reach our goal of sending men and women to Mars we can find out the answer to that little five-year-old's wondering about life on other planets. We can learn whether we can extract air and water from materials on Mars to sustain life. We can look for clues on Mars not only to teach us how the Earth developed, but also about the wellspring of life itself.

And pushing foward into space already is helping us here and now. More and more the new jobs for people of your parents' generation are being provided by our space programs. Revenues from American commercial space programs alone grew by 14 percent in 1991, and this year they're projected to grow by 20 percent. The commercial space business has grown so far and so fast that it now takes in about as much as money as all the receipts at the movie theatres all over the United States. If this trend continues, the celestial stars will be getting more attention than the Hollywood stars -- (laughter) -- and that might be all right. (Laughter.)

America now exports $1 billion -- $1 billion a year in commercial space goods and services. Those exports alone translate into jobs for 20,000 Americans. Real progress is happening almost faster than we can imagine. Navigation satellites that helped guide our troops in Desert Storm just a year ago now help hikers and fishermen and surveyors and motorists find their way. Personal navigation receivers now help us manage our forests and wetlands, speed the shipment of goods on our own highways.

Ten years from now the older kids here will be finished with college; some of you may be even finished with graduate school. And when that day comes, when you're ready to start careers and families, I hope many of you will be prepared to become the movers and shakers in our space program. It's up to your parents and grandparents and the congressmen they elect to keep us on track for this promising future of space exploration in commercial space enterprises.

To stress how important this is, a few weeks from now I will formally direct the establishment of a new national space exploration office led by NASA and including scientific talent from our Defense and Energy Departments and other agencies as well. Space exploration should be and will be a national effort. And I should again state that Dan Quayle's leadership as Chairman of the National Space Council has been absolutely vital to the renewed focus and momentum of our space programs.

When I send my annual budget -- when I send it up to Congress next week, it is going to mark the third straight year that I've called for a real increase in spending on our civil space program. And this includes full funding for Space Station Freedom, $2.25 billion, an increase of 11 percent. Space Station is back on track and on schedule. Last year we had an honest debate with those in the Congress who wanted to kill Space Station. We won because the American people agree that Space Station Freedom is not only a very valuable scientific program but it is essential to our destiny as a pioneering nation -- a pioneering nation in space.

And I know many are concerned about the balance between science and exploration in our space program, and the budget that I will propose next week will not short-change science. Space science will remain; more than 23 percent of NASA's program will increase by 10 percent over the current year. But America's destiny must include manned exploration. So my budget increases funding for technologies we need to send man beyond Earth's orbit. And that includes propulsion technologies, life support technologies, two new missions to complete the mapping of the Moon. And finally the budget will include a dramatic expansion of two exciting new programs -- $250 million to triple funding for our new launch system to develop a new family of rockets for the 21st century, and $80 million for the National Aerospace Plane which may one day enable direct flights from Earth to orbit.

For you to fulfill your dream in space exploration when you become adults we must make a new public investment in our space program now. And I'm asking Americans to make a farsighted

commitment, one that looks dozens of years and millions of miles beyond the recession and the other things that tend to preoccupy us today.

And I'm challenging you young people, too: Start your preparations for tomorrow's new age of space exploration right now. Keep that pledge you've made in joining the Young Astronauts Council. Make yourselves better and better students of math and science. Make the USA the leading country in the world in early education for math and science. Make you families proud. Make your teachers proud. Give your very best and America will be better for it.

In doing this, you not only help our space program, you'll also help us meet one of the most demanding goals that I've set for our schools. It aims to involve parents more with our schools, to revolutionize our schools with higher standards and better performance by the start of the new century.

Among the goals of America 2000 is to make America the world leader in math and science education. If we want to reach the Moon and Mars, we've got to aim high. And if you share my aim of making America's students and teachers the best in the world, and if you share my goal of sending American men and women to explore Mars, and if you share my dream of discovering the unknown to make our lives better, you'll see it will require time and effort and study and money.

And it's going to take teamwork across the years. That includes parents -- your parents and then my generation's. Most of all, for a long time to come, it will call for your own best efforts. And I applaud this Council for making a positive different with America's children. The Council is committed to our America 2000 education goals and is playing a true leadership role in our observance of 1992 to celebrate exploration, not only as the 500th anniversary of Christopher Columbus's voyage, but also as International Space Year.

Barbara and I are very proud to serve as honorary cochairmen of the Young Astronauts Council. And it's a pleasure to recognize three dedicated Americans who have been honored as 1992 Young Astronaut Teachers of the Year: Glenda Parker, of Denver, North Carolina, right here. (Applause.) Arthur Perchino -- Arthur, from Norwalk, Connecticut. (Applause.) And Karyn Sotero from right here in Washington, DC. (Applause.)

And now I understand that three young astronauts, Russell Frisby, Rachel Heckmann, and Conner Sabatino, have something they're going to give me. See, this is a very nice ending to this thing. (Laughter.) So you guys come on up here.

(Presentation of gift and representation of NASA/Young Astronaut Council poster contest.)

(Telephone conversation with the Discovery crew.)

THE PRESIDENT: Are we on the air -- I mean, way out there on the air? Colonel Grabe, can you hear me?

COMMANDER GRABE: Yes, sir, Mr. President, we hear you loud and clear.

THE PRESIDENT: What happened? Can you guys here me up there all right?

COMMANDER GRABE: We hear you loud and clear, Mr. President. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: Loud and clear. (Applause.) Well, let me just say to Commander Grabe and all the rest of you all, I'm here with a lot of the young astronauts and some of the older astronauts, as a matter of fact -- (laughter) -- four of the crews here in the White House complex. And we just called up to wish you well. The Vice President is with me. Admiral Truly is with me. And we just want to get from you all how it's doing down there.

A lot of these kids want to get going and get out to Mars. Have you got any advice, first of all, for these young guys here -- young kids, boys and girls?

COMMANDER GRABE: Well, certainly, Mr. President. For any young astronauts that want to pursue a career as an astronaut, they ought to be emphasizing math and science in their studies and just doing as well as they can. It's a long, hard road to get there and it takes a little luck along the way as well. But it's certainly worth the effort.

THE PRESIDENT: We've been talking a little bit about the contribution that these journeys make to science. Can you tell us a little bit about the -- in layman's terms, please -- about the experiments that you all are conducting?

COMMANDER GRABE: Let me turn that over to Bob Thagard; he's our payload commander here on my right.

COMMANDER THAGARD: Well, Mr. President, taking the experiments to orbit is an excellent way to do experiments in some areas in science and it makes this whole journey well worthwhile. The two principal things or areas that come to mind are physiology, both plants and animals, and crystal growing and other material science experiments.

And we have some 55 experiments, I think, in the IML complement, most of those are working even as we speak. And it is our plan to do some more TV, some more explanation later on about some more details of that science.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that is very interesting. Now, if you guys have a couple more minutes -- we don't want to detract you from all this experimentation, but it might be fun if one of these young astronauts, or maybe a couple, would like -- here comes my man. (Laughter.) He's back. This guy just gave a great speech here.

Tell them your name and see if you've got a question for them.

Q My name is Russell Frisby, and here's my question. What's it like in zero gravity?

THE PRESIDENT: Did you get that? He wanted to know what it's like in zero gravity.

COMMANDER GRABE: Yes, sir, we understood the question, what's it like in zero gravity. And I'll turn that over to Bill Readdy, who's on Bob's left.

ASTRONAUT READDY: It's great. just floating around and everything. And a lot of things it just makes a whole lot easier, besides putting your pants on both legs at the same time. (Laughter.) It's easy to translate back and forth. It makes it a whole lot easier to do a lot of the science because any particular orientation you choose works the same as any other. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: That makes it all very clear. (Laughter.) Thank you.

Any other -- come on, you come up and ask one. This is a rare opportunity. Fire away.

Q I wanted to know what was your favorite experiment you've taken up so far?

COMMANDER GRABE: That sounds like a good question for Steve Oswald, our pilot, to answer. Steve's over here on Bill's left.

ASTRONAUT OSWALD: Actually, I guess I'm not sure that, being in the front of the bus, we're working the experiments all that hard. But we've got the I-90 camera aboard. And Bill and Ron and I have been having a great time taking those movies that you see on the big screen. And we're taking pictures right now for a movie that will be coming out here within a year or two.

-- Q I would like to know, which one do you like better is.

ASTRONAUT OSWALD: -- to show that to you, how big it

ASTRONAUT READDY: You're asking about what's great about zero G. Well, this camera on Earth probably weighs about, oh, 110, 120 pounds. Even a big moose like Os has trouble lifting it. But you can see you can quite easily do it with just fingers.

ASTRONAUT OSWALD: The camera probably weighs as much as Roberta, who's manipulating it right now, and you can see she has no trouble at all with it.

THE PRESIDENT: That's great. Do you have one?

COMMANDER GRABE: Mr. President, the one crew member --

Q Which one do you like better, being in space or being on Earth? (Laughter.)

COMMANDER GRABE: I'd like to introduce our Canadian payload specialist, Roberta Bondar, who will be glad to answer that one. (Laughter.)

DR. BONDAR: Actually living, both in space and on the Earth really makes you appreciate the good and the bad of both. I think right now we're enjoying very much the limited opportunity we've had so far with being up here. We've certainly enjoyed looking back at the Earth during our brief moments when we're not in the lab working the sciences. And we're really looking forward to a return to Earth to bring back all the scientific information and all the enthusiasm and experience that we've gained in this flight.

So, for all of us, I think right now we're just enjoying where we are, and we're going to be enjoying where we're going to be when we come back. And I think it's just great to have had this opportunity to be assigned with this great crew.

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Bondar, this is not a young astronaut, this is the President speaking now. But I just want to say how pleased we are that you, representing Canada, are a part, a fundamental part of this. I think it's a wonderful thing, and I think in a wonderful way it shows the strength of ties between our two great countries.

So I understand the Prime Minister, my friend, Brian Mulroney, called. Did he actually get through the other day?

DR. BONDAR: That was right about the time we were having a briefing, just near launch time, and instead, I had a lovely telegram from him and he wished us all well and Godspeed.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, keep up the good work. Now, have you got time for one more question? We've got a real eager one right here. Front of the line. Here we go.

Q I wonder how you feel in space.

THE PRESIDENT: They're trying to decide here.

COMMANDER GRABE: The question was, how do we feel in space?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

COMMANDER GRABE: Well, in space it takes a little bit of time to get used to it. When you first get up, you might feel just the slightest bit queasy or so. But by about today -- this is our third day in space -- we're beginning to adapt pretty well. I think you can see we all feel pretty comfortable up here. So after you get over the initial adjustment, you can live in space quite well and do things that you do on Earth.

THE PRESIDENT: I have a rather technical question. What happens if you get the flu in space? (Laughter and applause.)

COMMANDER GRABE: Some of the older astronauts -- same enthusiasm a kid has, has got to be a great experience. And I feel like I'm about 12.

Q What planets have you seen?

THE PRESIDENT: What planets have you seen?

COMMANDER GRABE: Well, of course, we've got the world's greatest view of our world. But on some of our night passes we can see Saturn and Jupiter and Mars and Venus. It's really spectacular up here. Hope we can go to Mars here one of these days.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we're going to keep trying to get this program geared up to do just that. And maybe -- just maybe, Colonel, one of these kids will here today will be a part of that. Maybe sooner, maybe later. But I'll bet one of them will be a part of that mission.

But listen, I'm told we've got to run on. I've got a lot of eager questioners, but unfortunately, I guess we don't have the time. But we certainly want to wish you well. Your fellow astronauts are standing here quietly in the shadows, and I know that they are wishing you well for a successful conclusion of this productive journey.

You have our blessings and our support, and keep up the fine work. You're on the cutting edge and you're setting a great example for the rest of our country, the rest of the world. Congratulations, and thanks for taking the time out. (Applause.)

END 3:27 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release January 23, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
HONORING THE WOMENS WORLD CUP SOCCER CHAMPIONS

The Old Executive Office Building

2:42 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Well, a thousand apologies for keeping such a distinguished group waiting. And thank all of you for coming here to the White House. First may I single out the Acting Secretary of Commerce Rock Schnabel, down here, and John Keller, the Undersecretary for Travel and Tourism. Coach Dorrance -- the coach is over here -- the guiding light of the Women's National Soccer team. Congratulations. J.B. Marine, the U.S. Youth Soccer Association champions. Are they out there? Way back there. Hold up your hands, let's see you. (Applause.) How about the Potomac School Panthers -- I want these champs to look you over and see the competition coming up. (Laughter.) They're the Independent School League Divisional champs.

Georgetown Visitation's Team -- anybody here from them? Right back there. (Applause.) They are D.C.'s Independent Schools League champs. The Special Olympics Virginia champs -- right over here. (Applause.)

Let me just say that it's great to join you in honoring a group of women who reflect a favorite American pastime -- it's known as winning. (Laughter.)

Leave it to an American team to win the first FIFA World Championship -- world championship, I emphasize. And leave it to an American women's team to win our first World Soccer Championship ever. And that is a marvelous accomplishment. And someone once said that, "sport was the first gret separator of the sexes." For the sake of the male ego, I hope the men start catching up. (Laughter and applause.)

I've done a little bit of research on this gang and it may take a while to describe the terrific lineup. But I'm told of your exploits. Of Michelle Akers-Stahl -- where's Michelle? Right down there -- (applause) -- winner of the Golden Boot Award. That has all kind of connotations for those of us in politics -- (laughter) -- but having been a former soccer player, I imagine it says something about her excellence and her commitment. She scored the winning goal, showing what Hemingway so clearly described as, "Grace under pressure."

And then there's Carla Werden and Debbie Belkin and Lori Henry and Joy Biefeld -- where are they now? There are some of them. (Applause.) They gave a new meaning to the term U.S. defense.

Next, "Crazy Legs" -- (laughter) -- "I hope she owns up it. There is such a person. (Laughter.) Crazy Legs" Karen Jennings on offense. Julie Foudy, right here, who was found studying biology before the winning game, frogs legs and all that kind of thing -- but what a game. And finally, here's to Tracey Bates -- (applause) -- I think she's the real reason why Arnold Schwarzenegger said he couldn't make it today. The coach calls her the tiny terminator.

But look, for each of you, winning this Cup capped a long road of sweat and sacrifice and determination. First the qualifying tournament in Haiti, where I hear you ran circles around the competition -- 49 goals in five games. Then you trekked to China for that grueling championship tournament. I was told that many of you weren't used to some of those more exotic Chinese delicacies that Barbara and I encountered when we lived there for a year-and-a-half -- (laughter) -- duck feet, snakes, all of this kind of thing. These wise guys invented your own slogan: "Come to China; we take off weight." (Laughter.)

But then for the matches in the championship you took on tough opposition, edging Sweden, 3-2; upsetting Germany -- maybe you didn't think it was an upset, sportswriters played it as that -- 5 to 2. You beat the injuries, you beat the odds, and then on November 30th, you proved yourselves again, ousting Norway for the World Cup. No wonder Michelle Akers-Stahl said, "This team never gives up." You showed how America can outscore, outfight and outcompete any nation we're up against.

That kind of spirit made you champions -- the American spirit -- is proud, not arrogant; confident, determined and victorious. I remember the day when America's athletic excellence was limited to perhaps baseball and football in the eyes of the world. Well, today, Americans are taking over everywhere from sumo to soccer. And as proof of just how far soccer has come in this country, the U.S. will proudly host the 1994 World Cup Championship.

So let me just say to today's champions -- world's champions: Your victory is an inspiration, no matter what sport, your victory is an inspiration to all our athletes, male and female, young and old. And thank you for winning one for America. You've made us all very, very proud.

I get accused in my job of having perhaps too keen an interest in sports. Well, too bad. (Laughter.) I think it does a lot for the real spirit of this country. And certainly this team has made a contribution to the real spirit of this country. You've made us very, very proud. So bless you all and thanks for being with us today. (Applause.)

END 2:48 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release January 23, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN PRESENTATION OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE AWARDS

The Old Executive Office Building

10:35 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Connie, thank you. And at the outset of these remarks, let me just pay my respects to Connie Newman and say what a first-class job I know she's doing at OPM. And I know that you take a lot of pride in this event, since you rose through the ranks yourself, starting, as I understand it, if my history is correct, 30 years ago as a GS-3 -- (laughter) -- I've still got you beat on the age now -- (laughter) -- GS-3 clerk-typist at Interior. And look at you now. And we are very, very proud of you.

I also want to welcome Ed Derwinski -- Secretary Derwinski; Acting Secretary Busey; Secretary Stone; Pat Saiki, the Administrator of the SBA; Director Sessions; and so many other distinguished guests. I think I see Admiral Truly out there.

I hear that when one of the recipients was told that the speaker today would be the most important man in Washington, he said, "I thought Joe Gibbs had already left for Minneapolis." (Laughter.) We are caught up in a frenzy here. But that should not detract from the importance of this event.

And it is a privilege for me over here today to congratulate some extraordinary people -- you might say unsung heroes. You don't always get at the head table, don't always have your name flashing out there in lights -- you may be lucky on that one. (Laughter.) But really extraordinary people.

Vince Lombardi, you remember, he gave some pretty good advice off the field as well as on. He put it this way; he said, "The quality of a person's life is in direct proportion to their commitment to excellence."

Well, today what we're doing is honoring the lives of great quality. I am told that only one percent of our SES can receive the Distinguished Executive Award. And that means that out of more than 3 million public servants, you few here today embody the very finest qualities of leadership, dedication, personal integrity and public service.

I reminisce, but when I was growing up, my parents, particularly my dad, instilled in me a tremendous respect for the duty and obligation of public service. And I know that you share my belief that government service is a public trust -- that the highest honor we can have is to serve our country and in so doing serve our countrymen.

Good government cannot work without you -- committed men and women who devote yourselves to making certain that our government truly serves the people. Look at the contributions that you've made in this past year alone. Some of you were instrumental in one way or another in Operation Desert Storm. You share in the triumph we won for freedom abroad and, of some noted significance, of unity at home.

Some devoted your efforts to stirring economic growth here at home, creating opportunity for businesses and farmers and workers. Others dedicated your career to establishing ties abroad; bringing security and jobs to the people of this country in the process.

You worked on child nutrition programs; directed the census; planned water resource projects; managed scientific research; oversaw economic analysis; helped reform the federal pay system; managed aeronautical research; formulated human rights programs; managed veterans care; led drug investigations -- the list goes on and on. In other words, through putting into practice administration programs, you touched the daily lives and shaped the future of all Americans.

And so I am proud to participate in this program. I wanted to extend my congratulations to all, for living by the words of Abraham Lincoln, who said: "I do the very best I know how -- the very best I can; and I mean to keep on doing so until the end." Your country is grateful. And we thank you for your service.

And now, Connie, let's get on with the main business at hand. Thank you, and congratulations to each and every one of you. (Applause.)

(Presentation of awards.)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very much, and to all of you congratulations. This is special and it sends a wonderful message about the quality of our public service across the whole country. So keep it up. (Applause.)

END 10:55 A.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release January 23, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN PHOTO OPPORTUNITY WITH
EPA ADMINISTRATOR WILLIAM K. REILLY

The Oval Office

11:17 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Let me just say that I've had an upbeat and very impressive briefing from Administrator Bill Reilly, from Secretary Watkins, and from Chairman Mike Deland on some of our ongoing efforts to protect America's precious environment.

The budget that I will release next week I think demonstrates our continuing commitment to the environment in a way that is consistent with efforts to create economic growth and to preserve and create jobs.

In EPA's budget we're providing significant increases for Superfund, implementing the Clean Air Act, for enforcing our environmental laws -- and that's critical -- and protecting important resources like the Great Lakes, the Gulf of Mexico and the Chesapeake Bay -- a strong program.

Our budget includes specific grants to help clean up the water in some of our major coastal cities -- Boston and New York on the East Coast; Los Angeles, San Diego, Seattle on the West Coast; and then back to Baltimore on the East Coast.

This budget is going to include $200 million, double the amount enacted last year, for pollution control in the border area. Bill's just back there, I understand, along from California across to Texas.

Secretary Jim Watkins and I have tried hard making a major effort to clean up the federal facilities at which his department, the Department of Energy, has manufactured nuclear weapons materials. That's been going on now for three years. And next week's budget will reflect a major step forward in that commitment -- a $1.1-billion increase, 25 percent above last year's level.

The $5.5 billion that I'll put in my budget for cleaning up federal facilities is more than triple the amount included in the '89 budget when Secretary Watkins and I arrived.

And finally, our budget is going to increase funding in our commitment to the program known as America The Beautiful, expanding and improving our national parks, our forests, our wildlife refuges, and our recreation lands. The budget is going to increase the program to about $1.9 billion, more than double the amount devoted to parks and the outdoors in 1989.

Now, included in that amount is a major expansion, from $23 million to $60 million, for our partnership with the states for the creation of state parks. Now, this is an innovative partnership approach, one that leverages the federal dollars to get the most for every dollar. And I think you'll see this as a wave of the future in

terms of guaranteeing the precious environment that means so much to our country.

So I really want to thank Bill Reilly, thank the Secretary, thank Chairman Mike Deland for coming over and to say I look forward to working with them and the other members of the Cabinet to win support for this budget on Capitol Hill and for continuing to be responsible stewards of the environment.

I think we've got a positive record. We've certainly got able, committed individuals, three of whom are with me right here, working this problem. And I think this preview of coming attractions on the budget will be good news for all of us who share our concern about America's environment.

So I think Bill, as I understand the plan, is going to go in and take some questions in the press room on the expansion of this, what I've announced here today. And I think this will be well-received.

Q Mr. President, in recent days you've been busy on many different fronts -- education, trade, now environment --

THE PRESIDENT: Recent years -- yes.

Q Well, recent days also, sir. But is this -- and recent years -- but is this at all reflective of the perhaps concern about dropping polls? And are you concerned about falling polls?

THE PRESIDENT: No. What I think it does is show a continuing interest in domestic affairs. I've cited some history here -- what's been accomplished over three years. But we're in an election year, and you get all kinds of charges and countercharges, and I think people realize there's been this commitment. Some of the commitment to the domestic side has been overshadowed by the fantastic changes that have taken place around the world. But I think if you take a look at my schedules and my own use of personal time you'll see that this isn't anything new, just a continued commitment. We've made great progress. And I keep getting reassured by Bill Reilly and by Mike Deland, and in his field by Jim Watkins. But we're just going to keep on.

And polls, go up one day and down the next.

Q Mr. President, five months ago you vetoed one unemployment extension and you blocked the second. Now we're told that you're going back an extension on your extension. Isn't this an election-year conversion?

THE PRESIDENT: What we did before is to guarantee that the extensions were within the federal budget, because, you see, I think the American people are also concerned about the federal government spending too much. And what I did was stand for a program that would alleviate the suffering and would get the checks to individuals, but did it inside the budget agreement. So it wasn't a conversion, it was fighting for what was right -- the taxpayer as well as those that were hurting. And we prevailed. We prevailed in both instances. But you stay tuned for the next chapter. It will be coming up.

Q How about the multi -- the disarmament, Mr. President? Can you tell us anything about that?

THE PRESIDENT: Maybe I'll have something to say about that in the State of the Union message.

Anybody got any questions on the environment? (Laughter.) Domestic environment questions?

END 11:23 A.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release January 22, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO CITIZENS DEMOCRACY CORPS CONFERENCE

Room 450
Old Executive Office Building

11:17 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: This is strictly a cameo appearance, a drop-by. And excuse the -- I would ask these distinguished panelists to excuse the interruption and let you return to your regular program in just a few minutes. But I'm delighted to see Ambassador Hartman here, who served his country with such distinction -- most recent post, unless I missed one, was to what used to be the Soviet Union -- and did a great job. Then, of course, Ambassador Polansky, the CDC's Executive Director.

In less than two years, this Corps, this Citizens Democracy Corps, has proved to be an idea ahead of its time. The first mission was to reach out to the newley-independent nations of Eastern and Central Europe. And today, the CDC's mandate extends not only to the nations in the old Soviet bloc, but to the Baltic States, and then even to the former Soviet Union itself.

Let me also welcome a couple of others -- Cooper Evans, that worked long and hard in this building after he served with such distinction in the Congress; a good friend of longstanding; Diane Butterfield, who I know is doing a lot of efficient staff, modestly standing over here. And I'm told but I don't see him right here that Max Kampelman was here. Was he, or not? Well, he's supposed to be here -- (laughter) -- and tell him he's got three demerits for not being here -- (laughter) -- because I was going to say something very -- where is he? Hey, Max. Anytime they can put Max Kampelman in the back of the room in the shadows there's something wrong with the way this thing is set up.

But let me just say I'm grateful for his participation. And like Art Hartman and others here, he really worked hard for human rights and for peace and for all the values that all of us believe in so strongly.

George Soros is here, the President of the Soros Fund Management. My thanks to all of you, all of you, for coming to Washington to take part in an effort that really can, literally, shape the history.

You meet at a critical moment. Right now in the lands of the former Soviet Union, a new revolution is unfolding right before our very eyes. Millions of people have shed the dead weight of the communist past to reclaim their heritage and their history; to revive the powerful hope all people share of living in freedom.

This moment of great hope is also a time of terrible hardship, tremendous hardship. Seventy years of the Soviet experience and the implosion of the socialist economy have taken their toll. The harsh winter, empty shelves fueling discontent and threatening democracy's great gains.

The challenge now for the newley-independent states, the old Soviet Union, is to create a breathing space for free market reform and democratic institutions to take root and grow. Earlier this morning I went over to the State Department, meeting with representatives of over 47 nations. I think 40 of them are at the foreign minister level. They're all now focusing on the urgent question of humanitarian aid for the former Soviet Union.

Look, our country has always helped when people need food or medical attention. We've always tried to do our level-best to help people in need around the world, and this should be no exception.

And today I proposed that Congress now approve an additional assistance, $600 million in technical assistance in humanitarian aid to help the people of the Commonwealth of Independent States. At the urging of many in this room, we have stepped up and we have tried to do our part with several billion dollars of food aid arrangements. We have a tremendous stake in the success of Russia and, indeed, of the other members of the CIS, of this Commonwealth of Independent States.

But I came here to make the point that obviously you all understand, and that is that government to government is only part of the overall equation. Bringing the former Soviet Republics into the community of free nations is a task that can never be accomplished by government alone, particularly now, particularly with this experience that's taking place before our eyes -- the move to market economy, the need to remake, totally remake the financial institutions of whatever it is. It cannot be done by government alone.

So we've got to build the human contacts that give free government its real meaning. The countless exchanges that take place every day among private individuals, they help -- and between businesses and labor, terribly important. The academic exchanges or just contacts by our academicians making contacts with theirs wherever that may be -- terribly important.

All the groups and organizations that give life to a free society ought to be trying in one way or another to interact. And that's where each one of your organizations come in. That's why I proposed the Citizens Democracy Corps. As I said back in the spring of '90 when it was announced, the real strength of democracy is its citizens -- the collective strength of individual Americans.

So let me single out the work of one group here today as a proof of the kind of difference that all of you can make. It's a project called Dakota Cares, sponsored by the North Dakota Grain Growers Association. It started with one of the traditions of the American heartland, pitching in to help someone in need, and transported that idea to people in need thousands of miles away.

Right now, Dakota Cares is moving 100 tons of flour to the people of St. Petersburg, each bag stamped as a gift from the state of North Dakota. Its ability to move that flour across the country, across an ocean and off the docks and into the homes of people who need it, is testament to our spirit, to the American spirit at its very best.

That same spirit animates all the people gathered in this room because you do represent a cross section of American society; people with the expertise and the energy to help an old adversary make the transition to free markets and free government. People who show the world the true meaning of democracy in action. And I am very, very pleased to see so many American organizations, so many individuals so active in strengthening the forces of freedom and democracy.

Let me just say on the government's part, we are going to stay involved. We're in a funny kind of tough year now in terms of priorities, but I must not and I will not neglect my responsibilities to do what I can do as the President of this great country in mobilizing others to do the good work of government, to help where governments can. I'm looking forward to seeing President Yeltsin, for example, when he comes here, talking about the problems that I'm sure many of you are talking about today. We will stay actively and fully involved.

Everyone is looking to the United States of America, to our leadership, since the crumbling of the Soviet Union, not just in how we treat with the Commonwealth, but how we treat with other problems from the Middle East to South America to wherever in the world. So we've got to stay involved as a government and I just wanted you all to know that I will do my level-best to keep the government-to-government programs on the right footing. But the government simply can't do it, can't do it all. We need your help and we need your active involvement.

And it is an enormously exciting period -- it's a time of trouble, a time of great grief and worry for the people over there -- human suffering. But we've got to look at it like it's a time of great promise not just for democracy and freedom and free markets in these things, but for a whole new relationship between our country and these former -- the one former adversary -- parts of which we are trying to help now to the best of our ability.

So thank you very, very much for your concern and your interest. And believe me, you are engaged in something that is fundamental, fundamental to world peace. Thank you. (Applause.)

END 11:26 A.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release January 10, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE DRUG ADVISORY COUNCIL

The J.W. Marriott Hotel
Washington, D.C.

11:41 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very much for that welcome, and thank you Bill Moss, especially, and thank you for the job you did as chairman in launching the Drug Advisory Council.

I'm delighted to be home. And you've got to admit -- when I get the flu, I do it in a very dramatic -- (laughter) -- way. But it was so embarrassing. (Laughter.) But I do feel well. A little bit jet-lagged. We just flew 12 straight hours from Tokyo. In fact, we got here before we took off, if you look at the International Dateline. (Laughter.) So you will excuse me if I'm a little bit tired. But my health is good, and I am so grateful to so many across our wonderful country, and then also in Japan, who, I think, thinking I was a little more seriously sick than I was, expressed their concerns. And I just want to say thanks to everybody who did that.

I am delighted to be here. I did not want to go off to Camp David without stopping by this very, very important meeting. And I'm glad to be here with so many hard workers. I want to single out, of course, Bob Martinez, the former Governor of Florida who is in charge of the fiercely-committed fighters in our battle to lead America away from drugs. You heard from one of these earlier when David Kearns, representing Lamar Alexander -- David, our outstanding executive there at the Department of Education. And in addition, we are very fortunate in a government sense to have the leadership of Attorney General Bill Barr, who is working closely with Bob Martinez, with Lou Sullivan, our very able Secretary of HHS -- intimately involved in all of this. And we are trying as a government to meet this scourge head-on

But I believe that the answer lies right here. I know it lies with the leadership from Jim Burke, who is sitting here at my left. As many of you are aware, Jim has done an outstanding job unleashing the power of the media through this Partnership for a Drug-Free America. There is no way that government itself could do what this individual has done in getting the message -- anti-drug message out across this country. We are very, very grateful to him.

I also am sitting next to another tireless worker, a very successful man, Alvah Chapman, who organized -- just took this on to organize this meeting, organize this crusade all across the country, providing all of us with the vision and leadership that this whole coalition movement represents. So my thanks to him.

I was told by Jim coming in here of the many successful efforts going in the communities represented here, and then some that aren't even represented. And so I want to thank all who have come from all across this land to explore this idea of community coalitions gathering momentum. And if you needed any inspiration, I didn't get to hear her -- maybe she hadn't sung yet, but I've heard her many times. She's been our guest up at Camp David. If you need

a little momentum-gathering, try Sandy Patti on for size, because she is magnificent. (Applause.)

Well, let me just say, it is a pleasure to be back, and it was a great trip. Ten fascinating days in the Far East talking and listening and learning -- working hard for the objectives that we all share of trying to get this country moving through expanding our exports markets. Assuring our friends also that we are going to stay actively involved in the Pacific. You know, given all the changes in Eastern Europe and the hope that is about now because of people that had hated each other over the years, been ancient enemies, now talking in the Middle East. Some in the Pacific area thought that we've just foregone our interests in that part of the world. So I wanted to convince those leaders there that we will fulfill our security responsibilities to that critical area, and we will stay actively involved with that area -- our largest trading partner, incidentally.

But I came here today because I really believe that what you do is vitally important to the well-being of our country. And I wanted to just say this to you. Your nation recognizes the critically important work of your community anti-drug coalitions, and your nation is very, very grateful to each and every one of you.

We are working hard -- all of us, all of you -- to blast the curse of drugs off the face of our map. Our anti-drug effort is one of the highest priorities of any domestic initiative in the federal budget. In 1992, our budget proposal called for $11.7 billion for the drug war -- an increase of 82 percent since the beginning of our administration, and an 11 percent increase since the previous year -- one of the largest in the entire overall budget.

In our war, you know the answer, and I understand and think I know the answer -- we are seeing results. I'm not sure the entire country understands this yet, Jim and Alvah, but I believe we are seeing results. For 1990, we exceeded our goal for reducing overall drug use. We'd hoped for a decrease of 10 percent between '88 and '90 -- and it fell by more than that. I believe the figure was 11 percent. Occasional cocaine use went down 29 percent when we'd set a goal -- I think again, just trying to think positively, I think the goal we had set in our minds was 10 percent. For 1991, figures show we've even more dramatically exceeded many of our goals, particularly in areas like adolescent cocaine use. You know and I know, there is a problem. It's a horrible thing to think about adolescent cocaine use. But it's out there, and it's tough. And we are making headway. We'd hoped to reduce that by 30 percent since 1988, and it has fallen more than 60 percent. So what you're doing is working. What you're doing is having an effect and saving the lives of children.

But let's face it, much remains to be done. More than 12.5 million -- 12.5 million Americans currently still use drugs: 1.9 million of them currently use cocaine. And adolescent drug use has fallen, but still more than 1.3 million of our kids currently abuse drugs.

We're also committed to toughening the drug laws. We devote more effort to fighting drugs than to any other single area of crime. But we cannot do it alone. We need federal drug laws that are on the side of the people. We need a bipartisan effort to help law enforcement protect our present and ensure our children's future. As I said two years ago, when we announced the drug strategy, with this drug problem we face the toughest challenge in decades. We face the challenge not as partisans, but as a nation.

As we've said time and time again, we cannot win the drug war through law enforcement alone. I'm convinced we can do better on law enforcement. And I salute those who are out there

enforcing our laws. But we can't win it through law enforcement alone. We've got to have effective treatment programs, and we need national action.

More than two years ago we established this President's Drug Advisory Council. America was lucky -- very, very fortunate to gain the wisdom and vision of these distinguished American leaders who share our goal of ridding this nation of the devastation caused by illegal drugs. I want to give very special thanks today to our Council members who work tirelessly to mobilize the enormous power the private sector can wield in the war against drugs. Look at this head table, look around, look at those names of the people -- the men and women who are serving, and you'll see we've got very busy, successful people giving of themselves to help others.

In addition, every one of you here today are front-line soldiers in our war. You lead this country's local efforts to reduce drug use in the work place, schools and neighborhoods. We've got a good program. I was briefed by Al Casey and others not so long ago, and Jim was up there at Camp David on this drug-free work place concept. And we're making headway. Still a ways to go, but a very fundamental and important part of our work.

You organize your communities into coalitions. The key to healing this nation is found at the grass-roots level, being what I call a "Point of Light" -- holding your hand out to a neighbor. And this audience today certainly exemplifies in the finest sense the willingness of one American to reach out and help another.

As Americans hear your stories, they realize that there is an alternative to drugs -- and its name is hope. They hear stories of people like Brad Gates, the sheriff in Orange County, who was so concerned about drug deaths that he created the "Drug Use is Life Abuse" program. With the business community, he launched a massive drug education effort targeted at area youth. And the program works because it changes people's attitudes -- gets to the fundamental attitude change towards drugs.

And so does Tad Foote's. When he saw how drugs were destroying his community, he gathered top business leaders like Alvah Chapman and others -- the busiest, the most successful, and they formed The Miami Coalition, a broad-based community organization. And it was dedicated to tackling every aspect of the drug program -- divided it into eight task forces. They've convinced over one-third of all Miami businesses to adopt drug-free work place policies and employee assistance programs; and they have closed down 1500 crack houses. Now that is success, and that is due to the voluntary effort all the way.

The point is simple: no community -- none at all -- has to accept drug abuse. Americans don't have to live in fear. Drugs and so many other social problems can be driven from every community -- if every community cares enough to reach out and try.

Americans deserve a lot of credit for their individual and collective efforts. But we still have much to do. There are casualties in this war. We live in an age when tens of thousands of drug-affected babies are born each year. Therein is the real tragedy. Hold in your arms one of those babies, and you just can't help but have a broken heart. We live in an age when one out of every 4,000 American teens dies by his own hand or at someone else's, and too often drugs play a part -- a fundamental part -- in these tragedies. We live in an age when the scourge of drugs has cheapened life and threatens to erode the moral fabric of this great nation of ours.

Well, you have set an example, summed up by the anti-drug banners created by citizens in Albuquerque that read: "It's easier to build a child than repair an adult." With that kind of tough-minded dedication, we will win. We will make a difference.

Each and every one of you is making a difference, and may God bless you all for that.

Thank you very, very much. And thanks for that warm welcome. (Applause.)

END 11:55 A.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Tokyo, Japan)

For Immediate Release January 9, 1992

PRESS CONFERENCE BY PRESIDENT BUSH
AND PRIME MINISTER MIYAZAWA

Akasaka Palace
Tokyo, Japan

4:30 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: The Prime Minister has suggested I go first. So let me just say that we've had a highly productive and extremely enjoyable visit to Japan. Last night's coverage might not have looked like I was enjoying myself, but all in all it's been great. And for those who have been so nice to inquire, I really do feel almost back to the way I felt before I got hit by this flu.

But in any event, I want to first express my deepest appreciation to the Emperor and the Empress, and to Prime Minister and Mrs. Miyazawa. I just can't imagine anything more hospitable than their kindnesses to us. We appreciate the warm and gracious welcome that they've extended to us, and I also want to thank the many other Japanese leaders and people that Barbara and I have met in the last few days for their kindnesses and for the wonderful cards and the flowers that came in when I had that little flu bug.

We feel we have a much better understanding of your great country, sir, and the great promise of what truly is a global partnership.

The substantive focus of my visit has been the three very productive sessions that I had with Prime Minister Miyazawa, an old and respected friend. As leaders of the two largest economies in the world with a wide range of security and political as well as economic interest, we had an awful lot to talk about. And on the basis of these discussions, I can make three fundamental observations about U.S.-Japan relations.

First, our security alliance is sound. The U.S.-Japan Security Treaty remains the core of stability in East Asia, a region still beset with the uncertainties of a world in profound change. Japan's generous host nation support agreement has helped ensure our continuing ability to retain a forward-deployed presence in Japan, a presence that is essential to American, Japanese and regional interests.

Second, as we enter the post-Cold War era with its many challenges and opportunities, increased cooperation between the United States and Japan on global issues and regional problems is absolutely essential to achieve the foreign policy objectives of both countries.

In this visit, we've dedicated ourselves to building a more prosperous and peaceful world. And for this purpose, the Prime Minister and I have stressed the common purposes of our global partnership and we've set forth the principles for this partnership in a Tokyo Declaration.

And third, we made progress in our all-important economic relationship. Over the past few years we've worked with some success to open markets here so both our countries can benefit

from increased trade, lower prices, better goods and more jobs. And, indeed, we've increased our exports to Japan some 70 percent since 1987 and cut our trade deficit with Japan by about 30 percent.

My administration has negotiated some 11 arrangements to increase our exports in specific sectors. This trip adds another significant but interim step to that progress and, of course, we will be pressing ahead and monitoring progress. I believe the U.S. government and our business leaders have sent a strong message about the importance of fair access to markets.

The detail in the Action Plan including the voluntary import proposals involving many billions of dollars and increased U.S. content for Japanese cars made in the United States make it clear that the message has been received.

Our agreement on government computer procurement will open up additional opportunities in a large leading-edge industry for the United States. We've worked out specific commitments in other sectors representing increased opportunities for U.S. exports, including auto parts, paper and glass, and resolved over 50 standards problems -- this is the key -- 50 standards problems that have impeded American businesses. And we've agreed to expand our Structural Impediments Initiative by adding new commitments that will help us follow up on this trip. And I'm pleased that we have worked out together the announcement from a day ago, a strategy for world growth. That one will stimulate -- be helpful to both economies.

I'm also particularly pleased that Japan and the U.S. could agree on a strong joint statement about the Dunkel draft for the Uruguay Round negotiations. We're sending a joint message that I hope will build momentum to drive the GATT negotiations to a successful finish. There is no doubt that we have much more work to do, abroad and at home, to increase U.S. exports and the jobs they create.

Yet, we've made headway. There's no question about that. And I'm committed to accomplishing more in the future using all available measures.

In conclusion, this visit has been a success. It has reaffirmed our vital political, security and economic relationship. It has advanced our goal of leveling the playing field in U.S-Japan competition of further opening Japan's markets to our exports.

So this progress translates into jobs and economic growth in America because I know the American worker can compete with anyone around the world if given a fair chance. And that's exactly what we intend to do. And the accomplishments I've mentioned here aim us directly in that direction.

Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister.

PRIME MINISTER MIYAZAWA: Well, those of you who watched the television last evening must have been concerned very much. But as you can see, the President is very well today. And I think people around the world feel assured now. And I sincerely pray for his continued good health.

This is the first time in eight years that we welcome the U.S. President here. And we had three meetings with him. We were able to have very candid exchange of views. And I'm also very glad and satisfied that we have been able to strike very close personal relations.

As is shown by the dismemberment of the Soviet Union at the end of last year, the world in the post-Cold War era doubtless are developing new moves and trends towards the building of peace and democracy. And in creating such historic developments, I should like

to express once again my deep respect to President Bush for his outstanding foresight and leadership as is shown in the START agreement as well as the nuclear disarmament proposal.

Japan and the United States have steadfastly maintaining freedom, democracy and basic human rights and market economies together account for 40 percent of the global GNP, establishing unprecedented prosperity together. And I think it's important that we, together, work to further promote the building of the new world order -- the new world. And it is important that the United States continues to exercise leadership, and Japan wishes to actively support those efforts by the United States. I believe that the meetings that I had with the President would mark a concrete first step towards the building of a Japan-U.S. global partnership.

I had a candid exchange of views on various trade and economic issues as well. And in addition to steadily implementing our economic policies as reflected in the joint statement issued yesterday, I believe we were able to engage in substantive discussions on various measures related to the automobiles and automotive parts and components, the central area of Japan-U.S. trade issue today.

Now, in view of the closeness of the economic ties between our two countries, frictions would be inevitable from time to time, and, of course, our agreement this time would not necessarily resolve all the problems. But I believe that the discussions I had with the President have been very useful and I'm satisfied with the meetings.

Furthermore, on the basis of the discussions that I have had with the President this time, we have come up with the Tokyo Declaration and the attached document called the Action Plan. These documents are indeed very dramatic and -- in that they spell out how our bilateral relations ought to be, bearing in mind the 21st century, and also spells out our responsibilities and roles that our two countries respectively should play and the issues we together ought to address. And we are determined to further strengthen global partnership between our two countries on visa fees and documents.

I believe it is quite unprecedented that countries in terms of human history, countries with so strikingly different cultures and history have established a deep interdependence and cooperation. It is unprecedented that countries with such different cultural and historic backgrounds share the future together, and together would work for the world. And I believe that we are attracting a lot of attention from around the world, and I intend to do my best, together with the President, to respond to the adaptations.

Q First of all, I'm quite relieved to see you fit and well. My question is for President Bush. Before coming to Japan, Mr. President, you stated that there are two objectives to your visit. One is this is a job-creating trip; you are going to increase jobs for the Americans. I think that was the first objective that you've stated.

The second objective, and I think this was stated during the press conference in Singapore, you referred to the sense of dislike for the United States in Japan, and one of your objectives is to overcome such sentiment in Japan. In your statement just now you mentioned that you believe your visit has been successful for the first objective, that is for growth. So I should like to ask a question with regard to the second objective.

A U.S. high official said in Seoul, even if the political strength of Prime Minister Miyazawa is weak, there is a liberal democratic party in Japan. That was a statement that came out on the 5th of this month, and then on the 6th -- well, I think he

was referring to remarks that were made by Prime Minister Miyazawa at the Ise Shrine that since Japan enjoyed favor of the United States after the war, it is time for Japan to return that friendship. And that high official said you're not -- the United States is not seeking charity.

You've come with business leaders this time and I think --

PRESIDENT BUSH: What's the question?

Q -- Japanese people feel that is somewhat strange. So with regard to the second objective, I wonder if your visit this time really has been helpful in overcoming the extent of the dislike in the United States.

PRESIDENT BUSH: I'm embarrassed to say I didn't follow all the hypothesis. (Laughter.) But I think I got the two points that you asked. One is jobs. I think we have created jobs. We get back there and we'll have to see.

We've got the growth agenda. We have entrants to certain markets -- computers and other things. We've got auto parts that are -- they'll be discussed with you later on by the people that have worked out the details. So I think we can say this has been productive in that account.

In terms of -- you only said dislike for U.S. in Japan. I have been troubled about anti-Japanese feeling in the United States and anti-U.S. feeling in Japan. And I think, because of the hospitality of Prime Minister Miyazawa, because of the schedule that has been worked out, because of the personal attention to us by Their Majesties the Emperor and Empress, and hopefully, by the way our business people have moved out and talked to a lot of different folks, and Barbara's visits to the schools -- I hope that that has helped in this second category that you properly ask about.

I think time will tell. But I'll tell you from our standpoint, I think that the signals going back to the United States of this kind of hospitality, this kind of genuine friendship, this kind of caring when I have a little tiny bout of flu, sends a good signal. And sometimes we forget the big picture. And as I tried in my statement to say, this U.S.-Japan relationship is vital to world security and to many other things.

So I hope the visit has helped in that second account, sir.

Q Mr. President, people all around the world yesterday saw some very disturbing video of you collapsing in apparently very severe distress that many of us are not accustomed to when we see people with the flu. Can you describe what you were experiencing there? And also can you say that your doctors have conclusively ruled out anything other than the flu, or will there be further tests --

PRESIDENT BUSH: No further tests. Totally ruled out anything other than the 24-hour flu. I've had an EKG -- perfectly normal. I've had blood pressure taken and probing around in all kinds of ways. And it's all going very well, indeed. And I got a call from Bill Webster today, former head of CIA -- I didn't take it, but somebody passed it along -- and he told me of exactly the same thing happening to him where he went in and totally collapsed.

So this is the flu. I'm very fortunate that in all the years that I've been President, I don't think I've had much of it. And so let me just take this question and then reassure the American people and others that have expressed so much interest that it is -- that's all there is to it. Nothing else to it.

And somebody asked me earlier, am I going to slow down my schedule? I don't think it has anything to do with speed or slowness of the schedule. One of the businessmen, who is young and aggressive and eager -- this morning, a young guy on this trip got it. I understand some of the journalists have had flu. And people in our country have had it, so why isn't the President entitled to 24 hours? (Laughter.)

But, really, I'm glad to get the question because they've done all the checking in the world. The heart is normal, the thyroid, or whatever is left of it, is going fine, and -- (laughter) -- I really have no hesitancy or worry at all.

Q Are you at all concerned that now that you've had two quite sort of public health episodes that some of the Democratic political opponents who are a lot younger than you might make a subtle issue out of the fact that you're somewhat older and perhaps you --

THE PRESIDENT: Do you think only old people get the flu, Rita? Do you think only old people get the flu? I think Democrats get the flu from time to time. (Laughter.) So I wouldn't worry about that. And I don't think -- I think it would backfire if somebody tried to make an issue. I've been blessed by good, strong physical condition. I played tennis yesterday and then, wham, got hit with the flu. But that's perfectly normal. So I don't think there's any political downside.

I've always said that if I felt I couldn't do my job for serious -- some physical reason, I wouldn't run for president. But all signals are still go.

Q I've got a question for Mr. Miyazawa. I think you referred to giving impetus to the Uruguay Round talks, to the Dunkel document. I wonder what sort of momentum you're talking about. What sort of momentum does Japan intend to add?

PRIME MINISTER MIYAZAWA: This document refers to this moment which could be a stimulus or whatever you call it. Now, at these final stages of the Uruguay Round talks, the talks would boil down and in the Dunkel text, which is not the final text, the issues have been clarified. So the range of issues are becoming narrower. That is what we are referring to.

Q Mr. President, I read an interview, a transcript of an interview with Mrs. Bush in which she stated that if there should come a defeat in November for you that she wouldn't be extremely disappointed at the possibility of doing some other things. I'm wondering, sir, are you mentally prepared for the possibility of not winning in November, and if you have given any thought to her view of doing something else other than going all over the world and living 18-hour days?

THE PRESIDENT: The answer to your question is no and no. (Laughter.) I think I'm going to win. I have not thought of any alternative. I believe I've been a good President and I think -- everybody talks about dogged by sagging polls -- any time the country is facing problems and people are hurting, the President must and should pay a certain price for that. But I'm also confident that our economy will recover, and I think that we'll have an awful lot to take -- of a case -- a strong case to take to the American people.

So, literally, I've never thought about it. I don't think defeat when I'm fixing to go into a campaign and I don't think of alternatives. So it never has come up. Now, I won't give her equal time. I don't know what she's thinking about -- (laughter) -- but I literally have not thought about it at all. I believe I'm going to win.

Q I'd like to ask a question of Prime Minister Miyazawa. I wonder if you've been able to establish the results -- it seems that this has been unilateral concessions made by Japan depending on how you look at it. And I wonder how the Japanese should read the results.

PRIME MINISTER MIYAZAWA: The issues resolved between Japan and the United States -- of course, in the result of these problems, the goodwill and friendship between our two countries would be very important. But in the midst of such new and major changes in the world, I think it is very important that the United States, the world leader, remains firm and steady. And it would not be good for the United States, to be encumbered with such difficulties and headaches. Now, in welcoming the President, we had engaged in a long period of preparations and we've come up with these results. There are various issues which we've been thinking about for a long time and we hadn't acted on -- problems of our own.

More specifically, there have been some actions we thought it would be better, specifically, to better the trade balance between Japan and the United States. So there were areas of betterment of the Japanese economic structure itself and also betterment of the Japan-U.S. trade balance as well. And I think as a result of the measures we have agreed on, we will be able to respond to both issues.

Q American leaders since Nixon have been engaging in trade talks with Japan and emerging claiming great success, and nothing seems to change too much. Some of that, in a more specific sense, has been related to the American auto industry, relief from competition from Japan. And yet, they continue to lose market share.

Some Americans feel it's because our bloated salaries in Detroit, because of lack of responsiveness to consumers and the fact -- or the claim that they make cars that are not competitive. What's different from this round of trade talks than previous ones?

THE PRESIDENT: Gene, let me simply say that when this is over I believe there are going to be some briefings from our experts to give you the specifics of what has been worked out on auto parts or access to the Japanese market with autos. And so it's come a long way. There's some specificity here that I think will answer that question that I understand will be provided when this broader-scale briefing is over.

So I think when you look at the agreements you're going to see that both sides have agreed to more in the way of auto parts, more in the way of autos coming into this country from the United States and in a couple of other areas as well. So I think there's some specificity to go with the hope in this case.

Q Do you feel that the American industry has to do more to --

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I think we've got to do more as well, and not just on autos. In both the public and the private sector. One of the things that we haven't focused on here today is this economic growth agenda, and there the United States must do something. Japan is growing more than we are. So they should say, well, how about yourselves? And we're saying we're going to submit a growth package, we're going to fight for it, we're going to try to get our interest rates down. And we've got to do a better job in all industries on building quality, improving competitiveness, knowledge and understanding of the Japanese market so we can be vigorous competitors based on more cultural understanding and background.

So it isn't a one-way street. And I'm very unreluctant to say that right here.

Q In your press conference on New Years Day, you said you were thinking of America as -- (in Japanese) -- and my dictionary says it means with a feeling of sympathy, a feeling of compassion. Why do you feel sympathy for America?

PRIME MINISTER MIYAZAWA: Well, you use the words sympathy or compassion, and I would not claim that these are inaccurate. What I really tried to say was that we have to understand the other person's position. When you say favored and there is an antonym disfavor, well, what I'm trying to say is that we have to try and understand the other's position, and it is with that in mind that I've tried to address these series of issues.

And at the very base of all that is the long-standing relations, friendship between our two countries. But for various reasons, the U.S. society -- and I might say I believe the U.S. society is a great society -- but there are homeless people, there is the problem of AIDS and so on. And for various reasons, education is not as high as in the past. And U.S. industries are not as company competitive as in the past for various reasons.

Americans are pointing to these problems. And since Americans themselves are aware of these problems, I am convinced they will overcome these problems because I believe that the United States is a great country. But until those problems are cured those problems will continue to exist. And we have to understand the position of the United States, and with that understanding we have to address the issues between our two countries, because these problems appear in the form of trade imbalance between our two countries as well. So it is with that sort of understanding I think we ought to approach the problems.

I wonder if there is a Japanese press reporter who wishes to ask a question. If not, then we'll move over to the foreign press.

Q Since you are talking about your State of the Union in which you're going to propose some things that you hope from the U.S. side will help stimulate the economy, I imagine you might have heard something about that from some CEOs on this trip. Can you tell us if the payroll tax cut that would be an instant increase for businesses bottom line and in individual taxpayers' pockets is on the short list of any possible tax changes under consideration?

PRESIDENT BUSH: No, I can't tell you that because I'm not prepared to say what's on the short list, what we are considering. We will have a sound growth package that is sound enough that it will not adversely affect the long-term interest rates that will get to investment and job creation at home.

And that's what's needed in our economy right now. And I will be working with the Congress to try to get that done. I will try to avoid some of the ideas that I've seen out there that would shoot the interest rates right through the roof, would take too long to do anything and would, in the long run, be counterproductive. But I just would not -- do not want to go into detailing what's on a possible short list, although we are narrowing down now to -- just since I've been on this trip -- to what our final proposal will include.

Q Mr. President, in your summit meeting yesterday, Mr. President, you have said now that the Cold War is over the relations are at a turning point or a crossroads. And I think instead of confrontation, what do you think we must do for cooperation?

A question for the Prime Minister. You mentioned that we were very much touched by the President's speech in Pearl Harbor.

Now, bearing that in mind, I wonder how you would respond to the question raised by the President yesterday, Mr. Prime Minister?

PRESIDENT BUSH: Well, I would say cooperation, the successful conclusion of the GATT Round, although that's multilateral. I would say that Japan and the United States continue to be in such close touch that when it comes to helping other countries, be it in South America as democracy starts moving there, or be it in Eastern Europe or, indeed, in the Commonwealth, that it's the U.S. and Japan that stay in very close touch on those things.

I had a chance today, with Prime Minister Miyazawa, to take a tour de raison around the world. I would also say that it includes cooperation in trading in Asia itself outside of Japan. Neither he nor I want to see the world divided up into trading blocs. And so, as I was assuring him that the NAFTA -- the North American Free Trade Agreement -- which will affect Canada and Mexico is not a trading bloc, I had an opportunity to glean from him that Japan would lose if, say, there was an Asian trading bloc.

So neither of us -- I think in terms of cooperation, as your question asked -- we will cooperate to be sure that we don't inadvertently fall into trading blocs that will narrow trade rather than increase it. But Japan is a respected world power, and we must cooperate. I've supported publicly the return of the Northern Islands to Japan. And there's an area where perhaps cooperation between the two parties can be helpful.

We had long talks about Mr. Yeltsin's coming out and trying to bring democracy and free markets to Russia. And I think that there's an area where we can have cooperation. So as I look around the world, I believe cooperation is called for in almost every instance. I can't think of one where it's not. The United Nations working, in the U.N. now with Japan on the Security Council for two years. Close cooperation as we try to use international law to solve some of these problems, as we did in the Gulf.

PRIME MINISTER MIYAZAWA: In the speech delivered by the President in Honolulu he said he held no rancor against Japan or Germany. These former enemies have become best friends for democracy is what basically he said. He saw quite a few warships that are sunk in Pearl Harbor with the dead bodies of the soldiers and with veterans in front of him. So I believe it was not easy for the President to say all those things. And that is why I was especially moved by the friendship shown by the President, the sense of trust expressed by the President.

Japan was able to grow this much, thanks to the continued support and help by the United States. This again we should not forget. And this friendship was at the very foundation of the meetings that I had with the President this time.

The President in Honolulu also mentioned that we must fight against or fight off isolationism and protectionism. And I think these words were uttered with Japan in mind.

Now, in discussing economic issues this time, there was concern expressed that the entire world might fall into protectionism; and what can we do in order to prevent that? Trade imbalance persisted for 20 years or so, and if nothing is done then one of the parties concerned may well fall into protectionism. So something ought to be done about it.

Q Thank you very much, Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister.

Q Mr. President, are you satisfied? Did you get all you wanted? Did you get all you wanted?

Q Mr. President, have you heard from the auto industry, what they think of --

Q Can you put a number on the number of jobs, Mr. President? Or at least the nature of the jobs, sir?

Q How much will the trade imbalance go down, Mr. President?

END 5:30 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Tokyo, Japan)

For Immediate Release January 9, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT STATE DINNER

Imperial Palace
Tokyo, Japan

8:10 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Your Imperial Majesties and honored guests. On behalf of the American people, we wish to thank you for the warmth of this reception and for your tireless efforts in support of the relationship between our two great nations.

The United States and Japan today stand on the threshold of a new era of cooperation, in which our nations seek to build a new world of freedom and democracy. The task before us is daunting -- one which will require vision and courage. But it is one from which we cannot shrink. Too much depends on us.

As leaders of this new world, we face several challenges together: addressing the new security requirements of a changed world; promoting freedom and democracy; and generating world economic growth and prosperity.

Tonight, we celebrate the essence of this new world order and the opportunity to be true partners in its construction. We see how former enemies can become close allies and friends -- real friends -- each supporting, competing, growing, dreaming. Each understands that we must resolve our differences fairly and constructively.

Our people both believe in work, community, faith and family. We know how democracy supports the cause of peace among nations. We realize that although half a world may separate us, great ties unite us -- ties that are economic and military, moral and intellectual.

Your Majesty, the name you have chosen for your reign can be translated as "achieving peace." That choice signifies your deep personal commitment to this noble aspiration -- and your resolve not to revisit the tragedies of the past. We are now closer to achieving the blessings of peace than we have been at any time in this century.

When the great Japanese novelist Kawabata received the Nobel Prize in Literature, the citation praised him for "building a spiritual bridge spanning East and West." In this changing world where the walls that once divided whole nations from each other are crumbling, we all must become both bridges to and partners in a new world order.

In that spirit and with heartfelt thanks, Your Majesty, for your wonderful hospitality, I ask all of your guests to raise their glasses. To your health, sir, and to the bridge of friendship and common purpose uniting our countries; to those who built it and cross it still; and to the prosperity of our two great peoples.

(A toast is offered.) (Applause.)

END 8:13 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Tokyo, Japan)

For Immediate Release January 9, 1992

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF TREASURY NICHOLAS BRADY
AT JAPANESE WELCOMING COMMITTEE LUNCHEON

Akasaka Prince Hotel
Tokyo, Japan

12:45 P.M. (L)

SECRETARY BRADY: Thank you, Prime Minister Kaifu. Of course, I want to start my remarks by extending to all of you the President's apologies for not being present at lunch today. This meeting was to be a high point of his trip. I'm sure you all know as well of his great respect and warm feelings for former Prime Minister Kaifu. And it is with real regret that he was not able to be here at lunchtime today.

As Prime Minister Kaifu said, the President is fine. I talked to his doctor just an hour ago. The doctor is a former classmate of mine at college; I know him very well, so I can assure you the information is correct. The doctor has told the President in very strict terms to rest this morning. He will be resuming his schedule later today and I'm sure will express to all of you his deep regret at not being able to join you at this wonderful gathering.

Mr. Prime Minister, members of the Diet, distinguished guests. It is a deep honor to be here today. President Bush has asked me to make his remarks to you this afternoon. Although there have been minor grammatical changes in pronouns, this is the President's speech; these are his words.

We come to Japan at the culmination of a long and productive journey. Today we stand at a turning point in history; the Cold War is over, the Soviet Union has vanished, and with it the delusions of communism. Centuries-old enemies in the Middle East are tempering ancient hatreds in pursuit of peace. Freedom's phoenix is rising from the ashes of tyranny. And nations from Latin America to Eastern Europe and from Cambodia to Mongolia.

Freedom's rebirth was painful; its triumphs enscribed in blood; its truce seared by the fires of war and sacrifice. This century has taught us two crucial lessons: first, that isolationism and protectionism lead to war and deprivation; and second, that political engagement and open trade lead to peace and prosperity.

These last few years we again learned of the power of ideas. Technologies that transmit ideas in the blink of an eye carry the human spirit over barricades and through barbed wire. They hurdle walls designed to hold back the truth.

We live in a world transformed, shrunken by swift travel and instant communication; drawn closer by common interests and ambitions; propelled forward by people's imaginations and dreams.

As leaders of this transforming world, the United States and Japan must help build a new international order based on the rule of law, respect for human rights and political and economic liberty. We must shape a world enriched by open trade and robust competition; a world that will create a better life for people of all nations.

MORE

The United States lies between two great oceans, the Atlantic and the Pacific. We are a nation of the Atlantic by birth, but our ties to the Asia Pacific region deepen daily. Our two-way trade is now $310 billion annually, one-third larger than that with Europe. Our prosperity and yours are indivisible. American businesses cannot flourish in Asia unless the economies of Asia thrive and grow.

At the same time, Japan's growth needs American markets open and growing. Since 1975, a number of Americans of Asian origin has nearly quadrupled. What happens here is very important to us. And at the core of our continuing Asian engagement stands our alliance with Japan.

At each stop during his visit to the region the President has stressed the challenges we must face: addressing the new security requirements of our transforming world, promoting democracy and generating world economic growth and prosperity. Let me expand upon that by focusing on the special relationship that the United States enjoys with Japan.

Rarely in history have two nations with such different and differing historic cultural roots developed such an extraordinary relationship. Our people are bound by shared security, by democracy and by our deep economic ties. There are those who doubt the future of this relationship. There are reasons for tension. Here in Japan you have a saying, "Some rain must fall to prepare the ground for building." We can all see that without progress we may be in for some rough weather. And I must be frank in saying that there are problems in our economic relationship. Speaking not only for the United States, but for many developed countries, Japan's trade surplus is too high and its market access too restricted.

President Bush has come to Japan as a friend, seeking solutions to these concerns, believing that the expansion of free and fair trade will do nothing but strengthen our relationship. We in the United States are confident about our capacity for partnership. Our areas of common interest are too important. Consider the four key areas of our joint relationship.

First, the U.S.-Japan security alliance. We enjoy a strong security bond with Japan. Japan's generous host nation support for U.S. forces stationed here is an important demonstration of shared responsibilities. Let us make the most efficient use of our defense resources by building greater coordination of our military forces and by promoting the two-way flow of defense technology. Such cooperation enhances our security and builds even stronger political ties between us.

The Gulf crisis sparked spirited debate here about Japan's global role. That makes it all the more profound that no nation outside the Gulf region provided more generous financial support than did Japan. The American people and peace-loving people everywhere appreciate deeply your contribution -- Japan's contribution -- to the United Nations coalition in the Gulf.

Even before the Gulf war, but especially in its aftermath, Japan has continued to define its growing role in world affairs. An increasingly active engaged and responsible Japan is critical to a forward-looking post-Cold War community. That community will not exist unless its leading powers lead.

This brings us to the second area of our relationship: our foreign policy cooperation. We must fulfill the bright promise of our global partnership. Together, we produce 40 percent of the world's gross national product. We contribute together 40 percent of all bilateral aid. We have the ability to marshal unrivaled resources to build a better future if our foreign policies are well coordinated.

America has a responsibility here, but it is a responsibility we share with Japan. The upcoming conference on assistance to the nations of the former USSR., not the Commonwealth of Independent States, is a timely example of such foreign policy coordination.

The collapse of the Soviet Union has also spurred questions within Japan about the durability of U.S.-Japan alliance. For decades, this alliance has stood as the bulwark of American-Japanese international cooperation. It is today every bit the linchpin of regional stability and bilateral cooperation that wise men foresaw years ago.

The demise of the Soviet Union may confront us both with ominous dangers, but it also presents us an historic opportunity. The leadership Japan and other Asian nations can provide to help transform a once-totalitarian empire into market-oriented and democratic states helps guarantee the future peace and stability of our world.

Let me add that with the changes in the former Soviet Union, the United States sees no reason why Japan should not regain the Northern Territories. We share this goal, and in whatever way we can, we will help you attain it.

We cannot imagine meeting the foreign policy challenges of our time without Japan as a partner. That is why today Prime Minister Miyazawa and President Bush will issue a document called the Tokyo Declaration, setting out the basic principles and major challenges of our global partnership. By putting into words the fundamentals of the two great partners we hope to guide the way through the turbulent waters ahead. We must be clear about our responsibilities and our requirements, for our renewed alliance will do much to define the shape of the post-Cold War world.

Third, we must deepen our understanding of each other. For all of our interaction politically and economically, our peoples know too little of the other's history, traditions and language. We welcome the work of the Center for Global Partnership in expanding exchanges and interactions: intellectual, scientific and cultural. Thanks to such programs, our two nations will have an ever-increasing number of people who have lived in each other's country, speak each other's language and understand more fully how important we are to each other.

Although more than 200,000 Asian students now study in American colleges and universities, more Americans must immerse themselves in Asian societies and cultures.

As the exchange of free people and ideas flows between our nations, and as the Cold War ends in victory for our cause, our economic relations have taken center stage. This brings me to the fourth and most important point.

If we are to expand our economic ties, we must face up to the economic tensions that threaten our relations. We must reduce those tensions now by opening markets and by eliminating barriers to trade and investment. We are now each other's largest overseas trading partner. Japan will sell about $90 billion worth of goods and services to the United States this year; we will sell nearly $50 billion to Japan.

Our economies, the world's two largest and most technologically advanced, have become irreversibly intertwined. Closing markets and restricting trade have previously brought the world to the brink of economic disorder. Isolation and protectionism

must remain the sleeping ghost of the past, not the waking nightmares of the future. We must reject these failed notions in the sure knowledge that expanding markets mean expanding jobs and increasing prosperity for both our countries.

We must ensure a continued strong two-way economic relationship between Japan and the United States, with markets more open to new goods and services; manufacturers more open to new competitive ideas; the financial services industry competing on a fair basis; and an equitable flow of technology on both sides.

Our two countries share a special responsibility to strengthen the world economy. Yesterday the President and the Prime Minister announced a strategy for world growth, which commits both our countries to domestic policies to stimulate growth. Expanded domestic demand in Japan translates into additional exports to Japan for American products and jobs at home. And we are seeking broad support for growth policies among other industrialized countries as well.

Many American businesses learned during the past decade that the old ways no longer work in our changing international marketplace. Our companies have cut costs, improved quality, and championed innovation. As a result our products sell in markets everywhere they have access. And candidly, such access is still limited in Japan.

We must reduce the trade imbalance between us -- not through managed trade, through gimmicks or artificial devices, but simply by gaining true and welcome access to your markets. We want to create fair opportunities for traders and investors, both buyers and sellers, by removing the barriers both seen and unseen to open an equitable trade.

American business doesn't need a handout and doesn't want one. Some say that perhaps it is time to help the United States out of a sense of pity or compassion. Let me tell you, we are looking for no such help. What the United States wants from Japan is for Japan to recognize its international economic responsibility for its own sake and for the sake of the global marketplace upon which Japan depends. When we express appreciation to those who seek to open Japanese markets, it is not because we need a handout, but because we know an open Japan is good for us all.

Our companies simply expect the chance to compete fairly in markets around the world. Our government remains committed to open markets and we will further reduce our own trade barriers as our friends dismantle their own.

Our two countries have embarked on a unique experiment in economic independence called the Structural Impediments Initiative. In this effort, each side pinpoints the other's barriers to competitiveness, and each commits to reduce them. We both must reinvigorate this commitment to market access, whether for high quality American products or quality American services. The beneficiaries will be the workers and consumers on both sides of the Pacific.

Improving our economic relations includes further opening your markets. It means greater openness in many sectors of the Japanese economy still biased against outside investment. These practices hurt American companies, but they also hurt Japanese consumers.

Americans want the same things you want: a better quality of life for themselves and their families. Americans never say, please raise our prices, and I bet the Japanese don't either. Every worker is also a consumer and economic competition bring them great choices and lower prices. In fact, the Toys-R-Us store that

the President visited in Kyoto offers prices up to 30 percent lower than its Japanese competition. The stunning success of the consumer's response to its sister store north of Tokyo tells the same story. That's good for us and it's good for you.

U.S. export business is stronger than ever. We sold more exports last year than ever before. We enjoy a trade surplus with Europe. About one-third of our economic growth between 1985 and 1990 was attributable to merchandise exports. To Japan, our manufactured exports are up 70 percent since 1987, a $20-billion increase that represents almost half-a-million jobs.

Still the overall trade deficit with Japan remains large. And I might add, its persistence is truly the exception among our trading partners. Let me say this: We have waited a long time, but now the time has come for equal access; fair play is in both our interests.

As you know, the United States and Japan also face the urgent challenge of leading the way to a successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round. Because of the benefits we each derive from free trade, Japan and the United States bear special responsibility for tackling the remaining difficult issues quickly and decisively. The success of the Round depends on bold, far-sighted leadership. We must lift our gaze to the glimmering horizon of broader prosperity and not worry over the stones in our immediate path.

Yes, all of us have problems with portions of the so-called Dunkel draft, but we cannot let the progress it represents slip through our fingers. If we allow that draft to be picked apart by special interests, who wins? Not our people; not yours. Not the less-developed nations. No one.

The GATT Round is the world's best hope for expanding trade for all countries. Men and women from all walks of life and all parts of America constantly tell the President this: They believe very, very strongly in creating a level playing field for everyone. We want all our trading partners to give the United States' companies the same kind of opportunities that their firms enjoy in the United States. That's not just free trade, that's fair trade. And it creates a basis for even greater freedom and greater prosperity for all.

Many of our Japanese friends argue that the United States must improve its competitiveness, and they're right. We recognize that some of our bilateral trade imbalance stems from causes other than restricted market access. One reason for Japan's competitiveness is because Japan has saved and invested at a rate double that of the United States. You have focused on applied research and development and new manufacturing technologies. Your companies have established fine quality control systems. You have developed a highly educated labor force and have taken the long view to develop markets abroad.

There is much for us to learn from you. We are taking steps to boost our competitiveness. We can and will increase our rate of savings and investment. We will continue to boost our manufacturing excellence. We will reduce the budget deficit. To stimulate innovation, risk and longer-term business outlook, the President is pushing for investment incentives, R&D credits and capital gain tax cuts. In America, cutting capital gains is politically extremely difficult. It would be easier if our politicians saw the positive effect on Japan's competiveness due to low capital gains rates.

And America must raise its educational standards. Our America 2000 education strategy will fuel a revolution for better quality schools. This is another path to competitiveness. The education achievements of Japan and others in the Asia Pacific region

inspire us. That is why President Bush has invited the countries of the Pacific Rim to send their education ministers to Washington for a conference this spring to seek new ways to cooperate and to learn from each other's accomplishments.

With the President today, traveling with him, is a delegation of America's top business leaders. They've come to explore new business opportunities in all the nations the President has visited. Every one of them can tell you that despite the fact that our economy is facing some new tough times right now, America still draws upon tremendous strengths. Our basic research is the best anywhere. We have many of the world's finest universities. American technology remains on the cutting edge in many advanced fields, such as computers and biotechnology.

Our society is energetic, creative, and talented. It has the added advantage of drawing upon the strengths and insights of many cultures, including Japan's.

The chief executive officers accompanying the President will also tell you that they care about American jobs. They care about American exports -- obviously, so does the President. We know that the Asian Pacific market offers enormous potential to those American businesses that will accept the challenge of competition. That same competition has propelled Japan toward world leadership. Open markets around the world has provided Japan with economic prominence. Japan must now join the ranks of world leadership in strengthening free markets and freedom.

Finally, let me leave with you a message that the President wished to give directly to the people of Japan. And I quote:

The American people are your friends. Friendship must be built upon three pillars: fairness, trust and respect. We expect nothing less and we ask for nothing more. Today marks a turning point for us in many ways. Together, we face the next millennium. A new order for the ages, a new world of freedom and democracy. We stand as the world's powers with the future presenting us with a decision. The United States has made its choice against isolationism and in favor of engagement. Against protectionism and for expanding trade. Today, we bid Japan to do the same because engagement and open trade are in your best interest.

Together, let us shape a new and open world, a world of vigorous competition and dazzling innovation. Let us build a world of greater prosperity and peace than ever before. If not for the sake of ourselves, then for the sake of our children. This is the finest legacy that we could bequeath to them.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END 1:10 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Tokyo, Japan)

For Immediate Release January 8, 1992

REMARKS BY MRS. BUSH AND GENERAL SCOWCROFT
IN DINNER TOAST

The Prime Minister's Residence
Tokyo, Japan

8:55 P.M. (L)

MRS. BUSH: Mr. Prime Minister and Mrs. Miyazawa, I rarely get to speak for George Bush. (Laughter.) But tonight I know he would want me to thank you on behalf of the members of his administration and the American businessmen who are here for a wonderful visit and for a great friendship, for a lovely -- in my part, for a lovely day, And I think for a wonderful day for all of you.

You know, I can't explain what happened to George because it never happened before. But I'm beginning to think it's the Ambassador's fault. (Laughter.) He and George played the Emperor and the Crown Prince in tennis today, and they were badly beaten. (Laughter.) And we Bushes aren't used to that. (Laughter.) So he felt much worse than I thought. (Laughter.)

But General Scowcroft is going to speak for the President. And thank you very much for a wonderful visit. (Applause.)

GENERAL SCOWCROFT: Ladies and gentlemen, it's my great honor on behalf of the President, and without his assured elegance, to deliver the remarks he was going to make. May I first, Mr. Prime Minister, on his behalf, thank you for you very kind words, your expressions of solidarity, hope and friendship.

Prime Minister Miyazawa, Deputy Prime Minister Watanabe, distinguished ministers, distinguished former Prime Ministers, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Prime Minister, it is already clear from our discussions that we share much in common. Most important, we both want stronger ties, better trade and a closer friendship between our two countries.

Barbara and I are honored to be here. I am proud to join you in welcoming the season of the new year and to look ahead with honesty and understanding to the era of a new century.

Mr. Prime Minister, let me offer my very warmest congratulation on your election. I sincerely look forward to the work that lies together before us. As you remarked earlier this year, the United States and Japan share the same values and bear a heavy responsibility for world order. It is my conviction that the United States and Japan must move forward together as partners.

We share a common vision for the post-Cold War world -- a world knitted together by a global trading system with common rules making possible free and equitable competition.

MORE

Aiichi, I know our people share a love of baseball, so perhaps we should think of this new world in this spirit. You called your country a team player -- a description I would also apply to America. So let's compete in the arena of free and open trade. Open competition and close cooperation will make both our countries winners. Working together, no two nations can do more to realize a new era of peace and prosperity than Japan and the United States.

You once spoke of the need to create an economy for the benefit of mankind and to challenge the unknown. So now let us join together. Let us forge a global partnership as we confront the challenges of the coming century. For the sake of our children, for the sake of their children, we must not let these opportunities slip through our fingers.

Mr Prime Minister, I hear you are fond of the phrase, "Large trees with deep roots." Let us guard the growing tree of our friendship so that it may shelter all the generations to come.

To this friendship, I raise my glass.

(A toast is offered.) (Applause.)

END 9:07 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Osaka, Japan)

For Immediate Release January 7, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO U.S. AND JAPANESE STUDENTS

Cosmos Ballroom, Miyako Hotel
Kyoto, Japan

2:29 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very much. Why don't you all please be seated? (Laughter.) Let me just say what a pleasure it is to be here with our very able Ambassador in Tokyo, Mike Armacost, who is doing a superb job. He's one of the great career ambassadors of our service, and he's in a difficult and an important post, and he is doing an outstanding job. And I'm very pleased that he's here with us today.

I want to also say how pleased I am to be here with the former Prime Minister, Toshiki Kaifu. When he was Prime Minister and I was President, we worked very closely together on a lot of matters relating to world peace, better understanding between Japan and the United States. He was frank, he was straightforward, he was friendly to our great country, and I can tell you, I will never forget his many courtesies to me, and I will never forget what he did to strengthen the relationship between these two great countries, Japan and the United States. So, Toshiki, thank you, sir, for all you've done. (Applause.)

And it's a great pleasure to have this first day of our trip to visit these ancient centers and shrines of, really, the Japanese soul and the Japanese nation -- Kyoto, and later this afternoon Kashihara in Nara Prefecture. But I come as a friend, I come with some ideas that we're going to be discussing with the government in Tokyo starting tomorrow, and I also bring an open interest in learning a lot more about this great country.

I want to take note of the achievements three mayors: Mayor Kumakura, Mayor Aoki, and Mayor Kudo, over here. (Laughter and applause.) These guys -- they're from small towns in rural Japan, and these mayors have been instrumental in the establishment of branch campuses of American universities. And I really firmly believe -- and you all are better equipped to speak to it than I -- that these grass-roots exchanges pay important benefits to both our countries. So thank you very, very much, sir, all three of you, for what you're doing.

Let me just say to the students, this is kind of what we call in the trade a "cameo appearance" -- you're in here and you're out of here in a hurry. But to the students of the Stanford Center, of the Associated Kyoto -- well, one or two here -- (laughter) -- and the Kyoto program students at Doshisha University -- (laughter) -- how many are there? When I click all these things off, it would be fun to see. University of Michigan -- how many there? (Applause.) And how about the Aggies? Texas A & M? (Applause.) Small, but vocal contingent over here.

Incidentally, what the former Prime Minister was referring to is that each president, as you all know, Americans know, when he gets out of office, has a library -- archives for the papers, and mine is going to be in my home state, but at Texas A & M, and I'm looking forward to that very, very much, not too soon. (Laughter.)

Let me just click off for some of the journalists with us today some things that I know you all know. About 2,000 American students now attend undergraduate and graduate programs in Japan. Many more Japanese students take part in comparable programs back in the U.S. And more than 1,000 Americans now teach in Japanese schools. And I hope that we will continue to do everything that we can to promote greater and greater participation in these important exchanges in the years to come.

They open up, in my view, new intellectual and cultural horizons, and these experiences really, I think, turn an awful lot of participants into the great leaders of our country, and both countries, I might say. Look at today's Prime Minister of Japan, Prime Minister Miyazawa. When he was a university student -- some may not know this -- he took part in the Sixth Japan-America Student Conference at the University of Southern California.

I also want to single out once again Prime Minister Kaifu. Toshiki's first travel to the United States was through the U.S. Information Agency's International Visitor's Program. And then, as Minister of Education and later as Prime Minister, he made great efforts to promote educational and executive exchanges that really do foster understanding between our two countries. Another leader who recognized the value of exchanges was my friend, the late Minister Abe, Foreign Minister of Japan, who passed away. But the Global Partnership Fund, which he was so instrumental in organizing, carries on his good work today in supporting these student exchanges.

So in all, they are an aspect of the major purpose of this visit to Japan -- namely to open and expand opportunities for interchange between our countries. And I want the people of our countries to have a far better understanding of one another. We need more Americans who can speak Japanese and who understand the workings of the Japanese marketplace.

I want to increase access for American goods and services in these Japanese markets. Open markets, like student exchanges, yield a bounty for all who participate. They help each other better understand. Open markets lift the technical progress to new heights, and they raise everybody's standards and benefit consumers, as a matter of fact, through the expanse of the global marketplace.

I've been saying this as I've traveled on this trip through Asia, but I am strongly convinced -- I'm sure there are some economic majors out here -- I am strongly convinced that free and open commerce is not a zero-sum game. Free trade on a level playing field creates jobs and lifts standards in both of our countries. So the challenge of global competition can be driving our efforts for educational reform.

I don't know whether it's caught up with you all here, but we have a nationwide program called America 2000 -- has participants -- people from all -- both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, from governors in all states, helped me set the six major educational goals. American educational leaders and experts look to Japan for some examples as to how we can improve our schools.

David Kearns -- I don't know if that name rings a bell -- he's our number two at the Department of Education -- but he visited Japan many, many times to examine Japanese quality products. First, when he was the chairman and chief executive officer of one of our great companies, Xerox. He came back with a lot of ideas that he's now trying to help us implement there at the Department. American education experts attach importance to the fact that Japanese parents, more than in our country, are active in the children's schools and demand better performance. So we're trying to find ways to increase parental interest.

And if I might say a pleasant word of my bride of 47 years as of yesterday, newlyweds we are -- (applause) -- I think -- what Barbara is trying to do in terms of getting kids and getting families to read to their kids and kids to read to one another and adult education -- all adds into this program which we call America 2000. Next spring, actually, we're going to hold a meeting of the education ministers of the APEC, the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Group. And it's going to bring together the total experiences of 15 member societies to raise our common educational standards and to draw the most from our precious resource: the imagination and the energy of our people.

So student exchanges reach beyond the technical and the expert level. They enrich the individual spirit, and they nourish the cultures of communities and nations. So we need them. And while we need them to promote efficiency in markets and institutions, we simply must not neglect exchanges in the humanities, in history, fine arts, philosophy, the study of religion, languages and literature.

Octavio Paz, the 1990 Nobel Laureate for Literature, put it well when he wrote, "If human beings forget poetry, they will forget themselves." So those of you all involved in the liberal arts, you have nothing to do but be proud of the work you're engaged in. And if you don't believe it, just ask old Octavio Paz, winner of the Nobel Prize. (Laughter.)

But look, I do honor you -- salute you for your spirit of scholarship and adventure. And if you get a little lonely from time to time, keep it in the big perspective. As I see it, with the crying need for better education, the crying need for people to understand each other better, you are doing something important just being here, just working, just understanding the culture of this great country. In my view, you're really doing something important.

I will simply conclude by this broad comment on my job opportunities -- my own, that is. I can't think of a more exciting time in the history of this country to be -- in the recent history of this country -- to be President of the United States. Now, you go back to where things were just a couple of years ago as you look at Eastern Europe; you look at parties in the Middle East that weren't even willing to talk to each other; you look at the Soviet Union that we lived in fear of when you all were two or three years younger. You wondered whether we were going to evolve into some kind of a nuclear holocaust. Little kids going to bed scared in our country and in other countries all around the world. And that's changing, and it's changing for the better.

And so it is a very exciting time to represent the only, I guess in terms of both military and economic, the only remaining what they call superpower. But the thing that -- what we want to do is use our ingenuity and use our energies, well represented by this group here today, to help people around the world, to assure the peace; to raise the standards of living for our own people by, as I said earlier on, opening markets and having our economy much more vibrant.

So it's a wonderful time to be fighting these battles and accepting these challenges that will always be with whoever is President of the United States. This, as I say, is a cameo appearance; it's a quick drop-by. But looking around here, I can get a little sense of enthusiasm that occupies this crowd. And I really wanted to wish you all a very, very happy new year. And may God bless you in your important work.

Thank you all very, very much. (Applause.)

END 2:40 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Seoul, Korea)

For Immediate Release January 6, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN ADDRESS TO THE KOREAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

National Assembly Hall
Seoul, Korea

2:40 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Secretary General, Assemblyman Park, and distinguished members of this National Assembly. Believe me, it is a great honor to return once more to this house, the symbolic center of Korean democracy. As the Speaker said, I first came to this chamber in February of 1989, just one month after taking office, and Barbara and I still recall the warm welcome we received then from the people of Korea.

And here we are, celebrating our 47th wedding anniversary with all you young people. And you make us feel very much at home, and I'm grateful to each and every one of you. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

February of '89, that was nearly three years ago. In the short time since then, we have seen our world transformed. The epic Cold War struggle between the forces of freedom and the communist world came to an abrupt end; with God's mercy, a peaceful end. Gone is the Berlin Wall, the Warsaw Pact, not simply the Soviet empire, but even the Soviet Union itself. Everywhere, we see the new birth of democratic nations -- a new world of freedom, bright with the promise of peace and prosperity.

During my visits these last few days to Australia, to Singapore, and now to your wonderful country, Korea, I have stressed that this new world of freedom presents us with fresh and demanding challenges -- meeting new requirements for global security and stability, promoting democracy, and enhancing world economic growth and prosperity.

Korea, too, is a part, an important part of this changing world. Indeed, you are at the center of these challenges. At home your country is developing its own democratic and free market traditions. And in the world Korea is helping to shape a changing security and geopolitical landscape. Your influence in world affairs is enhanced by the fact that at long last Korea is assuming its place as a full member of the United Nations. Mr. Speaker, as President of a nation that fought under the U.N. flag to keep Korea free and to establish the conditions for growth and prosperity, we share your pride in what you have justifiably achieved. (Applause.)

Yes, change transforming our world, a revolution is on our hands. And yet, the Cold War continues to cast its shadow over Korea. Just 25 miles north of this capital city, the Korean Peninsula is still cleaved by that DMZ: the ribbon of land that separates one people yearning to live in peace. Who can calculate the human cost: 10 million Koreans separated now from family members for four decades.

For 40 years, the people of Korea have prayed for an end to this unnatural division. For 40 years, you have kept alive the dream of one Korea. The winds of change are with us now. My friends, the day will inevitably come when this last wound of the Cold War struggle will heal. Korea will be whole again, I am absolutely convinced of it. (Applause.)

For our part, I will repeat what I said here three years ago: The American people share your goal of peaceful reunification on terms acceptable to the Korean people. This is clear. This is simple. This is our policy.

Recently, North and South made progress in easing tensions, in exploring opportunities for peace and understanding through direct talks at the prime ministerial level. And this search has produced positive results: first, December's historic Non-Aggression Agreement -- and then, on the eve of this new year, an agreement to forever ban nuclear weapons from the Korean Peninsula.

These positive developments come at a critical time of rising concern, at a time when North Korea's pursuit of nuclear arms stands as the single greatest source of danger to peace in all of Northeast Asia.

This progress is a tribute to the policies of President Roh and the government of this Republic. South Korea has systematically eliminated any possible action that could justify the North's pursuit of such deadly weapons. This Republic has rejected all weapons of mass destruction, and to give further meaning to this pledge, South Korea renounced all nuclear reprocessing and enrichment activities. On December 18th, President Roh announced that there were no nuclear weapons on South Korean soil. To any who doubted that declaration, South Korea, with the full support of the United States, has offered to open to inspection all of its civilian and military installations, including United States' facilities.

At every point, South Korea's approach was open, sincere and fair. Each good-faith action increased the call for the North to make a positive response. Today the prospects for real peace on this peninsula are brighter than at any point in the past four decades.

And yet, paper promises won't keep the peace. I call on North Korea to demonstrate its sincerity to meet the obligations it undertook when it signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty six years ago. North Korea must implement in full, all IAEA safeguards for its nuclear facilities without exception -- (applause) -- and I might add, without delay. Moreover, North Korea, together with the Republic of Korea, should proceed to implement the inspection and verification portions of their unprecedented Joint Declaration on Non-Nuclearization, signed one week ago. Prompt action by the North will mark a new milestone on the path toward peace.

But let this be clear: The United States has and will support the security aspirations of its ally in the South in the cause of peace.

We are pleased that our September announcement about nuclear weapons helped lend momentum to the effort to make Korea safe from nuclear proliferation. And we've worked with others in the region to send a multilateral message to North Korea. And we've been willing to open our facilities to Korea to challenge North Korea to do the same.

We've also left no doubt that we'll back these overtures for peace with a demonstration of our military resolve. As you know, we've postponed our plan to reduce the number of American troops stationed here in Korea. And let there be no doubt: The people of this Republic should know that the United States' commitment to Korea's security remains steady and strong. (Applause.) I renew that pledge as an ally, as President of a nation that shares your devotion to democracy and self-determination.

Down through the decades, from Korea to Kuwait, from the American soldiers who gave their lives at Inchon, Pork Chop Hill, to the Korean forces who stood with us in Desert Storm, our two nations

have upheld the international ideal that between nations, and not just within them, common interests call for common action.

Today, in many quarters, that ideal is being questioned, even criticized. There are those who see the many changes in our world and say, well, our work is done. They urge us to declare victory, celebrate the collapse of our common enemy, and then come on home. And they fail to recognize a fundamental fact: The Cold War era changed our world forever. We did far more than hold a common enemy at bay. Together, we built a new world, a system of collective security to keep the peace; a system of free trade that fueled a generation of prosperity the likes of which the world has never seen; and a common commitment to political openness and liberty that now sustains a worldwide movement toward democracy.

The passing of the Cold War must not mark the beginning of a new age of isolationism. The nations of the free world share more than a common history; they share a common destiny. And there is no going back, only forward.

The developments of the past 40 years -- the dramatic expansion of democracy, the geometric increase in global trade -- has created a system of common interests. To turn our backs now, to walk away after this great victory for freedom or to retreat behind high trade walls into regional blocs would turn triumph to tragedy.

America is a Pacific nation. We will remain engaged in Asia, as we are in the other regions of the world. But just as the world itself stands on the threshold of a new era, so, too, we now enter a new era in U.S.-Korean relations. And what began in the heat of the war as a military alliance has grown into a broader relationship, a partnership anchored in shared economic interest and common political ideals.

Korea's new role will, yes, mean new responsibilities. A new partnership based upon Korea's growing capabilities, and increased ability to contribute to peace and prosperity in the Pacific and beyond.

The world recognizes Korea as an economic powerhouse. We are pleased that over the past few years that we've narrowed our current account imbalance from about $9 billion to about $1 billion, and that U.S. exports to Korea have increased at a pace of more than seven percent over the last two years. And we must acknowledge the equally important strides that you have made in strengthening the institutions of democracy.

Even in the three years since my last visit, the change is clear for all to see. With the encouragement of President Roh, this National Assembly now plays a greater role in Korean politics. I understand you have some very avid debates in this chamber. Well, join the club. That's what we do at home all the time. That's democracy in action.

In 1992 alone, South Korea will hold at least three elections at the local and national levels. Across the country, democracy is giving voice to new ideas and opinions. And since 1990 alone, 10 new daily newspapers and nearly 1,000 other new publications.

Free speech, free elections, private property: these are the cornerstones of the new world order -- fundamental freedoms that secure peace and prosperity.

Consider your own history, a case study in contrasts between North and South. More than four decades ago, the South -- with less land, fewer resources and more people than in the North -- set its course for free enterprise and free government. North Korea, well, they traveled a different path. Blessed with rich resources

and a stronger industrial base, the regime that ruled the North marched its people down the dead-end path of totalitarianism and international isolation. Its economy stalled, its society suffocated, its cohorts went their own way.

Today, the South is a dynamic participant in the community of democratic and market-oriented societies. The South is at peace, free and prosperous, with an average annual income four times higher than in the North, and a history of double-digit growth that has propelled it into the front ranks of the world's economies.

And now you must build on your success. You must sustain the conditions that fueled your phenomenal growth. Korea did not raise the living standard of its people by closing itself off from the outside world. Today, Korea stands as America's seventh largest trading partner. With me on my trip are executives from some of America's leading companies, many with interests in expanding business with Korean companies and Korean consumers. America is not only your largest market -- Korea's largest market -- but a leading source of the technology and capital that helps fuel your economic growth.

This nation owes much of its economic miracle to open markets abroad. Korea must see clearly that prosperity in the new century ahead lies in open markets.

Trade is one activity where the interests of all nations intersect. Let me repeat here what I've said in Australia and in Singapore: At home, in the United States, especially during tough economic times, my highest priority must be jobs and economic growth. But my allegiance to the American worker is not at odds with the interests of the Korean consumer. Trade is not a zero-sum game enriching some nations at the expense of the others. Growing trade provides the people of both our nations with higher standards of living and better lives.

Pressures for protectionism are building. We see it in my country, with the new breed of economic isolationists who urge us to build barriers to expanding trade and opportunity. And we see it here in Korea, in a "frugality campaign" that's been used by too many to discourage imports. But wherever this impulse shows itself, we must fight back for trade that is free, fair and open.

We must heed the lessons of history. For the first half of this century, great nations sought refuge in isolationism and in its economic accomplice, protectionism, and the world succumbed to the ravages of war and -- think back -- to depression. Since the Second World War, free nations, large and small, pursued a common course, forging alliances and fostering trade, and the world, as a consequence, has enjoyed an era of unprecedented peace and prosperity.

The history of this century is not lost on Korea. As a founding member of APEC -- the forum for Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation -- you have worked with your economic partners in the region to bring down barriers to trade. But the key test -- the key test now is before us in this Uruguay Round. As an emerging economic power, Korea has shared greatly in the bounty of an open and growing world trading system. That reward carries with it profound responsibilities. Korea must now shoulder with other trading nations the burden of leadership on behalf of the multilateral trade regime.

As I mentioned before the business leaders of our two nations earlier today, I am urging at each stop of my trip that we use the Dunkel draft text as the basis for successfully concluding the GATT Round of trade talks. Korea has the opportunity to help fight the forces of protectionism, to help tip the balance in favor of free and fair trade policies that remain the world's one path to prosperity.

Our two nations share a history written in the blood of our people. The bonds forged in the Cold War, at the brink of Korea's mortal danger, have grown stronger through the years. Forty years ago, the free world made your struggle their own struggle. Our forces fought here for a future free from tyranny. And you did far more than survive. In the shadow of the Cold War, you showed what we can achieve so long as we are free.

For four long decades, Korea has stood at the frontier of freedom, vigilant, determined never wavering in its commitment to the great cause of independence and liberty. So today, as we enter a new world, the world we fought for 40 years ago, Korea stands with us, a steadfast friend, ally and partner, proud, prosperous and free. (Applause.)

I salute you. I congratulate you. And may I thank you for this warm welcome. And may God bless the wonderful people of Korea. Thank you all very, very much.

END 3:00 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Canberra, Australia)

For Immediate Release January 2, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO AUSTRALIAN CENTER FOR AMERICAN STUDIES

Mural Hall
Parliament House
Canberra, Australia

2:20 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, sir, for those kind words. And let me just say how pleased I am to be here helping to launch this Australian Center for American Studies. We share a lot in common. You touched on that, sir -- culturally, historically, even linguistically. But differences do exist. And we can and should do much more to foster greater understanding.

There's much that we can learn from each other -- education and the sciences, certainly in trade, economics. Study in exchange in these areas will not only benefit our two nations, but enrich the lives of those involved and increase the productive capacities of the participants in our two countries' economies.

Mutual understanding is not only enriching but also is a vital prerequisite to peace and prosperity. The Fulbright Program has brought about the exchange of thousands of Australians and Americans. And among the many distinguished alumni of that program are my host in Sydney yesterday, Nick Greiner, and U.S. Ambassador -- our U.N. Ambassador Tom Pickering, who received his master's degree from Melbourne University.

The benefits of educational interchange come in many, many ways. The late Gordon Samstag, an American artist who taught at the South Australia School of Fine Arts endowed that school with a scholarship fund of $6 million to support Australian students studying abroad. And in 1988, former Prime Minister Bob Hawke helped to launch this Center for Australian Studies at the UT -- at the University of Texas at Austin -- contributing $50,000 Australian dollars to the Center.

And today I'm pleased to announce that the U.S. Information Agency is similarly contributing $50,000 to the Australian Center for American Studies.

I hope this Center will lead to an expansion of American studies in Australia. More broadly, I have spoken today about our intention to host an education ministerial under APEC auspices. And our Secretary of Education will invite APEC education ministers to Washington next summer. And I'm very enthusiastic about this addition to APEC's agenda. It seems only right that it not all be about politics and war and peace. We're talking here about an educational agenda.

The challenge the future holds is to find new ways to increase mutual understanding. And I am confident that the Australian Center will open many new paths for Americans and Australians to deepen these ties, deepen our ties and help ensure prosperity for our citizens.

MORE

So this is a good day, a happy day. And I know I speak for Barbara when I say that we are both proud to have a part in it.

And to those Australians here let me just say -- tell you what I told our joint meeting in here. We've really had a good time here. And your hospitality has been absolutely fantastic. And I think it says something about how this Center can prosper. People just get that feeling of mutual comradery, et cetera. That in itself, I think, will help in these troubled times.

So thank you all very much for being a part of this. (Applause.)

END 2:24 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Singapore)

For Immediate Release January 4, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO SINGAPORE LECTURE GROUP

Westin Stamford Hotel
Singapore

12:50 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr. Minister -- Prime Minister Goh, Senior Minister Lee. I'm delighted to be here, and thank you, sir, for that very kind introduction. Let me take this opportunity to say a few words about these two gentlemen I've just referred to.

Minister Lee, a quarter of a century ago, you led this small island of cultural and ethnic diversity, of limited physical resources, to independence. And then, through your vision and your force of intellect and will, you forged Singapore's nationhood. You stood courageously in a life and death struggle against the communists -- and you prevailed. You led your nation and your region in the quest for peace and prosperity. It is my convinced view that future generations will honor the name of Lee Kuan Yew. And as you know well from your visits in my own home in Kennebunkport -- Barbara's and mine -- I am pleased to know you as a friend.

Prime Minister Goh, I salute you, sir, for your wisdom, for your vigor in carrying Singapore forward now on its path to the future. I am grateful for the wonderful talks we had this morning, and I pledge America's steadfast friendship as you lead Singapore in facing the challenges of the coming generation. And I'm also pleased that you, like many of your countrymen, came to my the United States of America for part of your education. These, too, are ties that bind us together.

Now, on to the business at hand. It's an honor to deliver this lecture, following such leaders as Brian Mulroney, and Helmut Schmidt, and Rudd Lubbers, Bob Hawke, Mahathir bin Mohamad and Valery Giscard D'Estaing and such distinguished thinkers as Henry Kissinger and Milton Friedman. And let me acknowledge Professor K. L. Sandhu, Director, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies; A.V. Liventals, the Chairman, Mobil Oil Singapore; Lee Hee Seng, Deputy Chairman and Board of Trustees, ISEAS; and Dr. Richard Hu, Chairman of the Monetary Authority of Singapore and Finance Minister.

Let me also salute the members of the U.S.-ASEAN Business Council with whom I just met who are here with us in this auditorium today.

The addresses in this series reflect the changes in our world. Your first lecturers focused on the ideological and military struggle between socialism and democratic capitalism -- and especially between the United States and what we used to call the Soviet Union.

Think of that phrase for just a moment -- "what we used to call the Soviet Union." When citizens pulled down the hammer and

sickle 10 days ago, and hauled up a new tricolor of freedom over the Kremlin, the Soviet Union ceased to exist -- and the prospect of a new world opened before us.

That act culminated a decade of liberation -- a time in which we witnessed the death throes of totalitarianism, and the triumph of systems of government devoted to individual liberty, democratic pluralism, free markets and international engagement.

As this struggle has drawn to a close, these lectures have shifted their focus from military confrontation to matters of economic cooperation. Our new world has little use for old ways of thinking about the roles and relations of nation-states. The Cold War categories -- North-South, East-West, capitalist-communist -- no longer apply. The future simply belongs to nations that can remain on the cutting edge of innovation and information; nations that can develop the genius and harness the aspirations their own people.

Individuals wield power as never before. An innovator, equipped with ideas and the freedom to turn them into inventions, can change the way we live and think. Governments that strive only to maintain a monopoly of power, rather than to strengthen the freedom of the individual, will fall by the wayside, swept away by the tides of innovation and entrepreneurship.

Liberating technologies -- telephones, computers, facsimile machines, satellite dishes and other devices that transmit news, information and culture in ever greater volumes and at ever greater speeds -- have disabled the weapons of tyranny.

The old world of splintered regions and ideologies has begun to give way to a global village universally committed to the values of individual liberty, democracy, and free trade -- and universally opposed, I might add, to tyranny and aggression.

If we are to realize the opportunities of this new era, we must address three intertwined challenges: the new requirements of peace and security, the challenge of promoting democracy, and the challenge of generating greater economic growth and prosperity around the world.

Consider first the challenge of peace and security. The world has learned -- through two world wars, and most recently, as Senior Minister Lee talked about, through Saddam Hussein's naked aggression -- that the dogs of war can be unleashed any time would-be aggressors doubt the commitment of the powerful to the security of the powerless.

As a nation that straddles two great oceans -- a nation tempered by painful wartime experience -- the United States remains committed to engagement in the Atlantic Community and the Asia Pacific region -- and we are unalterably opposed to isolationism. That's my vow to you, as long as I am President of the United States of America.

A quarter century ago, many feared that free nations would fall like dominoes -- remember the domino theory -- fall like dominoes to the subversion of communism. Now, we can say with pride and a robust sense of irony that the totalitarian powers -- the powers that fomented conflict the world over -- have indeed become the dominoes of the 1990's.

This end to the Cold War gives the United States an opportunity to restructure its military. Having said that, I want to assure you and all of our many friends in this part of the world, that the closing of bases in the Philippines will not spell an end to American engagement. We will maintain a visible, credible presence in the Asia-Pacific region with our forward deployed forces, and through bilateral defense arrangements with nations of the region.

That is why I'm pleased to announce that this morning we've reached agreement with the government of Singapore to explore in detail how we can transfer a naval logistics facility from Subic Bay in the Philippines to Singapore in the next year. We appreciate Singapore's far-sighted approach to the security requirements of a new era.

The United States does not maintain our security presence as some act of charity. Your security and your prosperity serve our interests because you can better help build a more stable, more prosperous world. An unstable Asia burdened with repression does not serve our interests. Nor does an Asia mired in poverty and despair. We need you as free and productive as you can be, and we understand that our security presence can provide a foundation for our mutual prosperity and shared defense.

But we also need your support in addressing the new threats of this new era -- regional conflicts, weapons proliferation. And so I'm pleased that the ASEAN nations are working with us to craft new and flexible arrangements to ensure the common defense. Access agreements and increased ASEAN-U.S. dialogue can help us work cooperatively to promote stability in the whole region. By working cooperatively, we better share the security responsibilities of the post-Cold War era.

Strong, credible security arrangements enabled us to meet the second challenge, the challenge of democracy -- a challenge of shared interests and shared ideals.

Again, ASEAN is helping to spread positive political change, in ways that reflect the values, aspirations and cultures of the nations in this region. ASEAN is trying to help the former communist states in Indochina reintegrate themselves in a world that respects free markets and free people. Those efforts are starting to produce very hopeful results.

Just a few weeks ago American diplomats arrived in Phnom Penh for the first time in 16 years. We owe that breakthrough to years of effort by many nations. But the Cambodian Peace Accord, signed by Secretary Baker in Paris last October, could not have existed without the help and the cooperation of ASEAN. This historic agreement offers the very real hope of national reconciliation to the long-suffering people of Cambodia.

And additionally, when the Paris Conference agreed on a peace settlement for Cambodia, my government offered to remove our trade embargo as the United Nations Advance Mission began to implement the settlement. And today I am pleased to announce the lifting of that embargo. Working with others, we need to turn attention to the economic reconstruction of that deeply wounded land and so its new political reconciliation has a home from which to grow.

We are now normalizing our ties with Laos and have begun to move with Vietnam along a path marked by implementation of the Paris Accords, and for the sake of many, many American families, the satisfactory resolution of our concerns, our deep concerns about POW and MIAs.

The key point is this: After being strong, determined, and patient, we finally can entertain realistic hopes of building lasting ties of interest and affection with Indochina. Organizations such as ASEAN, which promote security, more open political systems, and open markets, form the building blocks for what I've called the new world order.

This movement toward democracy leads us to the third challenge for the future, the challenge of economic growth and building a world of open and fair trade.

Everyone agrees that political rivalry and military adventurism threaten international stability. But no one should doubt that economic isolationism -- protectionism -- can be at least as threatening to world order. The protectionist wars of the '20's and '30's deepened the Great Depression, and set in motion conflicts that hastened the Second World War.

On the other hand, during the past half century, engagement and trade have produced unprecedented peace and prosperity -- here, in Singapore; throughout free Asia; in Europe and in the United States. This prosperity also has led naturally to democracy, a fact that illustrates the indivisible relationship between security, democracy and individual liberty.

The United States will remain engaged economically, especially in this part of the world. The Asian-Pacific region has become the world's economic dynamo. Our trade with Singapore, it's increased tenfold during the past 16 years. We now export more to Singapore than to Italy or Spain; more to Indonesia than to the whole of Eastern Europe. The economies here continue to grow at an astonishing rate, while enjoying impressive income equality and general prosperity.

The ASEAN countries, along with other nations in the region, helped initiate the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation process two years ago, APEC. APEC offers a powerful vehicle for sustaining free, market-based trade; for advancing the cause of regional and global trade liberalization; and for strengthening the cohesion and interdependence of the Asia-Pacific region.

Now this is important to us. Most of America's recent economic growth has come from export industries. Each billion dollars' worth of U.S. exports support many thousands of good American jobs.

A delegation of executives from major American businesses -- from the automobile industry to computer and electronics firms, to food and energy companies -- has joined me in order to express our national commitment to free and fair trade. Our executives will learn more about opportunities here, and they will also work to help other firms compete fairly throughout the world. With us today also are the American ambassadors to the ASEAN countries. They will be returning to the United States soon to tell American businesses there about the opportunities that exist in ASEAN.

The United States is trying to establish an economic operating framework to facilitate and to encourage these ties. This past October we agreed to a new Trade and Investment Framework Agreement with Singapore. And I propose that we complement that Agreement by negotiating a bilateral investment treaty. When combined with our global efforts through GATT, and our regional initiatives through APEC, this comprehensive approach can enable us to meet the economic challenges of the post-Cold War era.

Americans believe in free and open trade. Nations can achieve astonishing levels of prosperity when they embrace the challenge of the marketplace.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade can play an especially crucial role in expanding freedom's economic frontiers. And that's why on each stop of this important trip I'm calling for urgent action on behalf of the international trading system. I am urging the world's trading nations to join with us in making GATT

Director Dunkel's proposed draft agreement the basis for the successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round.

While all of us have problems with portions of that draft, none of us can afford to let the progress it represents slip away into the past. Now is the moment for a strong collective response. And I particularly urge the dynamic trading nations of this region to help us to convince all GATT participants to build the momentum to achieve this agreement. A successful conclusion to this Uruguay Round can prepare the way for even greater trade liberalization in years to come and greater prosperity for everyone.

GATT ensures that the world will continue moving toward broad economic integration and not toward trade blocs. I don't have to point out to an audience in Singapore, especially an informed audience like this, that there's a huge difference between a free trade zone -- an oasis of free trade -- and a trade bloc that attempts to hold the rest of the world at bay. We resolutely oppose efforts to create economic fortresses anywhere.

On the other hand, we wholeheartedly endorse free trade agreements. Let me be clear on something. Our North American Free Trade Agreement will beckon all nations to make the best of the resources and opportunities that the United States, Canada and Mexico have to offer. NAFTA, that North American Free Trade Agreement, is not a threat to Asia. It would not encourage the division of the world into trading blocs.

Instead, our increased growth can stimulate more trade with Asia. And we support efforts to build free trade agreements elsewhere, including among the ASEAN nations.

Consider your own experience. A regime of free trade has enabled Singapore to become one of the Four Tigers of Asia, and one of the fastest developing nations on Earth. When other nations' economies falter, you suffer. The worldwide economic slowdown has slowed your rate of economic growth this year -- although most nations would be overjoyed to settle for six-percent growth. (Laughter.) And I can speak for one. (Laughter.) Singapore has one of the most open economies on Earth, and I appreciate Singapore's leadership in pressing for even greater market freedom around the world.

But we also need to consider the full import of economic development. An economy is the aggregate work, ingenuity and optimism of a nation. The term "economy" encompasses what millions of people do with their lives. And therefore, when we talk about strengthening economies, about growth, about opportunity, we mean much more than signing trade pacts. We mean building better lives for our people.

Americans understand that no nation will prosper long without a first-rate educational system. And I've encouraged Americans to mount a revolution in education, which we call -- we call it the America 2000 education strategy. America 2000 challenges our citizens to set high standards for their schools; it encourages all Americans to join forces in creating world-class schools. And meanwhile, we will continue to strengthen our university system -- we think the world's finest -- and the host today to over 200,000 students from Asia. Perhaps one may be a future Prime Minister. I am certain she'll be a good one. (Laughter.) And our APEC Educational Partnership initiative is seeking to link these educational ties to our mutual economic interests.

Once we have given students basic skills, we must give them the freedom to make the most of the knowledge they have acquired. Tax cuts and deregulation in the 1980's helped unleash the greatest peacetime economic recovery in American history. And while in my country reducing the tax on capital gains is somewhat

controversial politically, most of our competitors impose very low taxes on capital gains. Some, like Singapore, don't tax capital gains at all. We can learn from you -- we can create a climate even more conducive to risk, to innovation, to the bold exploration of new technologies and ideas -- and I'm confident that we will.

Beyond that, the nations of the world want to enjoy the blessings of growth without destroying the environment. And we need to achieve environmental protection without denying developing nations the opportunity to develop. The United States has environmental expertise and state-of-the-art environmental technology. The Asian nations have environmental challenges.

I am pleased to announce today that AID, the U.S. Trade Development Program, the Overseas Private Insurance Corporation -- OPIC -- and our Ex-Im Bank have developed a creative approach in partnership with this region to better address the challenge of balancing the environmental protection with development. We hope we can coordinate with our effort with those of other developed nations through various types of support, including U.S. equipment and technology. This will be good -- it will be good for Asia's environment, good for American jobs.

In conclusion, the nations committed to democracy and free markets have brought the world to a new era, one that promises unprecedented freedom from violence and deprivation. But this world will not simply happen. It will require hard work, tough negotiation, sacrifice, and the courage of our convictions. And if we cast our lot with the forces of enlightenment and freedom over the counsels of defeatism and ignorance, we will build a better world -- a world bound by common interests and goals.

Like you, Americans desperately want a world at peace, one in which no blood must be shed for the ideals we all share. So we will maintain a vigorous security presence in order to prevent despots and tyrants from undermining the triumphs of freedom and democracy.

Like you, Americans want to live in a world enriched and enlivened by international trade -- in goods, in ideas, in cultures, and in dreams for the future. We want the opportunity to compete aggressively in the international marketplace. And at the same time our consumers want access to the best goods and services that your economies have to offer. We want to live in a world made better by the genius and achievement of every culture. So we will advance the prospects for more open trade.

And like you, Americans want a world united and enlightened by freedom and justice, by political pluralism, by the universal commitment to individual liberty and prosperity. So we will stand fast by our principles -- and remain confident, strong, and vigilant.

Since 1784, when an American trading ship, the Empress of China, sailed for Canton from New York, the United States has tried to build strong ties of commerce with Asia. We remain committed to that vision. And together, the United States and its Asian-Pacific allies can indeed build a world filled with economic tigers -- nations growing rapidly; pioneering new intellectual, commercial and cultural terrain; spreading the blessings of free markets, democracy and peace. My trip through Asia this week marks a new start. The next step is up to all of us.

Thank you again. And may God bless you, the people of Singapore, people of the United States of America. Thank you all very, very much. (Applause.)

MODERATOR: Ladies and gentlemen, we have a tight schedule, certain to squeeze out the question and answer session. We

have a very few questions that the President has offered to meet. So can I ask the questioners to be brief, to the point -- state your name, and get to the point quickly, please.

Q Mr. President, the trend in closer economic interaction within the region, with Europe forging a single market and the U.S., Canada and Mexico moving towards a North American free trade area, all grow in momentum in the 1990s. How, in your opinion, can we ensure that these trends do not result in inward-looking economic blocs? How can APEC as a body promote greater economic openness and counter these inward-looking trends? Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: One, help us reach a successful conclusion in the GATT Round. Therein lies the most important single step that can guarantee against trading blocs. Secondly, accept my word that nothing in the North American Free Trade Agreement wants to divide this -- wants to contribute to dividing the world into trading blocs, into blocs that shut out other people's goods. That is not what it's about. If we are successful in the NAFTA, that will increase markets for Asian goods in South America, which has been an area that needs economic help.

So the first answer is, help with GATT -- successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round. And the second answer is, please understand that NAFTA -- and I can only speak for American participation therein, and I'm sure it's true of President Salinas of Mexico and of Brian Mulroney of Canada -- have no intention of having that free trade between ourselves be a bloc to ASEAN goods. Stop worrying about it. That isn't going to happen.

If I could think of a third reason, I'd tell you. (Laughter.) But those are the two I've got. (Laughter and applause.)

Q Mr. President, I believe that most countries in the Asia-Pacific region want to see the U.S. continue to play a major economic and security role in the Western Pacific. But many are worried that Japan may become the leader in the economic competition especially in trade and investments in the Asia-Pacific region. Will the U.S. respond to this Japanese economic challenge and stay in the competition? However, if Japan eventually becomes the preeminent investor and trader in the region, will the U.S. remain engaged in the economies and the security of the region?

THE PRESIDENT: Good question, and the answer is, yes. We are, regardless of what happens, we are going to continue our cooperation in terms of security. That's a given. That's important It's important, I think, to ASEAN. And I think it's very, very important to my country, the United States of America.

I'm not as gloomy, as the question implied, in terms of Japan dominating ASEAN. I would be worried about it if I thought that we would all acquiesce, including Singapore, in a bloc to offset Canada or to offset a perceived trading bloc in Europe. Then I would be concerned about that. But I don't think that is going to be the reality because we are going to forcefully, with our best we can offer in terms of economics and investment and two-way trade, stay involved in the area.

If you predicated it by saying the world will divide into three blocs; do we have any concern about domination from an economic superpower, which is Japan, I'd say you could have some concerns there. But that's not what I see as the reality. And I hope that in some way, this trip contributes to the idea that we want to avoid blocs that shut people out and we want to open markets that cause people to come in.

And so that is the way that I look at it right now. I we will stay engaged. I'm looking forward to the part of my trip

that takes me to Japan. We have trade problems there. They're aware of it; we're going to talk to them. But it's not going to be exclusively on that. I'm interested, as you know, in creating jobs for Americans through fair trade, through access to markets, through matters of this nature. But we also have a wide array of other considerations that I will be discussing with the very able leaders of Japan. And it might well be that we will talk about the idea that we ought not to see this world divided up into regional blocs.

So I'll do my best in that regard.

Q It was with some irony that I read recently in the observation of Li Peng, Chinese Prime Minister -- China's Prime Minister -- that, in fact -- with events surrounding the dissolution of the ex-Soviet empire, events in Yugoslavia, that, in fact, the single source of threat to your new world order is no longer security in Asia-Pacific but, in fact, Europe. Your comments, please.

THE PRESIDENT: Mike, please elaborate. I didn't see the comment by Li Peng and I need a little more of what he was talking about -- threat to Europe. In what sense?

Q In the sense of the threat to the new world order that you referred to earlier -- the theater of threat from a sort of geopolitical and military sense is no longer question marks over Asia-Pacific, but more question marks over the European theater.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, see, I wouldn't agree with the premise that in the past the concern wasn't about the Soviet Union, if that's what he was talking about. The major so-called "superpower confrontation" has been between the United States and the Soviet Union -- Soviet Union with its satellites and the United States with its friends and allies. And now, with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, we see that this doesn't exist; that major Cold War security threat, if we handle things properly with the emergence of the republics or this Commonwealth, should no longer concern us.

We're going to stay engaged with the republics. We're going to stay engaged with the Commonwealth, helping in every way we can these now-fledgling democracies as they emerge and strengthen their independence. We want to see that there isn't a security threat from that part of the world.

I may be missing what he's getting at, but I just think we have to guard against unpredictability, and thus, the security presence will remain in Asia. It may be different than it's been in the past -- the whole makeup of the U.S. defenses has been changing, as you know -- but we are going to retain because of unforeseen circumstances and with the welcome of our friends in this area, a security presence here.

So if the distinguished leader of China was implying that wasn't necessary anymore, fine, that's a good -- and I'm confident that China is not seeking external hegemony. There was a time when everybody was much, much more concerned about that. But we'll be here. We'll be around as a stabilizing, reassuring security presence where wanted.

By that, I can't say that we think the only threats to worldwide security might emerge in this area; we don't. But we've had a Pacific presence and we're going to continue to have a Pacific presence.

Still not sure I got to the point, but anyway, that's the answer. (Laughter.)

MODERATOR: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm sure there are very many questions, but the schedule is so tight I have to call a halt to the questions.

I'll now ask Professor Sandhu to say a few words in appreciation for the lecture and the answers the President has given.

PROFESSOR SANDHU: I suppose I'm not revealing any state secret when I say President Bush has never allowed burdens of state or the batings of his political opponents to either deter him from his mission or cloy his feelings for his fellow citizens. Moreover, his perceptions of the world include a vision which is not only farsighted and reassuring, but one that sees America's domestic imperatives and its global responsibilities as but two mutually compatible and profitable sides of the same coin.

To him, the future of a great America and a prosperous and stable world are inseparable twins. We are, therefore, Mr. President, all the more inspired and honored to have had you address us. And may I, on behalf of the Institute and all present, thank you for the unique opportunity and honor of listening to you in person. (Applause.)

We also have the added distinction of having the other half of the illustrious Bush partnership with us. And needless to say, Mrs. Bush, we are delighted that you could be with us and grace the occasion. And may I wish you and the other members of the distinguished presidential delegation a pleasant visit and a happy New Year. (Applause.)

It is fitting, too, that this first lecture by a President of the United States of America has taken place under the chairmanship of Senior Minister Lee Kuan Yew, and before the largest audience ever in the series.

We are also grateful for all the support that we have received for the series and particularly the presence among us of Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong and his senior cabinet colleagues. (Applause.)

On that note, ladies and gentleman, may I conclude by saying once again what a pleasure it has been to welcome our special guest, President George Bush, and each and every one of you. Thank you all and good day. (Applause.)

END 1:31 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Canberra, Australia)

For Immediate Release January 2, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT

Parliament House
Canberra, Australia

1:45 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And Mr. President; Mr. Prime Minister; and the leader of the opposition, Mr. Hewson; members and senators. It is a deep and wonderful honor for me to be here, and I am very, very grateful for the honor of appearing before this House of the Australian Parliament.

I know that the members have gone to extraordinary lengths to arrange this special session. And I think the people in our country will appreciate this very, very much.

I want to offer special greetings and thanks to the members of the Australian-USA Parliamentary group who have done so much to deepen the friendship between our countries.

Let me just make an initial observation, if I might. You have a wonderfully vigorous political climate. (Laughter.) That has got to be the classic understatement of the year. (Laughter.) And I see this rough and tumble that goes forth like this, and I thank God for the presidential system at home. But nevertheless -- (laughter.) Let me make this observation, though. I feel very fortunate to have known several of your members from both sides of the aisle over the years. And amidst all the intensity and emotion brought forth in these chambers, I've always been impressed by the united message that your leaders have sent to my country. Even when out of office or in the opposition, they have always placed Australia's interests ahead of personal interests. That says something very positive, very important about your great country.

That's certainly one reason that any visitor from the United States cannot help but feel a warm kinship with Australia. Both of our young nations were seen by explorers and pioneers and immigrants as destinations of freedom and opportunity. Our cultures reflect an extraordinary diversity -- from British and Irish, to Italian and Polish, to Vietnamese and Cambodian.

This Parliament Building displays an original copy of the Magna Carta, I'm told -- one of only four such manuscripts to have survived to this day. The U.S. National Archives is home to another of those original manuscripts. I can think of no more powerful symbol of our shared commitments to the rights of the individual, to the rule of law, and to the government of consent -- by consent of the people.

With our common ancestries and shared ideals, Americans and Australians also find other similarities: Each of our countries spans a continent rich in agricultural and mineral resources; spectacular natural beauty abounds in fantastic variety in both our

nations as well. To be frank, our people think big. And their biggest ideas are the ones we share: the belief in the indivisibility of human freedom, and the willingness to struggle and sacrifice for the peace and security of other nations.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the fateful Battle of the Coral Sea. We remember the courage and fighting skill of the Australian and American naval forces. Their valor spared Australia from invasion and stemmed the tide of totalitarianism.

In Korea and Vietnam, Australians and Americans again joined forces. Their sacrifices were not in vain. Korea is a democracy -- setting a standard for free market development worldwide. Long-suffering Cambodia now has the hope of a durable peace and free elections. Even Vietnam is opening to the world, seeking reintegration with the dynamic market economies of the region.

In the Persian Gulf, we stood together against Saddam Hussein's aggression. Indeed, the first two coalition partners in a joint boarding exercise to enforce the United Nations resolutions were Australians from the HMAS Darwin and Americans from the USS Brewerton. During the war, the joint defense facilities here in Australia played an invaluable role in detecting launches of Iraqi Scud missiles. And today, two of the three navies represented in operations enforcing the embargo against Iraq are those of Australia and of the United States of America.

But even as we recall our struggles and successes, we must now look forward to the opportunity to shape our shared destiny.

First, we face together the challenge of economic opportunity and growth -- creating jobs for our people and for their families. Second, we face new but no less exacting challenges to our security -- the threats of regional conflicts and proliferation of the weapons of mass destruction. Third, we face the exciting task of fostering the remarkable momentum for democracy and freedom that swept the world these past few years. A strong America has been central to the triumph of free markets and free people. I am confident that the United States will continue to have the conviction and the capacity to be a force for good -- and that a new era of economic opportunity will unfold with enhanced opportunities for peace.

The coming era promises unparalleled potential for economic growth in the nations of the Pacific. In 1990, the Asia-Pacific region accounted for a total of $300 billion in two-way commerce with the United States -- a total nearly one-third larger than America's volume of trade across the Atlantic. This region is the fastest growing market in the world. And still, there are voices on both sides of the Pacific calling for economic isolationism. And while for some nations, including Australia and the United States, these are tough, hard economic times, we both know protectionism is a fundamentally bankrupt notion. Make no mistake, America will continue to stand for open trade and open markets.

And trade means jobs -- it means good jobs -- at home and abroad. And I'm sure it comes as no surprise that my highest priority as President of the United States is to promote economic growth and jobs for our people. That goal is fully consistent with economic growth and jobs for Australians. You and I know that open markets generate growth, that international trade is not simply a zero-sum game.

And you also know that the nations who share the rewards of a vibrant and growing international trading system must also share the responsibilities. Australia has stood as a true leader in efforts to achieve success in the Uruguay Round of the GATT negotiations. And you brought great skill and energy in seeking deep cuts in trade-distorting agricultural subsidies. Progress on

agriculture is the key to the success of the GATT talks. Your farmers are not alone in feeling the pain caused by the heavy subsidies of the European Community -- our wheat production dropped by almost 30% last year. But I'm also aware of the concern such United States trade programs as this Export Enhancement Program can cause Australian farmers.

Our EEP program has one and only one objective: and that is to force the EC to stop its avalanche of subsidized exports. And the fact is that the EC subsidizes over 10 times the amount of farm exports that we do. Moreover, our program seeks to minimize the effects on Australia and other nonsubsidizing nations. While I don't like having to use these remedies, I will safeguard the interests of American farmers. And without EEP, the European Community would absorb additional markets, forcing out those who can compete fairly -- farmers in countries like Australia and the United States.

We both know -- all of us know -- that the real answer is what our two governments are doing -- working hard for an historic new GATT agreement that cuts back subsidies, especially for exports. That's why the U.S. is committed to working with GATT Director Dunkel's new text. We believe his draft moves us closer to finally concluding an agreement. While not perfect, it makes an important contribution -- and the international trading system is too important to pass up this opportunity. I trust and hope that Australia and other Pacific nations will join us to instill additional momentum in the Uruguay Round negotiations when they resume later this month. This is the best comprehensive approach that we can offer to our hard-working farmers and ranchers.

We also see the potential for using regional organizations to expand and liberalize trade around the globe. We are especially encouraged by Australia's leadership in the APEC -- in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation process. The success of the November APEC ministerial in Seoul was proof that APEC is emerging as the economic forum in the Pacific and is increasingly fostering a sense of community around the Pacific Rim. North America -- Mexico, the United States and Canada -- is part of this community. And so let me just assure you -- every one of you both sides of this aisle -- that the North American Free Trade Agreement will not become an exclusive trading bloc. It will lower internal barriers without raising external barriers. Our growth will help stimulate yours, just as growth in Asia will spur our exports.

We also can do more bilaterally to expand trade. That's why I am proposing a United States-Australia Trade and Investment Framework Agreement -- one way to enhance our already strong economic engagement. That's our agenda to expand exports and growth through reducing trade barriers -- whether globally, regionally, or bilaterally.

Clearly, with the dramatic changes in the world we must adapt to new security realities as well. But let me simply pledge to you our friends: no matter what changes may come about in the defense expenditures in the United States or in the nature of the threats to international peace, the U.S.-Australian alliance is fundamental to the stability of the Asia-Pacific region.

I understand that there is some concern in Asia about America's commitment given our imminent departure from Subic Bay in the Phillipines. Let me put it plainly: I've served in Asia, personally, in time of war and in time of peace. And with changing times, our posture's is going to change to suit different needs. But our role and our purpose as a Pacific power will remain constant. It is important that the people of Australia understand this: We intend to remain engaged no matter whatever the changing security arrangements of our time.

And, yes, we've talked about it here today with the Prime Minister, with the leader of the opposition, with others -- the Cold War is over. But the threat of communism which for so many decades occupied our energies, is now replaced by the instabilities of ethnic rivalries and regional conflicts. And, yes, the Soviet Union, as we have known it, is history. It's a new era. But like Australia the United States has fought three wars in Asia over the past 50 years. We know that our security is inextricably linked to stability across the Pacific, and we will not put that security and stability at risk. I can assure you that the United States intends to retain the appropriate military presence to protect its allies and to counter threats to peace.

Just recently in the Persian Gulf we witnessed that the dangerous combination of volatile regional conflicts and weapons of mass destruction requires our constant attention. And so I salute Australia's leadership in stemming the threat of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. It's your children and the children of the entire world who will grow up in a safer world thanks to such efforts.

Australia and the United States are also working to end another long-standing and tragic regional conflict. Our combined initiatives in the United Nations have been major factors in the progress toward peace and free elections in Cambodia. Both of us have now reestablished official representation in Phnom Penh in order to move the peace process forward. Australia is making an additional contribution by sending a senior military officer to head the U.N. peacekeeping force in Cambodia. And I am proud of our collective efforts to end the nightmare in Cambodia and usher in a new era of hope and rebuilding.

And finally, American and Australian aspirations for the future are evident in our increasing cooperation on such matters as environmental protection, educational and social issues. We can take pride in our governments' joint actions toward conservation of the tropical forests, protecting endangered species, and promoting technologies for clean-burning coal.

Australia also plays a leading role in the international fight against illicit drugs. And I know I speak for millions of American parents in expressing thanks for your efforts to fight drug abuse, to fight drug trafficking.

I believe the next generations of Australians and Americans will grow even closer. I see no threat to that at all. And I foresee a steady expansion of travel and cultural exchanges in years to come. Australia's natural beauty, of which I've seen regrettably little this trip, is really senstational, a powerful magnet for American tourists. But more than this, it is the spirit of your country that earns Australia so much admiration in our country -- in America -- and indeed around the world. Your artists' contributions to film and dance and music have whetted our appetites for more and more things Australian. U.S. television carries Australian-rules football, and many Americans enjoy the rough and tumble of hard hitting with reckless abandon. (Laughter.) We have something similar, but we call it politics in the United States. (Laughter.)

I credit the clear air of Australia for its effect on one of the freshest minds now working in Washington -- I'm speaking about our Secretary of Education, Lamar Alexander. In 1987, after completing eight years as Governor of Tennessee, Lamar took his wife and children to spend half a year in this beautiful country. And now that he's joined my Cabinet as Secretary of Education, Lamar Alexander is working for revolutionary changes to improve our schools.

And this, too, is part of our program to make America competitive and strong and to help it grow. Secretary Alexander is

promoting innovative ideas that he saw in practice right here in Australia. For instance the large measure of freedom that Australians have in choosing among private and religious or state-operated schools. And when we succeed with some of these reforms, we'll thank pathfinders such as Australians for their example.

Of course, we've always shared fraternal ties and a spirit of freedom ever since an American vessel named Philadelphia became the first trading ship to call at Sydney's Port Jackson in 1792. Almost a century later, Mark Twain visited Australia and spoke for all Americans when he said, "You have a spirit of independence here which cannot be overpraised."

And 50 years ago in the Coral Sea, Australians and Americans paid a high price for freedom, but they proved to the world that the future belongs to the brave and the bold. For the half century since, we have deepened our friendship, our economic interdependence, and our collaboration on mutual defense. And now, more clearly than ever, we can see a hopeful future for the far-flung kinsmen of Australia and America and for all who share those fundamental ideals that we hold dear. We're prepared to work as partners in the next century to break new ground for freedom, cooperation, and economic progress.

For me, this has been a great honor. For Barbara and me, it has been a sheer pleasure to be with you all here for these short two and a half days. But this hospitality of the Australian people is indescribable. I couldn't possibly tell you how emotional I feel about it. So let me simply say thank you again for the extraordinary honor of allowing me to address this distinguished Parliament. May your debates be lively and full of friendship and affection, as they once in a while are. And may God bless you all. And may the Lord smile on the kinship and friendship of Australia and the United States of America. Thank you very, very much. (Applause.)

END 2:07 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Lubbock, Texas)

For Immediate Release September 2, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO FARMERS AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Farm of Jeff Kapperman
Humboldt, South Dakota

10:05 A.M. CDT

THE PRESIDENT: Please be seated. And let me just say how very pleased I am to be back in this state.

Today I want to give a rather serious speech --I'm glad you all have seats, don't have to stand through this epic. But first of all, I want to thank George Mickelson, the Governor. You've got a great Governor. He's a great friend of agriculture and a great friend of George and Barbara Bush. (Applause.)

And I hope you'll excuse us for being a little tardy in getting here because Sue and Jeff Kapperman have just introduced us to one of the largest and nicest families I believe I've ever met back there. (Applause.) There's a representative group of them standing up against that fence. I cannot guarantee it's all of them.

But in any event, we're just very pleased to be here. I want to say that it's fun seeing the kids and visiting the farm here and coming to Montrose and Humboldt -- special because with us on the plane today, Air Force One coming out, was Larry Pressler, who's here someplace. Went right by his home farm, I believe. (Applause.) We salute him and thank him for his support there in Washington.

And I can get a little feel, coming back here, for what Money Magazine was talking about when they named Sioux Falls "the best place to live in America." That's pretty high praise. (Applause.) I also want to salute another public servant and one who has been at my side for a long time, the Lieutenant Governor Walt Miller. I think he's here with us -- Walter Miller. (Applause.) Anyway -- and old friend. And Mayor White greeted us. I thank him for that. Senator Shanard is here; Don Jarrett of the South Dakota Wheat Commission; and two people that I plan on seeing in Washington -- I've known Charlene Haar, she's a good woman and a good active campaigner. And I salute her -- (applause) -- for the United States Senate. And also John Timmer, running for the congressional seat here. I'd back him. We've got to make a change in this gridlocked Congress. (Applause.)

And, of course, I'd be remiss if I didn't single out another guy that's been at my side in politics, your former Governor, Bill Janklow -- I thank him. (Applause.) And also, Don Peterson, out there helping with the Republican effort this year. So many people doing so much for what I think is good, sound government.

I'm told that Jeff is a Democrat. But looking around at this setting, even I can't hold that against him. (Laughter.) And I must say thaMORE am very, very grateful to him and to his family for letting this mob -- including you guys out

here -- hit this beautiful place of his. It's something very special about talking about agriculture in a setting that's so down to earth and so wonderfully family oriented.

Jeff and Sue, as family farmers, represent something very important about this state -- and I would say, very important about this country. Agricultural families represent the heart of South Dakota's economy.

So I came out here today to rural America to talk with you about how I have been fighting and will continue to fight for the economic security of American farmers -- through a program that is based on opening markets abroad, and then helping you export and grow more, keeping the government off your back as best we can, and being there to help you get back on your feet when disaster strikes. (Applause.)

I plan to speak mainly today about wheat and about disaster assistance, but let me just say to America's corn growers -- I noticed the corn fields as we came in -- that I am a strong supporter of ethanol. (Applause.) We have worked hard to see ethanol demand go to new heights -- through everything from tax credits to research and new programs for clean fuels. And we're working now on a very difficult legal problem facing the White House -- to make sure that ethanol plays a leading role in America's drive for cleaner air and America's drive for greater markets for -- diverse markets for the corn growers of this country. And we're going to whip that problem.

We now enjoy an unparalleled reign of free markets and free people around the globe, an unprecedented opportunity for growth. When I think of my presidency I must say I look at these kids, and I think we are very lucky that in the last three years we've been able to reduce the threat of nuclear war that has scared every family half to death in this country. (Applause.)

And today when I talk to Boris Yeltsin, the Russian President -- and I talked to him just last week -- we don't talk about nuclear weapons, we talk about how much grain we can provide to Russian consumers, and how he can solidify his democracy, his freedom, his reforms. We also talk about the biggest swords-into-plowshares agreement ever, one that will turn that Russian bomb-grade material, uranium, into fuel for the peaceful generation of electric power right here in America.

The American people are universally respected as the most generous and innovative on Earth. American products -- whether it is a pair of blue jeans spun from Texas cotton or a bushel of wheat from here in South Dakota -- are in demand everywhere.

The challenge before us then is to seize this moment. Our challenge now is to win the economic competition -- literally to win the peace. In the 1990s, we must be a military superpower, an economic superpower, and an export superpower.

In two months, you're going to be asked to choose between two completely different versions of how to win this global economic competition. One vision is to turn inward, to try to protect what we have, to put up walls around America. Mine is to look forward -- to open new markets to American exports, to prepare our work force to compete, to keep the social fabric of this country strong, and to save and invest in those things that will help us win. (Applause.)

The best example that I can cite of our forward-looking approach is the work we've done to open new markets for American agriculture. In the last four years, we have signed 11

bilateral agreements with 10 countries to open up new markets for American farm exports.

We signed agreements to increase beef exports to Japan and Korea -- now the third largest market for U.S. beef. We've made inroads throughout Asia -- which now accounts for 38 percent of American agricultural exports -- 38 percent going to Asia.

And just last month, we concluded the North American Free Trade Agreement, which will boost our $3 billion worth of agricultural exports to Mexico.

One in every three acres planted in this country produces crops for export. That may be hard for some to realize, but that's a lot of export -- one in every three goes to exports. U.S. agricultural exports support over a million jobs. And just since 1989, our agricultural trade has reduced our overall trade deficit by almost $69 billion. You are doing the Lord's work.

Make no mistake: If the other side puts up walls around America -- whether they're high tariff walls or high tax walls -- the first loser is going to be the American farmer.

Now, let me drive this point home. Seventy-six percent of South Dakota's wheat is exported -- 76 percent of it. Agriculture contributes $13.2 billion to South Dakota's economy, three times more than any other industry -- we we're talking about it with the Governor coming in here. And if Governor Clinton gets infected with that antitrade strain from the protectionist crowd he's running around with, it will be the American farmer that catches pneumonia and South Dakota is going to get mighty sick.

Where does the Governor stand on free trade -- on our historic trade agreement with Mexico? He won't say, but -- says nothing about all of that right now, is studying it, taking another look.

The newspapers reported in Washington this morning -- I don't like to read those papers very much, but I do from time to time -- and they reported this morning that one of the most powerful labor bosses in the country, Lane Kirkland, said that they decided to -- the unions decided to let Governor Clinton off the hook on this one until after the election -- they'll let him be on both sides of this free trade agreement now.

Big labor made it clear that they are vehemently opposed to this free trade agreement, mind you, and one labor source said -- and this is a quote -- "there have been private conversations with the candidate and he remains receptive to us." I have found as President you cannot be on both sides of every issue. You've got to take a position and say what you think is right, whether some people like it or some people don't. (Applause.)

This was in the paper today. Here's another quote from them -- "labor does not plan to push Clinton for specific public commitments that might prove politically embarrassing to his candidacy." I think you're entitled to know -- not just as voters, but as people that are doing the Lord's work out in the field, you're entitled to know where a person stands on something as fundamental as a free trade agreement that's going to open up more markets for your products.

You cannot be on every side of every issue. He's stuck riding the fence so hard he's got saddle sores -- I might say "straddle sores". (Laughter.) But don't kid yourselves.

The money, the manpower, and the support for his campaign comes from the opponents of free trade. And after the election, they'll call in that antifree trade IOU, and then you'd better watch out. American agricultural exports and job-creating exports of every kind will be the victims.

I don't believe that this doublespeak means one thing except double trouble. The Congress is going to take this vacillation as weakness, and the vital national economic interest will lose out to congressional log-rolling, back-scratching, and business-as-usual.

Over 7.5 million jobs -- American jobs -- are tied to merchandise exports. We can create hundreds of thousands of additional new jobs with a free trade agreement. And we cannot afford a President who will put these jobs at risk.

That's why I fought very hard to reach a new agreement under the GATT -- the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. USDA -- Ag Department -- estimates that a successful GATT agreement will add over a billion dollars a year to farm income -- a billion dollars a year. And it will do something else: It will force our competitors, especially in the European Community, to reduce their excessive export subsidies in agriculture. We want free trade -- but we must insist on fair trade.

To help us reach good agreements, I've been using a strategy that won us military security: peace through strength. No unilateral disarmament. (Applause.)

Our Export Enhancement Program -- you all refer to it as EEP -- have enabled us to help farmers fight for market share against the EC's subsidized exports. Since 1989, we have doubled the number of EEP initiatives. We've nearly tripled the value of EEP bonuses. Just since the beginning of this year, we've awarded $914 million worth of EEP bonuses -- leading to sales of over $3 billion under the EEP program.

Wheat to Algeria, Egypt, the Philippines. Vegoil to Morocco and Turkey. A pork EEP to the former Soviet Union. In total, our EEPs have helped us fight back against European subsidies and sell almost $10 billion worth of commodities to 93 countries during these past four years.

But now we need to do more. The fact is that the prices farmers are receiving are too low today. To get prices up, we must expand demand -- and that means an aggressive export policy.

Today I am announcing a broadside of EEP initiatives to sell over one billion bushels or 30 million metric tons of U.S. wheat, with a market value of over $3 billion, to 28 countries around the world. (Applause.) This is the largest quantity of wheat ever made available under the EEP program at one time.

There is no question that, in a world of open trade, the U.S. would be the premier supplier of wheat to world markets. That's why we are committed to reducing subsidies worldwide. But my announcement today should leave no doubt: with heavy EC subsidies continuing, this EEP is vital -- and we will use it as necessary. I am putting foreign governments on notice to that effect right here today in South Dakota. (Applause.)

That's why I am also taking a second step today to show that we're in this competition for the long haul. Two years ago, I worked with Congress to include two so-called "GATT triggers" in our law. They were a warning to other nations that

we would counter their subsidized exports if they would not agree to negotiated cuts.

The date of the first trigger has passed, and so today, we are acting to protect the American farmer. We will increase programs to promote agricultural exports by $1 billion. The law said we would do this in 1994 and 1995; I am announcing that we will increase these programs beginning now -- and my support for wheat is the first step. (Applause.)

Let me make this comment to those friends of ours overseas also. Let me be clear: this action is aimed at those who subsidize, not at those, such as Australia and others, who do not subsidize.

Today's wheat EEP initiatives will give farmers, exporters, and buyers more certainty about market opportunities. We want to help growers plan -- and we want to strengthen America's reputation as a reliable supplier.

The other side's approach to trade is to create barriers here, right here in this country, that increase prices, dull our competitive edge, and hurt our growth. The usual strategy is to impose productions controls. My approach is to help our farmers take the battle to the competition: offense, not defense. My strategy is to outproduce our competition, and beat their socks off in the marketplace. (Applause.)

But as every farmer here knows, to win in the marketplace we must also take steps today that will make us more competitive tomorrow. So another part of my agricultural program is to help farmers keep pace by developing new techniques through our National Research Initiative for fighting pests and disease, for understanding human nutrition, for growing more.

We're increasing research in biotechnology and into new uses of agricultural products -- from cleaner fuels to printer's ink to biodegradable plastics. The initiatives we are pushing will help strengthen prices, boost farm income, and create jobs. That's why farm income over the past three years has averaged a higher level than at any time in American history -- and more of that income is coming from the market, instead of from the government, than at any time in decades.

But even so, 1992 has been a difficult year in parts for rural America. Last fall's drought -- followed by a freeze in late May -- severely weakened the winter wheat crop in Kansas, and right here in South Dakota, and elsewhere. Weather has hit farmers from Nebraska to New York, California to the Cotton Belt. And now Louisiana sugarcane has been damaged by the winds of Hurricane Andrew. Barbara and I saw some of that devastation yesterday there in Jeanerette, Louisiana.

For some farmers, these disasters come on the heels of losses in 1990 and 1991. Late last year, I signed a bill to provide about $1 billion in disaster assistance for the 1990 and 1991 crops. Today, I would like to announce the next step. I am releasing an additional $755 million in disaster assistance funds. A minimum of $100 million is set aside for crops planted in 1991 for harvest in 1992, such as winter wheat. American farmers need help. With this action, this disaster relief action, you will get it.

Now I know that this $755 million is not going to solve every problem. We will begin sign-ups for winter wheat next Tuesday; other crops shortly thereafter. We can't prevent an early freeze, and I know that this amount may not be enough to pay the full amount of every loss. But these funds will help

keep farmers on their feet -- so that bankers will work with you, and next season's crop can be planted.

We've worked hard over the past several years to reduce farm debt. Debt is way down, equity is up, balance sheets are stronger. Today's announcement will help to secure those gains -- to advance the economic security of the American farmer. If additional disaster funds are needed, we will go to bat with the Congress to secure them.

You see, an economic strategy based on competition is not an abandonment of governmental responsibility. Sometimes when disaster strikes, the federal government is uniquely equipped to help. We've seen that this week in Florida and Louisiana in the aftermath of the hurricane. That's one reason I went down to Florida and Louisiana again yesterday, to see the progress and the problems with my own eyes. And we're going to stay with the people of Florida and Louisiana until we get that job done. (Applause.)

Now getting the job done in agriculture means government should get out of the way of the producers when intervention will hurt our competitiveness.

Take the subject of regulation. My opponents want to take the world's safest food supply, tie it up with more regulation, and make it more expensive for the consumer. We want to work to make our food supply safe and affordable, without this extremis, without this hysteria.

Take the subject of taxation. My opponent says that government takes too much of your money and taxes. But they want to take more of it -- $150 billion already proposed in new taxes. New taxes on small business to pay for government health and mandatory training. I want to cut the taxes, cut them across the board -- reduce the burden particularly on small business. Small business is overregulated and overtaxed. (Applause.)

Take the subject of spending, which is absolutely critical -- federal spending. They want to use those new taxes to add $220 billion in new spending. And Newsweek Magazine pointed out this week that Governor Clinton failed even to put a price tag on his four biggest programs. The real cost of his spending binge, said Newsweek, "is arguably at least three times higher than that." That's the quote from Newsweek.

And remember, we tried this recipe of higher taxes and higher spending before. We went down the path of foreign policy inexperience. We tried the combination of a Democratic controlled Congress and a Democratic President, and you remember the results. We had back-to-back years of double-digit inflation. And farmers were devastated. We had interest rates at 21.5 percent, and farmers were devastated. We had grain embargoes -- nobody here forgets that -- we had grain embargoes, and food as a foreign policy weapon. And farmers were devastated.

In this political year it is easy to be fooled. The new kid on the block shows up with a new set of lyrics, but it is the same old song. Wouldn't it be ironic if now, at the exact moment of America's triumph around the world -- we were to turn backwards, to turn inward?

Not far from here, on the way into Humboldt, there's a sign that calls this a "Small town with a big heart." Well, now that the entire world is turning our way -- toward open markets, less bureaucracy, less regulation, more freedom, more competition -- we Americans must not and cannot lose heart.

We've learned this: freedom works. Opportunity awaits those who dare to reach for it. Competition brings out the best in our people -- especially those here working in the soil, those farmers that know how to really get out there and do the hard work. If we remember these home truths, there is no telling what we can accomplish. For America's finest hour is yet to come.

The opposition tells you that we're not respected abroad. They tell you that we're in decline. We are not a declining nation. We've had enormously difficult economic problems; so has the entire world, caught up in a global recession. But we are the United States of America. And if we follow these policies we can outcompete, outhustle, outwork anybody on the face of the Earth. (Applause.)

I wish I were this guy's age over here -- it's going to be an exciting time ahead. And the American farmer is going to lead the way. Thank you all very, very much. And may God bless our great country. Thank you. (Applause.)

END 10:30 A.M. CDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Springfield, Missouri)

For Immediate Release September 22, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO SPRINGFIELD SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

University Plaza Convention Center
Springfield, Missouri

8:53 A.M. CDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very, very much. Thank you very much. And let me just say to Governor Ashcroft how appreciative I am for that rousing introduction. And let me tell you, it's a joy to be back. I keep showing up in this marvelous part of the country. (Applause.)

And I understand that I owe a vote of gratitude to Ben Parnell, a leading, most respected Democrat who gave an outstanding talk here; to Hal Gibbs, a former leader in the Perot organization who is now suited up and working hard for us. And I'm grateful to him -- grateful to both of them. To an old friend, Johnny Morris. The only thing I feel deprived of is I can't go by that marvelous outlet here and enhance your economy. (Laughter.) Because I love fishing and I love the outdoors. (Applause.) And I respect Johnny Morris as one of our leading environmentalists in the entire United States. He's sensible and he speaks for the sportsmen all across this country.

And, of course, seeing -- modestly sitting in the front row over here, my old, dear friend whom Barbara and I respect and love, who's been with us at Camp David, with whom I campaigned four years ago -- Mo Bandy. I'll tell you, it's a joy to have him here. (Applause.)

And I also want to pay my respects to the Congressman -- I haven't seen Mel Hancock. Maybe he's not with us, but he's a great representative for this area. And, of course, I was privileged to -- (applause) -- privileged to ride in with Don Gunn, who is the neighboring state rep, a man that serves with John Ashcroft with such distinction in the Capitol.

So let me on with the business at hand. And John has set the course and set the agenda for today's comments. These trips today will take me to six different states. And two weeks ago in Detroit, I presented to the American people my Agenda for American Renewal. It is a clear-eyed look at what's wrong with our country, and also what's right about our country. I offered a comprehensive, integrated approach to win the new global economic competition. So that by early in the next century, the world's first $10-trillion economy will be found right here in the United States of America. (Applause.)

Last week, I discussed in detail how my vision of our future differs from that of my opponent. The differences simply could not be deeper -- the stakes, as John points out -- the Governor points out -- could not be higher.

Basically, it comes down to this: My opponent believes that government planners can manage the economy better than the workers and small businessmen and women who actually make it grow. I respect government, but I don't put my faith in it. I put my faith in the tax-paying, hard-working men and women

of America. (Applause.)

The first shot out of the box Governor Clinton says that he wants to raise taxes that will kill jobs. I want to see them cut to help Americans create jobs. (Applause.) Governor Clinton wants to increase -- he's already said this -- increase federal spending by at least $220 billion. And I want to cut it by that and more. I want the differences to be clear and sharp. And then the American people, then you will make a choice.

You know, the American people are interviewing two men for the same job. Now, you know me. My record is on the table, over the years. You know its shortcomings. I admit I've made mistakes and I hope you know my record's strengths. And in my agenda I've told you what I intend to do to build on that record. I have spoken from my heart about the great optimism that I feel for this nation -- how I know we can rise above our challenges today and achieve an even better tomorrow.

My opponent has taken a very different path. He hasn't hesitated a minute to try to tear down everything we've accomplished for 12 years -- to find everything he can about what's wrong with America. While I've been talking about ideas he and his people have admitted publicly that their focus is on the negative -- on what's wrong.

For month after month, Governor Clinton has persisted in attacks on me -- persistent, unrelenting and many very personal in nature. Frankly, he has distorted my record, and his campaign chairman even called me a racist. And this week, the Governor unveiled for the first time in this presidential race negative campaigning, negative television advertising -- first one of this campaign.

So far, right up to today in Springfield, I have resisted the urge to focus on Governor Clinton's record. Frankly, I have felt that Americans want a positive debate. But I must tell you, I am very tired of the distortions, tired of the half-truths. And the stakes are too high to let America be deceived by a negative campaign. So today, for really the first time, I have chosen to lay it on the line -- (applause) -- talk about my opponent's record -- talk facts. Talk about the record in Arkansas, the Governor's record. And that means explaining the Grand Canyon that separates his rhetoric from the reality of his record.

You need to know this, because our country's future is literally on the line. You need to know whether you can trust Bill Clinton to take America where it needs to go in the next four years. Because once you buy what he's selling, there's no refund.

I hear candidate Clinton is up in Michigan today talking about debates. Well, I propose a debate for him today -- candidate Clinton versus Governor Clinton. You see, we've all heard -- (applause) -- we've all heard what candidate Clinton says he can do for America. But that's very different from what Governor Clinton has done to Arkansas, to the good people of Arkansas. (Applause.)

And I want to stress this: My argument is not with the people of Arkansas. It is not. They are good, decent, hard-working people. Frankly, they deserve treatment better than they've received from Governor Clinton. So here we go. Let me begin with an issue of concern to every American, every fair-minded American: civil rights.

Governor Clinton says -- and I quote -- "Everybody knows I have the best civil rights record." His words. His modesty overwhelms me. (Laughter.) But how does his record stand? Some of you may know that in 1968 -- when I was a Congressman from Texas -- I supported the Fair Housing Act. It wasn't popular with some of my constituents. Times have changed,

of course, and nowadays 41 states have laws banning housing discrimination -- 41. But Arkansas is not one of them -- even though my opponent has been Governor for 12 years.

Forty-six states have human relations agencies that safeguard their citizens against discrimination. But not Arkansas under his leadership. Forty-eight states have basic civil rights laws that ban discrimination and guarantee equal opportunity. But not Arkansas. That's right: Arkansas is one of only two states in America without a civil rights statute.

Candidate Clinton likes to talk about my 1990 veto of the Democratic Congress's quota bill. I did veto that bill -- and I'll veto any other quota bill that the liberals cook up. (Applause.) I am for civil rights. And I am against quotas. That is not a contradiction.

So last year, after tough negotiations with Congress and beating back two attempts to ram down my throat and the people's throat a quota bill, I did sign -- proudly sign a major civil rights bill without resorting to quotas. In addition, I fought for the Americans With Disabilities Act, the most sweeping civil rights legislation in 30 years that brings those with disabilities into the mainstream and gives them a shot at the American Dream. (Applause.) And I'm proud of it. (Applause.)

What about Governor Clinton? Even though his party enjoys overwhelming control of the Arkansas legislature, Governor Clinton has still not brought a civil rights bill to the people of Arkansas.

So when you hear the candidate Clinton's rhetoric all across this country about civil rights, Governor Clinton's record just does not stand up.

Now, consider another issue: economic fairness. You know, candidate Clinton is playing the old game that liberals love to play -- class warfare. Divide Americans rich from poor, one group from another. And he's good at it, candidate Clinton is very good at that: using the same tired, twisted, partisan statistics to explain how the poor can only get richer if the rich get poorer.

According to candidate Clinton, the last 10 years have been a nightmare. Well, I've got news for him. It is not true. The Urban Institute back in Washington is not usually sympathetic to me, but listen to what they had to say about the 1980s. "When one follows individuals rather than statistical groups defined by income, one finds that, on average, the rich got a little richer and the poor got much richer." Now, that's the truth. Our policies of cutting taxes have spurred growth for all Americans.

Yes, we've got tough times now. But it's fair to look at the whole record. And candidate Clinton doesn't think this is a "fair" result. He doesn't think it's fair. Maybe because he -- it's maybe because Governor Clinton doesn't have much experience with tax fairness in his own state. Governor Clinton has more than doubled -- if you want a horror story, listen to this -- he has more than doubled Arkansas state spending since 1983. And he has paid for it by raising the taxes that hurt poor and working families the most.

My opponent has raised and extended his sales tax repeatedly -- and he has opposed removing that tax from groceries. Governor taxes -- Governor Taxes -- sorry. (Laughter.) Freudian slip. (Applause.) Freudian slip. Governor Clinton raised taxes on beer and started taxing mobile homes, too. And he more than doubled Arkansas's gas tax -- to 18-and-a-half cents per gallon. Governor Clinton even taxed food stamps until the federal government forced him to stop. And as

if working families in Arkansas did not have enough problems, he's even tried to tax child care.

When it comes to taxes, Governor Clinton can't seem to get enough. Last year, he signed the largest tax increase in Arkansas history. I signed a tax increase once, and I've regretted it ever since. I admit it when I make a mistake. And therein lies the difference. (Applause.)

Let me quote from an article in the Arkansas Gazette on all of this. "In the Clinton era," it says, "the state tax system has become more and more regressive. It has become, step by step, a pretty bad system, stacked against the ordinary taxpayer and consumer, stacked for the rich and special interest." End of quotation. Now, that's been his tax policy in Arkansas. Look at what it did to that state's economy -- a wonderful state, but look what it did to the economy.

The per-capita income, for example -- that's the bottom line for working men and women, how much income on average each of them have. Well, at the end of the 1980s, Arkansas ranked 48th in the nation per-capita income -- only about 73 percent of the national average, and that was even lower than the 75 percent in 1980. The poor people have been going backwards under this man. And what about all those good manufacturing jobs that candidate Clinton talks about? Well, average hourly earnings for Arkansas manufacturing workers ranked 47th in 1980. By 1989, they had dropped to 50th.

Now candidate Clinton says he wants to do to the American economy what Governor Clinton's done to Arkansas -- Arkansas taxes, Arkansas income, Arkansas jobs. And I don't think he's kidding. I wish he were. Candidate Clinton wants the biggest tax increase in history. He hasn't even got there yet and he's proposing the largest tax increase in history. And that's not even counting his payroll taxes for training and also those that would be required under his health care plan. And that's not fair. That simply is not fair for every working man and woman in America.

Another issue, one near and dear to the hearts of every American, rural or urban, and that's crime. Candidate Clinton likes to talk tough. You'll hear him criticize me about federal aid to state and local law enforcement. But, in fact, since 1989, we've proposed a 59-percent increase in federal spending to fight crime. You'll also hear candidate Clinton make some pretty impressive claims about crime control in Arkansas. Wrong. Wrong again. Not. (Laughter.)

Candidate Clinton -- meet Governor Clinton. During the 1980s, the nation's overall crime rate during the '80s actually declined. But not in Arkansas! In fact, Governor Clinton's state had the biggest increase in the overall crime rate in the entire nation -- nearly 28 percent. Again, this is not fair to the good people of Arkansas.

What about violent crimes? Arkansas's violent crime rate went up more than 58 percent -- one of the worst records in the entire nation. Why? Well, I've got a few hunches. Arkansas ranks near rock bottom in every important per-capita law enforcement expenditure. For prisons: 46th. For judicial and legal systems: 50th. And when it comes to spending for police officers, Arkansas ranks 49th.

And in Arkansas, when the prison door slams shut on a convicted criminal, he knows it won't be long before it opens up again. As incredible as it sounds -- as incredible as it sounds, most inmates in Arkansas serve less than one-fifth -- one-fifth -- of their sentence behind bars. That's the worst record in the entire nation. The people of Arkansas deserve to walk their streets without fearing that some crazy convict is

going to ruin their lives -- some guy let out of jail far too early.

Now, contrast the situation in Arkansas with what we've been doing on the federal level. Most federal inmates serve at least 85 percent of their full sentence. And I think it's pretty simple: if you take liberties with the law, you're going to lose your own liberties -- for a long, long time. (Applause.)

When you look at Governor Clinton's record on law enforcement, it's not surprising that last week, the fraternal order of police in Little Rock gave me their endorsement for President of the United States of America. (Applause.) And that is the verdict of the police officers in Governor Clinton's own backyard. They agree with me. You do not coddle criminals -- you stand up for the law-abiding citizens in this country. (Applause.)

I'm really enjoying getting this record out here. (Laughter.)

Let's look at another contrast. It's been 11 long months of his hammering me. And we're just starting today right here Springfield -- (applause) -- because I want the American people to know the truth. (Applause.) I want them to know the facts. (Applause.) I want them to know the truth. (Applause.)

Let's look at another contrast between candidate Clinton's rhetoric and Governor Clinton's record with children. In his new book, candidate Clinton says that America has failed to provide its children with either the best education or adequate protection from violence. That's what the candidate says. Now how about the Governor?

Look at the facts. During the 1980s, Arkansas fell from 47th to 48th place in the percentage of adults with a high school diploma. Arkansas's rankings on its primary college entrance examination -- known as A.C.T -- have declined overall. Twenty-eight states use the A.C.T as their primary college entrance test. The New York Times recently reported that in 1979 Arkansas ranked 20 out of those 28. The state's latest available ranking is down to 25th out of the 28.

And we know that more than three-quarters of Arkansas high school graduates require remedial instruction when they get to college. It's not fair to the. Think about it -- 75 Percent of Arkansas college students spend their first year of college relearning what they missed out on in high school. Now these are bright, dynamic young people. And they deserve better than a failed education system. And when it comes to the percentage of adults with a college degree, Governor Clinton's Arkansas still ranks 50th.

Now, when it comes to protecting children from violence, you should know this: My opponent's record is, in one word, appalling. The facts are not pretty. But America should listen to the facts.

During the 1980s, the death rate for American children 14-and-under improved dramatically across the country. But in Arkansas, it got worse. The state ranked 49th in 1989. In the late 1980s, Arkansas's rate of violent deaths for teenagers soared at three times the national average. And over the decade, child abuse reports shot up 130 percent. Now, behind that statistic are tales of heartbreaking tragedy. The young people over in Arkansas deserve to have their hearts healed.

ANd now, it's hard to believe that Governor Clinton was unaware of what was going on. Throughout the 1980s, study after study contained detailed findings and recommendations -- a cry for help, if you will. And he even commissioned some of

these studies himself. In 1990, his own Department of Human Services reported that "frequent and widespread" official failures had placed the children of Arkansas in, again a quote, "imminent peril." Still Governor Clinton did nothing.

And finally a group of child welfare advocates took the Governor to court. And they filed a federal class action naming him as lead defendant. And on June 8th, less than four months ago, my opponent finally settled. And now candidate Clinton promises to crack down on violence against children.

Now to the environment to what Johnny Morris is famous for and that Governor Ashcroft can take great pride in -- the environment. I love to hike. I love to camp out. I love to go fishing. I like to go hunting. And you've heard me talk about the importance of protecting the environment many times. But to me real eloquence is action -- and I have acted. And there's our historic Clean Air Act, cutting acid rain in half -- we did that. We banished offshore oil rigs from sensitive beaches on both coasts and added a billion dollars worth of new forests and parks for our children to enjoy.

And in the past three years, our Environmental Protection Agency has assessed more than half of all the civil penalties and criminal fines in the history of EPA -- more than $200 million. To those who spoil our lakes and air we are saying, mess with our children's health and you will pay.

And those are facts. And that is the record -- a record I am very proud of on the environment; a sound, progressive record. But candidate Clinton calls America's environmental record since 1989 a "disaster." And he promises, quote, "real environmental policy" that will, again quote, "challenge Americans and demand responsibility at every level."

My advice: Let's take candidate Clinton at his word. Demand that candidates run on their records. I'm prepared to do that. We've got a good record to take to the American people, the people of Missouri. I'll stand by my record. Now, let's see if he can stand on his. And, again, I'm going to be very, very factual.

Earlier this year, my opponent was asked to name a single Arkansas law that exceeds federal environmental standards. He couldn't do that -- not one. The Governor has accepted generous campaign contributions, free plane rides from Arkansas's powerful chicken industry. And the industry is the ultimate source of -- and I'll put this as delicately as I possibly can -- fecal coliform bacteria, which pollutes hundreds of miles of Arkansas rivers. Governor Clinton did create an animal waste task force to deal with the issue. But the task force subcommittee was headed by a chicken executive. And they decided that controls on what they call "chicken litter", unquote -- (laughter) -- should be purely voluntary. It's hard to keep this clean, but I'm telling you the record is bad over there. (Applause.)

But I guess with Governor Clinton, some things do run thicker than water. (Laughter and applause.) Last year, the Institute for Southern Studies released an extraordinarily detailed, state-by-state study of environmental quality and progress. And let me quote the Institute's research director: "in the areas of policy -- laws passed, not task forces or commissions set up to study a problem -- Arkansas was 50th, the worst in the nation."

Arkansas residents want clean air and clean water. They're sportsmen just like you all are -- just like I am. They love the outdoors just like you do and just like I do. And they should not be last in the entire nation.

And finally, let's talk about health care. As you might expect, my opponent and I have two vastly different approaches to the problem. I want to use competition to expand coverage, preserve quality, drive down the costs. And candidate Clinton's plan could eventually bring our health care system under the control of the federal government.

And until last month, candidate Clinton pretended that his plan wouldn't cost a dime. But then someone at USA Today got him to admit what I've been saying all along: his plan would require a new payroll tax. And I say small business does not need any more taxes. Let's do it my way. (Applause.) A new payroll tax will kill jobs, especially in the small businesses that we're looking to to create the new jobs we need in this country. It'll cut wages.

But since we're talking about our records today, consider this, too. Candidate Clinton says "health care should be a right, not a privilege." And yet, under Governor Clinton, Arkansas has one of the nation's worst health insurance crises. More than 42 percent of Arkansas workers, the second highest percentage in the nation, don't even have employer-paid health insurance. And the New York Times says a full 25 percent of all state residents have no health insurance at all.

Candidate Clinton now says America -- quote -- "can't afford four more years" without a solution to our health care problem. And I totally agree with that. But Governor Clinton took a long time to come around. Early last year, in his fifth term as Governor, he finally signed a bill to provide bare bones coverage to people who have gone uninsured for more than a year.

And so there you have it. Nothing personal, just the facts. And next time you hear candidate Clinton promise to be a progressive change agent for the entire United States, think of civil rights and taxes in the state he's left behind. Think of crime and child abuse and education in that great state of Arkansas. Think of the environment that he's neglected, the health care problems he's ignored. Think about all this the next time candidate Clinton says he will do for America what he's done for Arkansas.

It is true we're having a big debate about America's future. But first you have to learn who's really on the other side. And you have to know, is it the words of candidate Clinton or the actions of Governor Clinton.

We've seen over the last nine months that candidate Clinton appears willing to say anything to anyone. But the record of Governor Clinton proves that it doesn't matter what the candidate will say to anyone, because he won't deliver.

So either way -- whether it's candidate Clinton or Governor Clinton -- I believe that Bill Clinton is wrong to be President of the United States of America. (Applause.)

You know, I feel better now -- (laughter) -- because when I started this morning, I explained how for months Governor Clinton has distorted my record. And I sat there through primary after primary, one assault by another -- not all by Governor Clinton, I might add; joined by a handful of other guys that have fallen by the wayside.

And I've made a decision -- I was President; I was trying to do something to help this country. And I chose not to fight back until now, because I believe Americans want action from their President. And I believe they want positive ideas -- want real solutions to our challenges.

But I simply cannot let Governor Clinton's distortions go unanswered. His own record must be exposed --

because look at what is at stake. (Applause.) This man has the gall to go around America and promise the moon, when on issue after issue, the sky has fallen in his own backyard.

And I say Arkansas deserves better. And I mean that. And I say America deserves better. And I say America deserves more than learning what's wrong, we need to know what works to build a safer and more secure future for these kids over here. And this is what I offer in this campaign -- experience, character and ideas that are right for America.

And my agenda contains 13 specific actions that I'm going to fight to accomplish in the first year of my second term with all those new congressmen that are coming in as a result of the confusion and disarray in the House. (Applause.) And I'm going to get them done. I'm going to get these things done with your help, because America has what it takes to win the economic competition, to win the peace. So let's get on with the job.

And thank you for this exceptionally warm welcome -- this Missouri welcome. And may God bless the greatest country on the face of the Earth, the United States of America. Thank you all.

END 9:27 A.M. CDT2

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Longview, Texas)

For Immediate Release September 22, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO CITIZENS LONGVIEW, TEXAS

Longview County Airport
Longview, Texas

2:17 P.M. CDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very, very much. Thank you so much. And it's an honor and privilege to be introduced by Florence Shapiro -- not only the Mayor of Plano, but going to be a member of the Texas Senate. We need her; she's typical of our great women leaders in our state of Texas. Thank you, Florence. (Applause.) And I want to thank our State Chairman, Jim Oberwetter, who is here somewhere; Rob Mosbacher, the Texas Victory '92 Chairman; Barbara Patton, the Bush-Quayle cochairman; and our Master of Ceremonies, Jim Offutt. And let me say it's great to be back in East Texas -- great, where the people understand the values that make this country strong. (Applause.)

You know, Longview brings back many memories. Back when I started a business out in West Texas and then down on the Gulf Coast, where I met a payroll, learned the basic truth about things like the role of government and the power of the individual, I stood here at this very airport I believe it was 22 years ago and saw a former president come into this airport, and I am proud to be back here as President of the United States, asking for your support for four more years. (Applause.)

Here in Texas, I learned something, and I learned that prosperity doesn't come just from the hallowed halls of government. It comes from the hard work, the imagination and the industry of men and women like you here today. And I'm grateful to you for coming out to this rally. (Applause.) I'm glad to see all the bands and participants here. Glad to see the Kilgore Rangerettes. (Applause.) I wish they'd go up to Washington for a few days. They could go over and take a look at the Congress and put those high-kicking boots to good use -- help us to clean house. (Applause.) You talk about kicking it -- they're the ones to do it.

Now, you know, for the past few weeks I've been traveling the length and breadth of our country -- and what a great country it is -- stumping for the ideas that I believe in, the agenda for American renewal. And I want to open new markets for our American products and new jobs for American workers. Americans never retreat. We always compete. And we always win. Let's open these foreign markets. (Applause.)

I have a fundamental difference with the Governor next door. I believe government is too big and spends too much of your taxpayers' money. And I want to do something about it. He wants to raise taxes and increase spending; I want to cut taxes and cut spending. (Applause.)

Good news today for the nation -- good news today on housing starts. They are up -- the largest increase in 18 months. Inflation is down, interest rates are down, productivity is up, and the economy is poised for a recovery. We must not let Governor

Clinton get in and tax it back into oblivion. (Applause.) I want to see incentives. I want to see incentives. And one of them ought to apply to the domestic oil business. We want to change the alternative minimum tax so we can get on with the business of developing more domestic resources and less dependency on foreign oil. (Applause.)

You know, it's small businesspeople, small businesswomen, small businessmen that saved this economy when the going has been tough. And they need relief from taxation, regulation and, yes, from litigation. As a nation, we spend up to $200 billion a year on lawsuits. And as a nation, we ought to sue each other less and care for each other more. (Applause.)

I see a lot of young people here today, and welcome. (Applause.) And let me say this about education. I want to give the young what they truly deserve -- the finest schools in the entire world. And I want to give every parent and every family the right to choose their children's schools, whether they're public, private or religious. (Applause.)

You know, I believe the Governor next door, Governor Clinton, has made up his mind: The only way he can win is to tell everybody how horrible things are about this country. He has persisted on attacking me day-in and day-out, many of the attacks personal. He has distorted, and I would say told the untruths about my record. And this week, he unveiled -- started in, the first one to do it, the first negative campaign ad. He's the one that says, watch out for the Republicans, watch on the television the first negative campaign ads in the presidential race of 1992 belong to that sorry ticket of Clinton and Gore. It's a sad thing. (Applause.)

And I have taken it for 11 months, listening to these guys. And I'll tell you today: I'm starting to dish it out and tell the truth about his record. (Applause.) So, this morning for openers I went to the state of Missouri and I laid out the Clinton record -- just the facts, telling the truth. And I'm stopping by these states, our state and others that are neighbors to the state of Arkansas so that we can get past this campaign rhetoric of his and look at what he's done for the people of Arkansas -- or, should I say, done to the people of that great state. (Applause.)

Look, they are good, decent people next door. They are good, hardworking people and they deserve better treatment than they've received from their Governor.

You know, the other side keeps talking -- you hear him talking about debate -- they want to change the rules from the debate rules that have been in effect for the last four presidential campaigns. Now he wants to change them. But now they ought to have a debate. On the one hand, you ought to have candidate Clinton; he'd be over here. And on the other side, promising everything, Governor Clinton. They ought to debate each other on the issues. (Applause.)

Each stop here along the way in this six-state swing, I'm talking about various issues. And let me talk today just about affordable health care, something that I am desperately interested in providing to every man, woman and child in this country. As you might expect, my opponent and I have two vastly different ideas how to go about this. I want to use the competition to expand coverage, making insurance available to the poorest of the poor, to everybody else -- everybody -- preserve quality and allow you to spend less of your paycheck on health insurance.

And he has a different approach. He expresses so much enthusiasm for government, he would have government get involved in setting health care prices, and perhaps eventually get involved in running our health care system. We do not need the government to run

it. We need to protect quality and provide insurance to all. (Applause.) You'd think he'd learn from the way the Democrats ran the House Post Office. They can't run that; they can't run a bank. Why in heaven's name do you think they can run the health insurance programs? (Applause.)

You know, this guy -- he's too much. Up until a few weeks ago Governor Clinton pretended that his plan wouldn't cost a dime. But then someone at USA Today -- you know the paper that got him to admit what I've been saying all along -- his plan would require a new payroll tax on the back of, you've got it, small business. Now, I don't know about you, but I think small businessmen and women pay enough in taxes already. We cannot let him do this to the American economy. (Applause.)

You know, he says that health care should be a right, not a privilege. Yes, I think everybody should have health care. But look at his record as Governor -- not the candidate, but Governor Clinton. Arkansas has one of the nation's worst health insurance crises. More than 42 percent of Arkansas workers -- decent, hardworking people -- 42 percent, the second highest percentage in the entire nation don't have employer-paid health insurance at all, and a full 25 percent have no health insurance at all. He talks one way around the nation, he delivers misery at home. We do not need that for the nation. (Applause.)

You know, early last year in his fifth term as Governor, Clinton finally signed a bill to provide bare-bones coverage to people who have gone uninsured for more than a year. And last fall, even his minimal plan had still not been implemented. And even today, not a single insurance company has ever set up a single policy for anyone under Governor Clinton's model program.

So, on this issue, on health care -- and I could be talking about the environment -- whatever -- on this one, look at the grand canyon between the words of candidate Clinton, running around the country criticizing me, and the actions of Governor Clinton, which is a sorry record by any Texas standard. (Applause.)

I wish -- I thought about being -- I love fishing and hunting. I know everybody in East Texas does, too. (Applause.) I flew over some beautiful bass lakes, and I got thinking about Governor Clinton's record on the environment. Some of you may have tried to fish or swim in the Arkansas River. You may have heard that night fishing is catching on over there. The rivers are so polluted that the fish glow in the dark. He has a lousy record on the environment; and we across the line in Texas have a good record on the environment. (Applause.)

You know, on issue after issue he talks a great game but his actions betray his words. And while he makes promises, the workers, the decent, hardworking women and women of Arkansas, their standard of living weakens and their crime rate rises up faster than the rest of the nation. Their children's test scores slip, and Governor Clinton cannot muster the courage to even put in a basic civil rights law like we have right here in Texas. Forty-eight states have them, but not Arkansas. That is not fair, there's not fair play in Arkansas. (Applause.)

So in other words, what I'm asking the American people today on this six-state swing is to take a look at the record that he's laid down and then compare that against the rhetoric that he's trying to take all across the country. And be careful, because it's slippery when wet. (Applause.) You're right.

We've got a lot of challenges and we have a lot of problems, but we've got a great future.

I see that airplane sitting over there and I don't want to start telling you war stories, but that's the kind of torpedo

bomber I flew in World War II. I was shot down in that airplane in World War II and I am proud that I served my nation in combat. (Applause.) And I am proud that since I have been President we have reduced the threat of nuclear war so young men and women go to bed at night without that awesome fear of nuclear war. (Applause.)

We have changed the world; and now I'm asking for your help to bring honor and decency right back here at home and change things to make things better for the people of Texas and the other 49 states. We can do it. We've got a sound record. We are on the right track.

And now I need the help of the American people to guarantee four more years to finish the job. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: I am very proud to be back home. We are going to carry Texas and we are going to win this election because we are right on the issues and because I have been telling the truth all along. (Applause.) Thank you very, very much.

May God bless you all. Thank you so very, very much for this wonderful rally. What a fantastic turnout. And I love the signs, man. Thank you.

END 1:32 P.M. CDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Tulsa, Oklahoma)

For Immediate Release September 22, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT TULSA AIRPORT WELCOME

Tulsa Airport
Tulsa, Oklahoma

11:12 A.M. CDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very much. What a fantastic rally. Thank you. (Applause.) Thank you so very much, and good morning, Oklahoma. I'm delighted to be back. (Applause.) May I first salute J.C., the man that introduced me, my friend. You should be very proud to have a man of his character and experience in office here in the great state of Oklahoma. J.C., thank you very, very much. (Applause.)

Before I share just a few remarks with you on our campaign, as I look at national priorities, one of them simply must be the reelection of your great Senator, Don Nickles. We need him in Washington. (Applause.) And, you know, everyplace I go you hear people saying, "Clean House. Clean House." We've got a good man in Jim Inhofe. Reelect him, and then send Jerry Hill to the United States Congress. (Applause.) We've got to change it.

And I am just delighted to be here. And may I pay a special tribute to these great bands -- the Hornets, the Warriors, the Indians and the Eagles. (Applause.) And it's great to be back in one of the great states for high school football. All four of these schools won their football games last weekend. Good news. (Applause.)

And may I also just say a word to those who work for the great company that puts together that fabulous fighting machine, the F-15, the people at McDonnell Douglas. And thanks for hosting us here, and good luck with the new sale abroad. And I want to say hello, also, to those who work for the great Rockwell Industries -- two giants of American industry, employing men and women who are the best workers in the entire world. (Applause.)

You know, for the past few weeks I've been traveling the length and the breadth of this fantastic country of ours, stumping for the economic ideas that I believe in: An agenda for American renewal. And I want to create new markets for American products and new jobs for American workers. You see, we never retreat, we always compete, and we will always win. We are the United States of America. (Applause.)

And, yes, we've had some tough times in this country. But don't believe the pessimists on the other side who can only win by tearing down America. We're coming out of our difficulties and we are leading the world, and we'll continue to do so as long as I'm you're President. (Applause.)

Big difference in this election. He wants to spend more and tax more; I want to see the federal government spend less and I want to see us taxed less, so private sector can get the job done. (Applause.) And I'm standing in Tulsa, Oklahoma, one of the great oil capitals of the world. And I want to see a change in our tax system that benefits the independent oil people so we can get those

rigs running again. Change the alternative minimum tax, and watch what Tulsa and the rest of Oklahoma can do. (Applause.)

And, frankly, we are trying hard to give small business relief from taxation, from regulation and, yes -- yes, from litigation. We are suing each other too much, and we should care for each other more. And I want to change all the lawsuits up there. (Applause.) And another big objective -- and we're on the right track -- is, we want to change the American schools. I want to give these young people the finest education in the entire world. (Applause.) And I want to give the parents the right to choose the schools, whether it's public, private or religious. (Applause.)

And we've got a good health care program for America, and I want to use competition to cut the cost of health care, make it available to you and your neighbors. And the way I see it -- you should only feel the pain when you're in the doctor's office, not a month later when you get the bill in the mail. And, so, do not go for the Clinton plan that says get the government further involved; go for our plan that says provide insurance to all, and keep the quality of health care we now have. (Applause.)

You know, for about 11 months, Governor Clinton has been attacking me and my record. And I've sat back trying to get things done for this country. Month after month, he's persisted in these unrelenting attacks, many of them quite personal in nature, distorting my record; and his campaign cochairman even called me a racist. And this week, Governor Clinton unveiled the first negative television advertising of the campaign. He fired the first negative campaign shot, and I am not going to take it anymore. I'm going to take his record to the American people as well as my own. (Applause.)

And so let's see how the American people -- how they feel after they understand the facts about his record. In Springfield, Missouri a few minutes ago I talked about the overall record. And today I'm coming by some of the other states that are near Arkansas to move beyond the record and find out what he has actually done in Arkansas -- or, put it this way -- done to the good people of the state of Arkanasas. (Applause.)

First, my argument is not with the people of that great state; they are good, they are decent, they are hard-working and they deserve better treatment than they've received from their Governor. (Applause.) And the other side is eager to debate. We'll probably have a debate. But for openers, let them debate each other. Let one side, as candidate Clinton, a promising young man who seems to be willing to promise anything to get elected; and on the other as Governor Clinton, whose record in Arkansas is a series of broken promises.

Now, let me look at just one issue today, because I think of the people of Oklahoma as fair. Let's take a look at the civil rights record. Candidate Clinton says -- and I quote -- "Everybody knows that I have the best civil rights record." Well, that is a very modest statement by the Governor, saying he has the best civil rights record. But let's see if his rhetoric is matched by his record.

Some of you may know in 1968 when I was a member of Congress from Texas that I voted for a fair housing act. And it was not a popular vote with my constituents. But times have changed now, and nowadays 41 states have laws banning housing discrimination -- 41 states, including the great state of Oklahoma. Arkansas is not one of them, and that man's been Governor for 10 or 12 years. He's talked a lot and done nothing. (Applause.)

Forty-eight states, the young people here might be interested, have basic civil rights law -- 48 that ban discrimination and guarantee equal opportunity, and Oklahoma is proud to be one of them. But not Arkansas. Arkansas is one of only two states without a civil rights statute. What has the Governor been doing, other than talking about fair play? (Applause.)

And Governor Clinton goes around criticizing my 1990 veto of the Democrat Congress' quota bill. Well, yes, I did veto that bill. And I'll veto any other quota bill that the liberals cook up in Washington, D.C. (Applause.) I am for civil rights, and we've got a good record on that. And I am against quotas, and that is not a contradiction. (Applause.) And I'm proud last year to have signed a very good equal opportunity bill, and it had no quotas in it.

Now, even though his party enjoys overwhelming control of the Arkansas Legislature, he still hasn't brought a civil rights bill to the people of Arkansas. So when you hear Candidate Clinton, his rhetoric about civil rights, remember Governor Clinton's record in Arkansas.

You know, Bill Clinton, talks a very good game. He's got more statistics than there are problems out there. But his actions betray his words. In Arkansas, individual income has slipped; crime is up relative to the nation; children's test scores get weaker; while streams of air get more polluted. If you go swimming in that Arkansas River, keep your mouth closed and hold your nose. They are doing a terrible job on pollution. (Applause.)

And so again, Candidate Clinton talks one way and Governor Clinton has a very, very different record. Governor Clinton proves that it doesn't matter what the candidate says. He simply will not deliver. So whether it's Candidate Clinton or Governor Clinton the message is the same: Bill Clinton is the wrong man to accept your trust to be President of the United States of America. (Applause.) I will let you all make up your mind about service to country when it comes to war and peace. I will take my record with pride to the American people. We have stood tall and freedom has prevailed. (Applause.)

Not far from here, you know, is the birthplace of Will Rogers, the man who said he wasn't a humorist, he just watched the government and reported what happened. Well, I don't know what he'd say about Governor Clinton. Maybe he would say that here's a guy with the gall to promise the moon to America while the sky is falling down in his own backyard. But I really believe we can do better. And I say America deserves better.

And, yes, we have challenges; and, yes, we have problems. But this agenda of mine will confront our challenges. There's going to be over 100 new members of Congress, maybe 150. And the day I am reelected and they are elected, I'll sit down with them and say, now let's improve our schools, let's fight for America's security, let's do something about these lawsuits that are plaguing America, let's do something about health care, let's get on with the business of governing this nation and solving our problems. (Applause.)

And so what I will be offering the voters -- and I ask for your support -- is: experience, ideas that are right for America, and I hope that my character will pass muster with you, the American people.

Thank you very much and may God bless this great state. And thank you for this fantastic welcome to Oklahoma. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: We want Bush! We want Bush!

END 11:26 A.M. CDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Lansing, Michigan)

For Immediate Release October 19, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT, GOVERNOR BILL CLINTON AND MR. ROSS PEROT IN THE THIRD PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE OF 1992

Wharton Center for the Performing Arts
Michigan State University
Lansing, Michigan

7:00 P.M. EDT

MR. LEHRER: Good evening. Welcome to this third and final debate among the three major candidates for President of the United States -- Governor Bill Clinton, the Democratic nominee; President George Bush, the Republican nominee -- (applause) -- and independent candidate, Ross Perot. (Applause.)

I am Jim Lehrer, of the McNeil-Lehrer News Hour on PBS. I will be the moderator for this debate, which is being sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debates. It will be 90 minutes long. It is happening before an audience on the campus of Michigan State University in East Lansing.

The format was conceived by and agreed to by representatives of the Bush and Clinton campaigns. But then it is somewhat different than those used in the earlier debates. I will ask questions for the first half under rules that permit follow-ups. A panel of three other journalists will ask questions in the second half under rules that do not. As always, each candidate will have two minutes -- up to two minutes to make a closing statement. The order of those, as well as that for the formal questioning were all determined by a drawing.

Gentlemen, again welcome and again good evening.

It seems from what some of those voters said at your Richmond debate and from polling and other data that each of you, fairly or not, faces serious voter concerns about the underlying credibility and believability of what each of you says you would do as President in the next four years.

Governor Clinton, in accordance with the draw, those concerns about you are first. You are promising to create jobs, reduce the deficit, reform the health care system, rebuild the infrastructure, guarantee college education for everyone who is qualified, among many other things -- all with financial pain only for the very rich. Some people are having trouble, apparently, believing that is possible. Should they have that concern?

GOVERNOR CLINTON: No. There are many people who believe that the only way we can get this country turned around is to tax the middle class more and punish them more. But the truth is that middle class Americans are basically the only group of Americans who have been taxed more in the 1980s during the last 12 years, even though their income [illegible] wealthiest [illegible].

Middle class people will have their fair share of changing to do and many challenges to face, including the challenge of becoming constantly reeducated. But my plan is a

departure from trickle-down economics, just cutting taxes on the wealthiest Americans and getting out of the way. It's also a departure from tax-and-spend economics because you can't tax and divide an economy that isn't growing.

I propose an American version of what works in other countries. I think we can do it better -- invest and grow. I believe we can increase investment and reduce the deficit at the same time if we not only ask the wealthiest Americans and foreign corporations to pay their fair share. We also provide over $100 billion in tax relief in terms of incentives, new plants, new small businesses, new technologies, new housing, and for middle class families; and we have $140 billion of spending cuts.

Invest and grow. Raise some more money, spend the money on tax incentives to have growth in the private sector, take the money from the defense cuts and reinvest it in new transportation and communications and environmental cleanup systems. This will work.

On this, as on so many other issues, I have a fundamental difference from the present administration. I don't believe trickle-down economics will work. Unemployment is up. Most people are working harder for less money than they were making 10 years ago. I think we can do better if we have the courage to change.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President, a response.

THE PRESIDENT: Do I have one minute? Just the ground rules here.

MR. LEHRER: Well, you have roughly one minute. We can loosen that up a little bit. But go ahead.

THE PRESIDENT: He doesn't like trickle-down government, but, hey, I think he's talking about the Reagan-Bush years where we created 15 million jobs. The rich are paying a bigger percent of the total tax burden. And what I don't like is trickle-down government. And therein -- I think Governor Clinton keeps talking about trickle-down, trickle-down, and he's still talking about spending more and taxing more.

Government -- he says invest government; grow government. Government doesn't create jobs. If they do, they're make-work jobs. It's the private sector that creates jobs. And, yes, we've got too many taxes on the American people and we're spending too much. And that's why I want to get the deficit down by controlling the growth of mandatory spending.

It won't be painless. I think Mr. Perot put his finger on something there. It won't be painless, but we've got to get the job done. But not by raising taxes.

Mr. and Mrs. America, when you hear him say we're going to tax only the rich, watch your wallet, because his figures don't add up, and he's going to sock it right to the middle class taxpayer and lower if he's going to pay for all the spending programs he's proposed. So we have a big difference on this trickle-down theory. I do not want any more trickle-down government. It's gotten too big. I want to do something about that.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. Perot, what do you think of the Governor's approach -- what he just laid out?

MR. PEROT: Well, the basic problem with it is it doesn't balance the budget. If you forecast it out, you still will have a significant deficit under each of their plans, as I understand them. Our challenge is to stop the financial bleeding. If you take a patient into a hospital that's bleeding

arterially, step one is to stop the bleeding. And we are bleeding arterially.

There's only one way out of this. And that is to stop the deterioration of our job base, to have a growing, expanding job base, to give us the tax base. See, balancing the budget is not nearly as difficult as paying off the $4-trillion debt and leaving our children the American Dream intact. We have spent their money; we have got to pay it back. This is going to take fair shared sacrifice.

My plan balances the budget within six years. We didn't do it faster than that because we didn't want to disrupt the economy. We gave it off to a slow start and a fast finish to give the economy time to recover. But we faced it and we did it. And we believe it's fair shared sacrifice.

The one thing I have done is lay it squarely on the table in front of the American people. You've had a number of occasions to see in detail what the plan is and at least you'll understand it. I think that's fundamental in our country that you know what you're getting into.

MR. LEHRER: Governor, the word "pain" -- one of the other leadership things that's put on you is that you don't speak of pain. That you speak of all things -- nobody's going to really have to suffer under your plan. You've heard what Mr. Perot has said. He said -- to do the things that you want to do, you can't do it by just taking the money from the rich. That's what the President says as well. How do you respond to that? The numbers don't add up.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: I disagree with both of them. For one thing -- let me just follow up here. I disagree with Mr. Perot that the answer is to raise -- put a 50-cent gas tax on the middle class and raise more taxes on the middle class and the working poor than on the wealthy. His own analysis says that unemployment will be slightly higher in 1995 under his plan than it is today. And as far as what Mr. Bush says, he is the person who raised taxes on the middle class after saying he wouldn't. And just this year Mr. Bush vetoed a tax increase on the wealthy that gave middle class tax relief. He vetoed middle class tax relief this year.

And furthermore, under this administration, spending has increased more than it has in the last 20 years -- and he asked Congress to spend more money than it actually spent. Now, it's hard to outspend Congress, but he tried to for the last three years.

So my view is the middle class is the -- they've been suffering, Jim. Now, should people pay more for Medicare if they can? Yes. Should they pay more for Social Security if they get more out of it than they've paid in and they're upper income people? Yes. But look what's happened to the middle class. Middle class Americans are working harder for less money than they were making 10 years ago and they're paying higher taxes. The tax burden on them has not gone down; it has gone up.

I don't think the answer is to slow the economy down more, drive unemployment up more, and undermine the health of the private sector. The answer is to invest and grow this economy. That's what works in other countries and that's what will work here.

MR. LEHRER: As a practical matter, Mr. President, do you agree with the Governor when he says that the middle class -- the taxes on the middle class -- do your numbers agree that the taxes on the middle class have gone up during the last --

THE PRESIDENT: Everybody is paying too much taxes. He refers to one tax increase. Let me remind you it was a

Democratic tax increase. And I didn't want to do it and I went along with it. And I said I make a mistake -- if I make a mistake, I admit it. That's quite different than some. But I think that's the American way.

I think everyone is paying too much. But I think this idea that you can go out and -- then he hits me for vetoing a tax bill. Yes, I did. And the American taxpayer ought to be glad they have a President to stand up to a spending Congress.

We remember what it was like when we had a spending President and a spending Congress and interest rates -- who remembers that -- they were 21.5 percent under Jimmy Carter. And inflation was 15. We don't want to go back to that.

And so, yes, everybody's taxed too much, and I want to get the taxes down. But not by signing a tax bill that's going to raise taxes on people.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President, when you said just then that you admit your mistakes, and you looked at Governor Clinton and said -- what mistake is it that you want him to admit to?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the record in Arkansas. I mean, look at it. And that's what we're asking America to have? Now, look, he says Arkansas's a poor state. They are. But in almost every category -- they're lagging. I'll give you an example.

He talks about all the jobs he's created in one or two years. Over the last 10 years since he's been Governor, they're 30 percent behind. They're 30 percent of the national average. On pay for teachers, on all these categories, Arkansas is right near the very bottom.

You haven't heard me mention this before, but we're getting close now and I think it's about time I start putting things in perspective. And I'm going to do that. It's not dirty campaigning because he's been talking about my record for half a year here, 11 months here. And so we've got to do that. I've got to get it in perspective.

What's his mistake? Admit it, that Arkansas is doing very, very badly against any standard -- environment, support for police officers, whatever it is.

MR. LEHRER: Governor, is that true?

GOVERNOR CLINTON: Mr. Bush's Bureau of Labor statistics says that Arkansas ranks first in the country in the growth of new jobs this year -- first.

THE PRESIDENT: This year.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: Fourth in manufacturing jobs. Fourth in the reduction of poverty. Fourth in income increase. Over the last 10 years we've created manufacturing jobs much more rapidly than the national average. Over the last five years our income has grown more rapidly than the national average. We are second in tax burden -- the second lowest tax burden in the country. We have the lowest per capita state and local spending in the country.

We are low spending, low tax burden. We've dramatically increased and our jobs are growing. I wish America had that kind of record, and I think most people looking at us tonight would like it if we had more jobs and a lower spending burden on the government.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. Perot, if you were sitting at home now and just heard this exchange about Arkansas, who would you believe?

MR. PEROT: I grew up five blocks from Arkansas. (Laughter.) Let's put it in perspective. It's a beautiful state. It's a fairly rural state. It has a population less than Chicago or Los Angeles, about the size of Dallas and Fort Worth combined. So I think probably we're making a mistake night after night after night to cast the nation's future on a unit that small.

MR. LEHRER: Why is that a mistake?

MR. PEROT: It's irrelevant. (Laughter and applause.)

MR. LEHRER: What he did as Governor of Arkansas --

MR. PEROT: No, no, no. But you can't -- I could say that I ran a small grocery store on the corner; therefore, I extrapolate that into the fact that I could run Wal-Mart. That's not true. (Applause.) I can't protect an Arkansas --

MR. LEHRER: Governor?

GOVERNOR CLINTON: Mr. Perot, with all respect, I think it is highly relevant, and I think that a $4-billion budget in state and federal funds is not all that small. And I think the fact that I took a state that was one of the poorest states in the country and had been for 153 years, and tried my best to modernize its economy and to make the kind of changes that have generated support from people like the presidents of Apple Computer and Hewlett Packard and some of the biggest companies in this country, 24 retired generals and admirals and hundreds of business executives are highly relevant.

And, you know, I'm, frankly, amazed that since you grew up five blocks from there you would think that what goes on in that state is irrelevant. I think it's been pretty impressive.

MR. PEROT: It's not --

GOVERNOR CLINTON: And the people who have jobs -- (applause) -- the people who have jobs and educations and opportunities that didn't have them 10 years ago don't think it's irrelevant at all. They think it's highly relevant, and wish the rest of the country --

THE PRESIDENT: I don't have a dog in this fight, but I'd like to get in on it.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: You think it's relevant. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: Governor Clinton has to operate under a balanced budget amendment. He has to do it. That is the law. I'd like to see a balanced budget amendment for America, to protect the American taxpayers. And then that would discipline not only the Executive Branch, but the spending Congress, the Congress that's been in control of one party -- his party -- for 38 years. And we almost had it done. And that institution, the House of Representatives -- everyone's yelling "Clean House" -- one of the reasons is we almost had it done. And the Speaker -- very able, decent fellow, I might add -- but he twisted the arms of some of the sponsors of that legislation and had them change their vote.

What's relevant here is that tool, that discipline that he has to live by in Arkansas -- and I'd like it for the American people. I want the line-item veto. I want a check-off so of the Congress can't do it, let people check off their income tax, 10 percent of it, to compel the government to cut spending.

And if they can't do it, if the Congress can't do it, let them then have to do it across the board -- that's what we call a sequester. That's the discipline we need. And I'm working for that, to protect the American taxpayer against the big spenders.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President, let's move to some of the leadership concerns that have been voiced about you. And they relate to something you said in your closing statement in Richmond the other night about the President being the manager of crises. And that relates to an earlier criticism that you began to focus on the economy, on health care, on racial divisions in this country only after they became crises. Is that a fair criticism?

PRESIDENT BUSH: Jim, I don't think that's a fair shot. I hear it. I hear it echoed by political opponents, but I don't think it's fair. I think we've been fighting for day one to do something about the inner cities. I'm for enterprise zones. I have had it in every single proposal I've sent to the Congress. And now we hear a lot of talk -- oh, well, we all want enterprise zones. And yet the House and the Senate can't send it down without loading it up with a lot of these Christmas tree ornaments they put on the legislation. I don't think in racial harmony that I'm a laggard on that. I've been speaking out since day one.

We've gotten the Americans For Disabilities Act, which I think is one of the foremost pieces of civil rights legislation. And, yes, it took me to veto two civil rights quota bills, because I don't believe in quotas, and I don't think the American people believe in quotas. And I deep-backed the Congress on that, and then we passed a decent civil rights bill that offers guarantees against discrimination in employment. And that is good.

I've spoken out over and over again against anti-Semitism and racism, and I think my record as a member of Congress speaks for itself on that.

What was the other part of it?

MR. LEHRER: Well, it's just that -- you've spoken to it. I mean, but the idea -- not so much in specifics --

PRESIDENT BUSH: Yes.

MR. LEHRER: -- but that it has to be a crisis before you -- it gets your attention.

PRESIDENT BUSH: I don't think that's true at all. I don't think that's true. But, you know, let others fire away on it.

MR. LEHRER: Do you think that's true, Mr. Perot?

MR. PEROT: I'd like to just talk about issues, and so --

MR. LEHRER: You don't think this is an issue?

MR. PEROT: Well, no. But the point is that's a subjective thing. The subjective thing is when does President Bush react. And I feel it would be very difficult for me to answer that in any short period of time.

MR. LEHRER: Well, then, let's phrase -- I'll phrase it differently then. He said the other night in his closing words in Richmond that one of the key things that he believes the American people should decide between -- among the three of you, is who they want in charge if this country gets to a crisis. Now, that's what he said. And the rap on the President is that it's only crises time that he focuses on some of these things.

So my question to you -- we're going to talk about you in a minute.

MR. PEROT: I thought you'd forgotten I was here. (Laughter.)

MR. LEHRER: No, no, no. No, no. But my question to you is -- so -- if you have nothing to say about it, fine. I'll go to Governor Clinton. But --

MR. PEROT: I will let the American people decide that. I would rather not critique the two candidates.

MR. LEHRER: All right.

Governor, what do you think?

GOVERNOR CLINTON: The only thing I would say about that is I think that on the economy, Mr. Bush said for a long time there was no recession and then said it would be better to do nothing than to have a compromise effort with the Congress. He really didn't have a new economic program until over 1,300 days into his presidency and not all of his health care initiative has been presented to the Congress even now.

I think it's important to elect a President who is committed to getting this economy going again and who realizes we have to abandon trickle-down economics and put the American people first again, and who will send programs to the Congress in the first 100 days to deal with the critical issues that America's crying out for leadership on -- jobs, incomes, the health care crisis, the need to control the economy. Those things deserve to be dealt with from day one. I will deal with them from day one. They will be my first priority, not my election year concerns.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President.

PRESIDENT BUSH: Well, I think you're overlooking that we have had major accomplishments in the first term. But if you're talking about protecting the taxpayer against his friends in the United States Congress, go back to what it was like when you had a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress. You don't have to go back to Herbert Hoover. Go back to Jimmy Carter. And interest rates were 21 percent, inflation was 15 percent, the Misery Index -- unemployment, inflation added together -- it was invented by the Democrats -- went right through the roof. We've cut it in half. And all you hear about is how bad things are.

You know -- you remember the question, "Are you better off?" Well, is a homebuyer better off who can refinance the home because interest rates are down? Is a senior citizen better off because inflation is not wiping out their family savings? I think they are. Is the guy out of work better off? Of course, he's not. But he's not going to be better off if we grow the government -- if we invest, as Governor Clinton says, invest in more government.

You've got to free up the private sector. You've got to let small business have more incentives. For three months -- three quarters, I've been fighting -- three quarters been fighting to get the Congress to pass some incentives for small business -- capital gains, investment tax allowance, credit for first-time homebuyers. And it's blocked by the Congress. And then if a little of it comes my way, they load it up with Christmas trees and tax increases. And I have to stand up in favor of the taxpayer.

MR. LEHRER: I have to let -- we have to talk about Ross Perot now or he'll get me, I'm sure.

Mr. Perot, on this issue that I have raised at the very beginning and we've been talking about, which is leadership as President of the United States, the concerns -- my reading of it, at least -- my concerns about you, as expressed by folks in the polls and other places, it goes like this: You've got a problem with General Motors. You took your $750 million and you left. You had a problem in the spring and summer about some personal hits that you took as a potential candidate for President of the United States, and you walked out. Does that say anything relevant to how you would function as President of the United States?

MR. PEROT: I think the General Motors thing is very relevant. I did everything I could to get General Motors to face its problems in the mid-'80s while it was still financially strong. They just wouldn't do it. And everybody now knows the terrible price they're paying by waiting until it's obvious to the brain dead that they have problems. (Laughter.)

Now, hundreds -- thousands of good, decent people, whole cities up here in this state are adversely impacted because they would not move in a timely way. Our government is at that point now. The thing that I am in this race for is to tap the American people on the shoulder and to say to every single one of you: Fix it while we're still relatively strong. If you have a heart problem, you don't wait until the heart attack to address it.

So the General Motors experience is relevant. At the point when I could not get them to address those problems, I had created so much stress in the board, who wanted just to keep the Lawrence Welk music going, that they asked to buy my remaining shares. I sold them my remaining shares. They went their way, I went my way. Because it was obvious we had a complete disagreement about what should be done with the company.

But let's take my life in perspective. Again and again on complex, difficult tasks, I have stayed the course. When I was asked by our government to do the POW project, within a year the Vietnamese had sent people into Canada to make arrangements to have me and my family killed. And I had five small children. And my family and I decided we would stay the course, and we lived with that problem for three years.

Then I got into the Texans' war on drug program, and the big-time drug dealers got all upset. Then when I had two people imprisoned in Iran, I could have left them there, I could have rationalized it. We went over, we got them out and we brought them back home. And since then, for years, I have lived with the burden of the Middle East where it's eye for an eye and tooth for a tooth country in terms of their unhappiness with the fact that I was successful in that effort.

Again and again and again, in the middle of the night at 2:00 a.m. or 3:00 a.m. in the morning, my government has called me to take extraordinary steps for Americans in distress. And again and again and again, I have responded. And I didn't wilt and I didn't quit.

Now, what happened in July we've covered again and again and again. But I think in terms of the American people's concern about my commitment -- and I'm here tonight, folks. I've never quit supporting you as you put me on the ballot in the other 26 states. And when you asked me to come back in, I came back in. And talk about not quitting -- I'm spending my money on this campaign. The two parties are spending your money -- taxpayer money. I've put my wallet on the table for you and your children -- over $60 million at least will go into this campaign to leave the American Dream to you and your children to get this country straightened out. Because if anybody owes it to you, I do. I've lived the American Dream; I'd like for your children to be able to live it, too. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: Governor, do you have a response to the staying the course question about Mr. Perot?

GOVERNOR CLINTON: I don't have any criticism of Mr. Perot. I think what I'd like to talk about a minute is, since you asked him the question was the General Motors issue. I don't think there's any question that the automobile executives made some errors in the 1980s, but I also think we should look at how much productivity has increased lately -- how much labor has done to increase productivity and how much management has done. We're still losing a lot of auto jobs, in my judgment because we don't have a national economic strategy that would build the industrial base of this country.

Just today, I met with the presidents and the vice presidents of the Willow Run Union near here. They both said they were Vietnam veterans supporting me because I had an economic program that put them back to work. We need an investment incentive to modernize plant and equipment. We've got to control the health care costs for those people; otherwise we can't keep the manufacturing jobs here. And we need a tough trade policy that is fair, that insists on open markets in return for open markets. We ought to have a strategy that will build the economic and industrial base.

So I think Mr. Perot was right in questioning the management practices. But they didn't have much of a partner in government here as compared with the policies the Germans and the Japanese followed. And I believe we can do better. That's one of the thing I want to change. I know that we can grow manufacturing jobs. We did it in my state and we can do it nationally.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President, do you have a response?

THE PRESIDENT: To this?

MR. LEHRER: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I wondered when Governor Clinton was talking to the autoworkers whether he talked about his and Senator Gore's favoring CAFE standards -- those are fuel efficiency standards -- of 40 miles per gallon. That would break the auto industry and throw a lot of people out of work.

As regarding Mr. Perot, I take back something I said about him. I once said in a frivolous moment when he got out of the race, if you can't stand the heat, buy an air conditioning company. And I take it back because I think he said he made a mistake. And the thing I find is if I make a mistake I admit it. I've never heard Governor Clinton make a mistake.

But one mistake he's made is fuel efficiency standards at 40 to 45 miles per gallon will throw many autoworkers out of work. And you can't have it both ways. There's a pattern here of appealing to the autoworkers and then trying to appeal to the spotted owl crowd or the extremes in the environmental movement. You can't do it as President. You can't have a pattern of one side of the issue one day and another the next.

So my argument is not with Ross Perot; it is more with Governor Clinton.

MR. LEHRER: Governor, what about that charge -- having it both ways on this issue?

GOVERNOR CLINTON: Let's just talk about the CAFE standards.

MR. LEHRER: All right.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: That's the fuel efficiency standards. They're now 27.5 miles per gallon per automobile fleet. I never said -- and I defy you to find where I said -- I gave an extensive environment speech in April. And I said that we ought to have a goal of raising the fuel efficiency standards to 40 miles a gallon. I think that should be a goal. I never said we should write it into law if there is evidence that that goal cannot be achieved. The National Science Foundation did a study which said it would be difficult for us to reach fuel efficiency standards in excess of 37 miles per gallon by the year 2000. I think we should try to raise the fuel efficiency.

And let me say this: I think we ought to have incentives to do it. I think we ought to push to do it. That doesn't mean we have to write it into the law.

Look, I am a job creator, not a job destroyer. It is the Bush administration that has had no new jobs in the private sector in the last four years. In my state we're leading the country in private sector job growth. But it is good for America to improve fuel efficiency.

We also ought to convert more fuel -- vehicles to compress natural gas. That's another way to improve the environment.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. Perot, based on your experience at General Motors, where do you come down on this? This has been thrown about, back and forth during this campaign from the very beginning about jobs and CAFE standards.

MR. PEROT: Well, everybody's nibbling around the edges. Let's go to the center of the bull's eye to the core problem. And, believe me, everybody on the factory floor all over this country knows it. You implement that NAFTA -- the Mexican trade agreement -- where they pay people $1 an hour, have no health care, no retirement, no pollution controls, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, and you're going to hear a job -- sucking sounds of jobs being pulled out of this country right at a time when we need the tax base to pay the debt and pay down the interest on the debt and get our house back in order. We have got to proceed very carefully on that.

See, there's a lot I don't understand. I do understand business. I do understand creating jobs. I do understand how to make things work. And I've got a long history of doing that. Now, if you want to go to the core problem that faces everybody in manufacturing in this country, it's that agreement that's about to be put into practice.

But here -- very simply -- everybody says it will create jobs. Yes, it will create bubble jobs. Now, watch this. Listen very carefully to this: One-time surge while we build factories and ship machine tools and equipment down there. Then year after year for decades they will have jobs. And I finally thought I didn't understand it. I called all the experts and they said, "Oh, it will be disruptive for 12 to 15 years." We haven't got 12 days, folks. We cannot lose those jobs. They were eventually saying Mexican jobs will eventually come to $7.50 an hour and ours will eventually go down to $7.50 an hour. It makes you feel real good to hear that, right?

Let's think it through, here. Let's be careful. I'm for free trade philosophically, but I have studied these trade agreements until the world has gone flat, and we don't have good trade agreements across the world. I hope we'll have a chance to get into that tonight, because I can get right to the center of the bull's eye and tell you why we're losing whole industries in this country. Excuse me.

MR. LEHRER: Just for the record, though, Mr. Perot, I take it then for your answer you do not have a position on whether or not enforcing the CAFE standards will cost jobs in the auto industry.

MR. PEROT: Oh, no. It will cost jobs. But that's not -- let me say this: I'd rather -- if you gave me two bad choices --

MR. LEHRER: Okay.

MR. PEROT: I'd rather have some jobs left here than just see everything head south, see?

MR. LEHRER: So that means no -- (laughter) -- in other words, you agree with President Bush, is that right?

MR. PEROT: No, I'm saying our principal need now is to stabilize the tax base, which is the job base, and create a growing, dynamic base. Now, please, folks, if you don't hear anything else I say, remember where the -- millions of people at work are our tax base. One quick point: If you confiscate the Forbes 400 wealth -- take it off, you cannot balance the budget this year. Kind of gets your head straight about where the taxes year in and year out have got to come from. Millions and millions of people at work.

MR. LEHRER: I wanted -- yes, sir.

PRESIDENT BUSH: Well, I'm caught in the middle of NAFTA. Ross says, with great conviction, he opposes the North American Free Trade Agreement. I am for the North American Free Trade Agreement. My problem with Governor Clinton, once again, is that one time he's going to make up his mind -- he will see some merit in it, but then he sees a lot of things wrong with it. And then the other day he says he's for it. However, then we've got to pass other legislation. When you're President of the United States, you cannot have this pattern of saying "Well, I'm for it, but I'm on the other side of it." And it's true on this and it's true on CAFE.

Look, if Ross were right and we get a free trade agreement with Mexico, why wouldn't they have gone down there now? You have a differential in wages right now. I just have an honest philosophical difference. I think free trade is going to expand our job opportunity. I think it is exports that have saved us when we're in a global slowdown -- a connected, global slowdown -- a recession in some countries. And it's free trade, fair trade that needs to be our hallmark and we need more free trade agreements, not fewer.

MR. LEHRER: Governor, a quick answer on trade, and I want to go on to something else.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: I'd like to respond to that. You know, Mr. Bush was very grateful when I was among the Democrats who said he ought to have the authority to negotiate an agreement with Mexico. Neither I nor anybody else, as far as I know, agreed to give him our proxy to say that whatever he did was fine for the workers of this country and for the interests of this country.

I am the one who is in the middle on this. Mr. Perot says it's a bad deal. Mr. Bush says it's a hunky-dory deal. I say, on balance, it does more good than harm if we could get some protection for the environment so that the Mexicans have to follow their own environmental standards, their own labor law standards; and if we have a genuine commitment to reeducate and retrain the American workers who lose their jobs and reinvest in this economy.

I have a realistic approach to trade. I want more trade. And I know there are some good things in that agreement, but it can sure be made better.

Let me just point out -- just today in The Los Angeles Times, Clyde Prestowitz, who was one of President Reagan's leading trade advisors, and a lifelong conservative Republican, endorsed my candidacy because he knows that I'll have a free and fair trade policy, a hard-headed realistic policy, and not get caught up in rubber-stamping everything the Bush administration did. If I wanted to do that, why would I run for President, Jim? Anybody else can run the middle class down and run the economy in a ditch; I want to change it. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: I think he made my case. On the one hand, it's a good deal, but on the other hand, I'd make it better. You can't do that as President. You can't do it on the war, where he says, well, I was with the minority, but I guess I would have voted with the majority.

This is my point tonight: We're talking about two weeks from now you've got to decide who is going to be President. And there is this pattern that has plagued him in the primaries, and now about trying to have it both ways on all these issues. You can't do that. And if you make a mistake, say you made a mistake and go on about your business, trying to serve the American people.

Right now we heard it. Ross is against it. I am for it. He says on the one hand I'm for it, and on the other hand, I may be against it. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: Governor --

GOVERNOR CLINTON: That's what's wrong with Mr. Bush. His whole deal is, you've got to be for it or against it and you can't make it better. I believe we can be better. I think the American people are sick and tired of either-or solutions, people being pushed in the corner, polarized to extremes. I think they want somebody with common sense who can do what's best for the American people. And I'd be happy to discuss these other issues. But I can't believe he is accusing me of getting on both sides.

He said trickle-down economics was voodoo economics. Now, he's its biggest practitioner. (Laughter and applause.) Let me just say --

THE PRESIDENT: I've always said trickle-down government is bad.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: I could run this string out a long time, but remember this, Jim: Those 209 Americans last Thursday night in Richmond told us they wanted us to stop talking about each other and start talking about Americans and their problems and their promises. And I think we ought to get back to that. I'll be glad to answer any question you have, but this election ought to be about the American people. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: Mr. Perot?

MR. PEROT: Is there an equal time rule here tonight?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. PEROT: Or do you just keep lunging in at will? I thought we were going to have equal time, but maybe I just have to interrupt the other two. Is that the way it works this --

MR. LEHRER: No. Mr. Perot, you're doing fine. Go ahead. Whatever you want to say, say it.

MR. PEROT: Now that we've talked all around the problem about free trade, let's go again to the center of the bull's eye.

MR. LEHRER: Wait a minute. I was going to ask -- I thought you wanted to respond to what we were talking about.

MR. PEROT: I do. I do. I just want to make -- these foreign lobbyists, this whole thing -- our country has sold out to foreign lobbyists. We don't have free trade. Both parties have foreign lobbyists on leave and key roles in their campaigns. And if there's anything more unwise than that, I don't know what it is. Every debate, I bring this up and nobody addresses it.

I would like for them to look you in the eye and tell you why they have people representing foreign countries working on their campaigns. And, you know, you've seen the list, I've seen the list. We won't go into the names. But no wonder they -- if I had those people around me all day every day telling me it was fair and free, I might believe it. But if I look at the facts as a businessman, it's so tilted. The first thing you ought to do is just say, guys, if you like these deals so well, we'll give you the deal you gave us.

Now, Japanese couldn't unload the cars in this country if they had the same restrictions we had, and on, and on, and on, and on. I suggest to you that the core problem -- one country spent $400 million lobbying in 1988 -- our country. And it goes on and on. And you look at a Who's Who in these campaigns around the two candidates. They're foreign lobbyists taking leaves. What do you think they're going to do when the campaign's over? Go back to work at $30,000 a month representing some other country. I don't believe that's in the American people's interest.

I don't have a one of them, and I haven't taken a penny of foreign money, and I never will. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President, how do you respond to that? Mr. Perot has made that charge several times -- the fact that you have people working in your campaign who are paid foreign lobbyists.

THE PRESIDENT: Most people that are lobbying are lobbying the Congress. And I don't think there's anything wrong with an honest person who happens to represent an interest of another country for making his case. That's the American way. And what you're assuming is that that makes the recipient of the lobbying corrupt or the lobbyists themselves corrupt. I don't agree with that.

But if I found somebody that had a conflict of interest that would try to illegally do something as a foreign registered lobby, the laws cover this. I don't know why -- I've never understood quite why Mr. Perot was so upset about it, because one of the guys he used to have working for him, I believe, had foreign accounts. Could be wrong, but I think so.

MR. PEROT: Soon as I found it out, he went out the door, too. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think you've got to look at the integrity and the honor of the people that are being lobbied and those that are lobbyists. The laws protect the American taxpayer in this regard. If the laws are violated, so much -- but to suggest if somebody represents a foreign country on anything that makes him corrupt, I don't -- or against the taxpayer, I don't agree with it.

MR. PEROT: One quick relevant specific. We're getting ready to dismantle the airlines industry in our country, and none of you know it. And I doubt, in all candor, if the President knows it. But this deal that we're doing with BAC and US Air and KLM and Northwest -- now, guess who is on the President's campaign big time? A guy from Northwest. This deal is terribly destructive to the U.S. airline industry. One of the largest industries in the world is the travel and tourist business. We won't be making airplanes in this country 10 years from now if we let deals like this go through.

I can -- if the press has any interest tonight, I'll detail it to you. I won't take 10 minutes tonight; all these things take a few minutes. But that's happening as we sit here today. We hammer-lock the American companies -- American Airlines, Delta -- the last few great we have, because we're trying to do this deal with these two European companies. And never forget, they've got Airbus over there, and it's a government-owned, privately-owned consortium across Europe. They're dying to get the commercial airline business.

Japan is trying to get the commercial airline business. I don't think there are any villains inside government on this issue, but there sure are a lot of people who don't understand business. And maybe you need somebody up there who understands when you're getting your pocket picked. (Applause)

MR. LEHRER: Governor, I'm sorry, but that concludes my time with --

GOVERNOR CLINTON: Boy, I had a great response to that.

MR. LEHRER: All right. Go ahead, quickly. (Laughter.) Just very briefly.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: I think Ross is right, and that we do need some more restrictions on lobbyists. We ought to make them disclose to people they've given money to when they're testifying before congressional committees. We ought to close the lawyers' loophole; they ought to have to disclose when they're really lobbying. And we ought to limit -- we ought to have a much longer period of time, about five years between the time when people can leave Executive Branch offices and then go out and start lobbying for foreign interest. I agree with that.

We've wrecked the airline industry already because there's all these leveraged buyouts and all these terrible things that have happened to the airline industry. We're going to have a hard time rebuilding it. But the real thing we've got to have is a competitive economic strategy. Look what's happening to McDonnell Douglas. Even Boeing is losing market share because we let the Europeans spend $25 billion to $40 billion on Airbus without an appropriate competitive response.

What I want America to do is to trade more, but to compete and win by investing in competitive ways. And we're in real trouble on that. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: I'm going to be in real trouble if I don't bring out -- it's about time --

THE PRESIDENT: I promise it's less than 10 seconds.

MR. LEHRER: Okay.

THE PRESIDENT: I heard Governor Clinton congratulate us on one thing. First time he said something pleasant about this administration. Productivity in this country is up. It is way up. Productivity is up, and that's a good thing. There are many other good ones, but I was glad he acknowledged that.

MR. PEROT: I've volunteered -- now, look, I'm just kind of a, you know, third dog here. I was put on the ballot by the people, not special interest; so I have to stand up for myself. Now, Jim, let me net it out. On the second debate, I offered, since both sides want the enterprise zones but can't get together, I said I'll take a few days off and go to Washington and hold hands with you and we'll get it done. I'll take a few days off, hold hands with you and get this airline thing straightened out, because that's important to this country.

That's kind of pathetic I have to do it, and nobody's called me yet to come up, I might mention -- (laughter) -- but if they do, if they do, it's easy to fix. If you all want the enterprise zones, why don't we pass the dang thing and do it, right?

MR. LEHRER: All right. Now we're going to bring in three other journalists to ask questions. They are Susan Rook of CNN, Gene Gibbons of Reuters, and Helen Thomas of United Press International.

You thought you'd never get in here, didn't you?

THE PRESIDENT: Uh-oh. (Applause)

MR. LEHRER: Okay, we are going to continue on the subject of leadership, and the first question goes to Governor Clinton for a two-minute answer. It will be asked by Helen Thomas.

Helen?

MS. THOMAS: Governor Clinton, your credibility has come into question because of your different responses on the Vietnam draft. If you had it to do over again, would you put on the nation's uniform? And, if elected, could you, in good conscience, send someone to war?

GOVERNOR CLINTON: If I had it to do over again, I might answer the questions a little better. You know, I had been in public life a long time and no one had ever questioned my role, and so I was asked a lot of questions about things that happened a long time ago. I don't think I answered them as well as I could have.

Going back 23 years, I don't know, Helen. I was opposed to the war. I couldn't help that. I felt very strongly about it, and I didn't want to go at the time. It's easy to say in retrospect I would have done something differently.

President Lincoln opposed the war, and there were people who said maybe he shouldn't be President. But I think he made us a pretty good President in wartime. We've got a lot of other Presidents who didn't wear their country's uniform and had to order our young soldiers into battle, including President Wilson and President Roosevelt. So the answer is, I could do that. I wouldn't relish doing it, but I wouldn't shrink from it.

I think that the President has to be prepared to use the power of the nation when our vital interests are threatened, when our treaty commitments are at stake, when we know that something has to be done that is in the national interest. And that is a part of being President.

Could I do it? Yes, I could.

MR. LEHRER: A reminder now, we're back on the St. Louis rules, which means that the Governor had his answer, and then each of you will have one minute to respond.

Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I've expressed my heartfelt difference with Governor Clinton on organizing demonstrations while in a foreign land against your country when young ghetto kids have been drafted and are dying.

My argument with him on -- the question was about the draft -- is that there is this same pattern. In New Hampshire, Senator Kerry said you ought to level, you ought to tell the truth about it. And April 17th, he said he's bring out all the records on the draft. They have not been forthcoming. He got a deferment or he didn't. He got a notice or he didn't. And I think it's this pattern that troubles me more than the draft. A lot of decent, honorable people felt as he did on the draft. But it is this pattern.

And again, you might be able to make amendments all the time, Governor, but you've got to -- as President, you can't be on all these different sides, and you can't have this pattern of saying, well, I did this or I didn't. Then the facts come out and you change it. That's my big difference with him on the draft. It wasn't failing to serve.

MR. LEHRER: Your minute is up, sir.

Mr. Perot, one minute.

MR. PEROT: I've spent my whole adult life very close to the military; feel very strongly about the people who go into battle for our country; appreciate their idealism, their sacrifices; appreciate the sacrifices their families make. That's been displayed again and again in a very tangible way.

I look on this as history. I don't look on it, personally, as relevant. And I consider it really a waste of time tonight when you consider the issues that face our country right now.

MR. LEHRER: All right. The next question goes to President Bush and Gene Gibbons will ask it. (Applause.)

MR. GIBBONS: Mr. President, you keep saying that you made a mistake in agreeing to a tax increase to get the 1990 budget deal with Congress. But if you hadn't gotten that deal you would have either had to get repeal of the Gramm-Rudman deficit control act or cut defense spending drastically at a time when the country was building up for the Gulf War, and decimate domestic discretionary spending, including such things as air traffic control. If you had it to do all over again, sir, which of those alternatives would you choose?

THE PRESIDENT: I wouldn't have taken any of the alternatives. I believe I made a mistake. I did it for the very reasons you say. There was one good thing that came out of that budget agreement and that is we put a cap on discretionary spending.

One-third of the President's budget is at the President's discretion -- or really, the Congress, since they appropriate every dime and tell the President how to spend every dime. We've put a cap on the growth of all that spending. And that's good. And that's helped. But I was wrong because I thought the tax compromise, going along with one Democratic tax increase, would help the economy. I see no evidence that it has done it.

So what would I have done, what should I have done? I should have held out for a better deal that would have protected the taxpayer and not ended up doing what we had to do -- or what I thought at the time would help.

So I made a mistake. And I -- you know, the difference, I think, is that I knew at the time I was going to take a lot of political flack. I knew we'd have somebody out there yelling, "Read my lips." And I did it because I thought it was right. And I made a mistake. That's quite different than taking a position where you know what's best for you. That wasn't best for me, and I knew it in the very beginning. I thought it would be better for the country than it was.

So there we are. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: Mr. Perot, one minute.

MR. PEROT: The 101 in leadership is be accountable for what you do. Let's go back to the tax and budget summit briefly. Nobody ever told the American people that we increase spending $1.83 for every dollar of taxes raised. That's absolutely unconscionable. Both parties carry a huge blame for that on their shoulders.

This was not a way to pay on the deficit. This was a trick on the American people. That's not leadership. Let's go back in terms of accepting responsibilities for your actions. To create Saddam Hussein over a 10-year period and using billions of dollars of U.S. taxpayer money, step up to the plate and say, it was a mistake.

To create Noriega, using taxpayer money, step up to the plate and say it was a mistake. If you can't get your act together to pick him up one day when a Panamanian major has kidnapped him -- a special forces team is 400 yards away and it's a stroll across the park to get him -- and if you can't get your act together, at least pick up the Panamanian major who they then killed -- step up to the plate and admit it was a mistake. That's leadership, folks.

Now, leaders will always make mistakes. We've created -- and I'm not aiming at any one person here. I'm aiming at our government. Nobody takes responsibility for anything. We've got to change that.

MR. LEHRER: I'll take responsibility for saying your time is up.

MR. PEROT: I'm watching the light.

MR. LEHRER: All right.

Governor Clinton, one minute, sir.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: The mistake that was made was making the "read my lips" promise in the first place just to get elected, knowing what the size of the deficit was. (Applause.) Knowing what the size of the deficit was, knowing there was no plan to control health care costs, and knowing that we did not have a strategy to get real economic growth back into this economy. The choices were not good then.

I think at the time the mistake that was made was signing off on the deal late on Saturday night in the middle of the night -- that's just what the President did when he vetoed the Family Leave Act. I think what he should have done is go before the American people on the front end and said "Listen, I made a commitment and it was wrong. I made a mistake because I couldn't have foreseen these circumstances and this is the best deal we can work out at the time."

He said it was in the public interest at the time, and most everybody who was involved in it I guess thought it was. The real mistake was the "read my lips" promise in the first place. You just can't promise something like that just to get

elected if you know there's a good chance that circumstances may overtake you.

MR. LEHRER: All right, Mr. Perot, the question is for you. You have a two minute answer, and it will be asked by Susan Rook.

MS. ROOK: Mr. Perot, you've talked about going to Washington to do what the people who run this country want you to do. But it is the President's duty to lead, and often lead alone. How can you lead if you are forever seeking consensus before you act?

MR. PEROT: Let's talk about two different subjects. In order to lead, you first have to use the White House as a bully pulpit and lead. Then you have to develop consensus, or you can't get anything done. And that's where we are now; we can't get anything done. How do you get anything done? When you've got all of these political action committees, all of these thousands of registered lobbyists -- 40,000 registered lobbyists, 23,000 special interest groups, and the list goes on and on and on, and the average citizen out here just working hard every day. You've got to go to the people. I just love the fact that everybody, particularly in the media, goes bonkers over the town hall. I guess it's because you will lose your right to tell them what to think. (Laughter.) The point is, they'll get to decide what to think. (Applause.)

PRESIDENT BUSH: Hey -- you've got something there.

MR. PEROT: What you've been -- I love the fact that people will listen to a guy with a bad accent and a poor presentation manner talking about flip charts for 30 minutes, because the want the details. See, all the folks up there at the top said people -- "the attention span of the American people is no more than five minutes. They won't watch it." They're thirsty for it.

You want to have a new program in this country -- if you get grassroots America excited about it and if they tap Congress on the shoulder and say "Do it, Charlie," it will happen. And that's a whole lot different from these fellows running up and down the halls whispering in their ears now and promising campaign funds for the next election if they do it.

Now, I think that's going back to where we started. That's having a government from the people. I think that's the essence of leadership, rather than cutting deals in dark rooms in Washington. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: Governor Clinton, one minute.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: Well, I believe in the town hall meetings. They started with my campaign in New Hampshire. And I think Ross Perot has done a good job in having them. And I, as you know, pushed for the debate to include 209 American citizens who were part of it in Richmond a few days ago. I've done a lot of them and I'll continue to do them as President.

But I'd also like to point out that I haven't been part of what we're criticizing in Washington tonight. Of the three of us, I have balanced a government budget 12 times. I have offered and passed campaign finance reform. Offered, pushed for, and passed in public referendum lobbyist restrictions. Done the kinds of things you have to do to get legislators together, not only to establish consensus, but to challenge them to change. And in 12 years as Governor, I guess I've taken on every interest group there was in my state at one time or another to fight for change. It can be done. That's why I've tried to be so specific in this campaign to have a mandate, if elected, so that Congress will know what the American people have voted for. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: President Bush, one minute.

PRESIDENT BUSH: I would like the record to show the panelists that Ross Perot took the first shot at the press. My favorite bumper sticker, though, is "Annoy the Media. Reelect President Bush." (Laughter and applause.) Sorry, Helen. I'm going to pay for this later on.

Look, you have to build a consensus, but in some things -- Ross mentioned Saddam Hussein. Yes, we tried. And, yes, we failed to bring him into the family of nations. He had the fourth largest army. But then when he moved against Kuwait I said, this will not stand. And it's hard to build a consensus. We went to the U.N. We made historic resolutions up there. The whole world was united. Our Congress was dragging its feet. Governor Clinton said "Well, I might have been with the minority. Let sanctions work. But I guess I would have voted with the majority."

A President can't do that. Sometimes he has to act. And in this case, I'm glad we did, because if we'd have let sanctions work and had tried to build a consensus on that, Saddam Hussein today would be in Saudi Arabia controlling the world's oil supply, and he would be there maybe with a nuclear weapon. We busted the fourth largest army and we did it through leadership.

MR. LEHRER: All right, we're going to go onto another subject now, and the subject is priorities. And the first question goes to you, President Bush, and Susan will ask it.

MS. ROOK: President Bush, gentlemen, I acknowledge that all of you have women and ethnic minorities working for you and working with you. But when we look at the circle of the key people closest to you, your inner circle of advisors, we see white men only. Why, and when will that change?

PRESIDENT BUSH: You don't see Margaret Tutwiler sitting in there with me today?

MS. ROOK: The key people, President Bush.

PRESIDENT BUSH: What?

MS. ROOK: The key people, the people beyond the glass ceiling.

PRESIDENT BUSH: I happen to think she's a key person. I think our Cabinet members are key people. I think the woman that works with me, Rose Zamaria is about as tough as a -- (applause) -- up there and makes some discipline and protects the taxpayer. Look at our Cabinet. You talk about somebody strong, look at Carla Hills. Look at Lynn Martin, who's fighting against this glass ceiling and doing a first class job on it. Look at our Surgeon General, Dr. Novello. You can look all around and you'll see first-class, strong women.

Jim Baker's a man. Yes, I plead guilty to that. (Laughter.) But look around -- look who's around with him there. I mean, this is a little defensive on your part, Susan, to be honest with you. We've got a very good record appointing women to high positions and positions of trust. And I'm not defensive at all about it.

What we've got to do is keep working, as the Labor Department is doing a first-class job on, to break down discrimination, to break down the glass ceiling. And I am not apologetic at all about our record with women. We've got -- I think -- you think about women in government. I think about women in business. Why not try to help them with my small business program to build some incentives into the system.

I think we're making progress here. You've got a lot of women running for office. As I said the other night, I hope a lot of them lose because they're liberal Democrats and we don't need more of them in the Senate or more of them in the House. But nevertheless, they're out there. And we've got some very good Republican women running. So we're making dramatic progress.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. Perot, one minute.

MR. PEROT: Well, I've come from the computer business and everybody knows women are more talented than the men. So we have a long history of having a lot of talented women. One of our first officers was a woman -- a chief financial officer. She was a director. And it was so far back, it was considered so odd. And even though we were a tiny, little company at the time, it made all the national magazines.

But in terms of being influenced by women and being a minority, there they are right out there -- my wife and my four beautiful daughters. And I just have one son. So he and I are surrounded by women telling us what to do all the time. (Laughter.)

For the rest of my minute, I want to make a very brief comment here in terms of Saddam Hussein. We told him that we wouldn't get involved with this border dispute, and we've never revealed those papers that were given to Ambassador Glaspie on July 25. I suggest, in the sense of taking responsibility for the actions, we lay those papers on the table. They're not secrets to the nuclear bomb.

Secondly, we got upset when he took the whole thing, but to the ordinary American out there who doesn't know where the oil fields are in Kuwait, they're near the border. We told him he could take the northern part of Kuwait, and when he took the whole thing we went nuts. And if we didn't tell him that, why won't we even let the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Intelligence Committee see the written instructions for Ambassador Glaspie?

PRESIDENT BUSH: I'd like to reply on that. That gets to the national honor. We did not say to Saddam Hussein, Ross, you can take the northern part of Kuwait. That is absolutely absurd. Glaspie has testified --

MR. PEROT: Where are the papers?

PRESIDENT BUSH: -- and Glaspie's papers have been presented to the United States Senate. (Applause.) So please --

MR. PEROT: If you have time, go through NEXIS and LEXIS, pull all the old news articles. Look at what Ambassador Glaspie said all through the fall and what have you, and then look at what she and Kelley and all the others in State said at the end when they were trying to clean it up. And talk to any head of any of those key committees in the Senate. They will not let them see the written instructions given to Ambassador Glaspie. And I suggest that in a free society owned by the people, the American people ought to know what we told Ambassador Glaspie to tell Saddam Hussein. Because we spent a lot of money and risked lives and lost lives in that effort, and did not accomplish most of our objectives. We got Kuwait back to the Emir, but he still got his nuclear, his chemical, his bacteriological, and he's still over there, right? I'd like to see those written instructions. Sorry. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President, when you -- just make sure that everybody knows what's going on here. When you responded directly to Mr. Perot then --

PRESIDENT BUSH: Yes.

MR. LEHRER: -- you violated the rule -- your rules. Now, I'm willing --

PRESIDENT BUSH: I apologize. When I make a mistake I say -- (laughter.)

MR. LEHRER: No, no, no. I just want to make sure that everybody understands. If you all want to change the rules, we can do it.

PRESIDENT BUSH: No, I don't. I apologize for it. But that one got right to the national honor.

MR. LEHRER: All right. Okay.

PRESIDENT BUSH: And I'm sorry.

MR. LEHRER: Okay. But, Governor Clinton, you have a minute.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: Susan, I don't agree that there are no women and minorities in important positions in my campaign. There are many. But I think even more relevant is my record at home. For most of my time as Governor, a woman was my chief of staff, an African American was my chief cabinet officer, an Africa American was my chief economic development officer.

It was interesting today -- there was a story either today or yesterday in The Washington Post about my economic programs and my chief budget officer and my chief economic officer were both African Americans, even though The Post didn't mention that, which I think is a sign of progress. The National Women's Political Caucus gave me an award -- one of their good guy awards -- for my involvement of women in high levels of government. And I've appointed more minorities to positions of high levels in government than all the governors in the history of my state combined before me.

So that's what I'll do as President. I don't think we've got a person to waste. And I think I owe the American people a White House staff, a Cabinet, and appointments that look like America, but that meet high standards of excellence, and that's what I'll do. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: All right. The next question goes to you, Mr. Perot for two minutes. It's a two-minute question, and Helen will ask it.

Helen.

MS. THOMAS: Mr. Perot, what proof do you have that Saddam Hussein was told that he could have -- do you have any actual proof or are you asking for the papers? And also, I really came in with another question. What is this penchant you have to investigate everyone? Are those accusations correct -- investigating your staff, investigating the leaders of the grassroots movement, investigating associates of your family?

MR. PEROT: No, they're not correct. And if you look at my life for the first -- until I got involved in this effort, I was one person. And then after the Republican dirty tricks group got through with me, I'm another person, which I consider an absolutely sick operation. And all of you in the press know exactly what I'm talking about.

They investigated every single one of my children, they investigated my wife, they interviewed all my children's friends from childhood on. They went to extraordinary, sick lengths. And I just found it amusing that they would take two or three cases where I was involved in lawsuits and would engage an

investigator -- the lawyers would engage an investigator, which is common. And the only difference between me and any other businessman that has the major businesses I have is I haven't had that many lawsuits. So that's just another one of those little fruit-loopy things they make up to try to instead of facing issues, to try to redefine a person that's running against them. This goes on night and day.

I will do everything I can -- and I got up there to make dirty tricks a thing of the past -- one of the two groups has raised it to an artform. It's a sick artform. Now, let's go back to Saddam Hussein. We gave Ambassador Glaspie written instructions. That's a fact. We've never let the Congress and these foreign relations -- Senate Intelligence Committee see them. That's a fact.

Ambassador Glaspie did a lot of talking, right after July 25th, and that's a fact and it saw the newspapers. And you pool all of at once and read it -- and I did -- and it's pretty clear what she and Kelly and the other key guys around that thing thought they were doing.

Then, at the end of the war when they had to go testify about it, their stories are a total disconnect from what they said in August, September and October. So I say, this is very simple: Saddam Hussein released a tape, as you know, claiming it was a transcript of their meeting, whereas she said we will not become involved in your border dispute; as a matter of fact, you can take the northern part of the country.

We later said, no, that's not true. I said, well, this is simple. What were her written instructions? We guard those like the secrets to the atomic bomb, literally. Now, I say: Whose country is this? This is ours. Who will get hurt if we lay those papers on the table? The worst thing is, again, it's a mistake. Nobody did any of this with evil intent. I just object to the fact that we cover up and hide things -- whether it's Iran-Contra, Iraqgate, or you name it. It's a steady stream.

MR. LEHRER: Governor Clinton, you have one minute.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: Let's take Mr. Bush for the moment at his word. I mean, he's right, we don't have any evidence, at least, that our government did tell Saddam Hussein he could have that part of Kuwait. And let's give him the credit he deserves for organizing Operation Desert Storm and Desert Shield. It was a remarkable event.

But let's look at where I think the real mistake was made. In 1988, when the war between Iraq and Iran ended, we knew Saddam Hussein was a tyrant. We had dealt with him because he was against Iran. The enemy of my enemy maybe is my friend.

All right, the war is over. We know he's dropping mustard gas on his own people. We know he's threatened to incinerate half of Israel. Several government departments -- several -- had information that he was converting our aid for military purposes and trying to develop weapons of mass destruction. But in late '89, the President signed a secret policy saying we were going to continue to try to improve relations with him, and we sent him some sort of communication on the eve of his invasion of Kuwait that we still wanted better relations.

So I think what was wrong -- I give credit where credit is due, but the responsibility was in coddling Saddam Hussein when there was no reason to do it and when people at high levels in our government knew he was trying to do things that were outrageous.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. President, you have a minute.

THE PRESIDENT: It's awful easy when you're dealing with 90-90 hindsight. We did try to bring Saddam Hussein into the family of nations. He did have the fourth largest army. All our Arab allies out there thought we ought to do just exactly that. And when he crossed the line, I stood up and looked into the camera and I said, this aggression will not stand. And we formed a historic coalition and we brought him down. And we destroyed the fourth largest army, and the battlefield was searched, and there wasn't one single iota of evidence that any U.S. weapons were on that battlefield. And the nuclear capability has been searched by the United Nations, and there hasn't been one single scintilla of evidence that there's any U.S. technology involved in it.

And what you're seeing on all this Iraqgate is a bunch of people who were wrong on the war trying to cover their necks here and try to do a little revisionism. And I cannot let that stand, because it isn't true. Yes, we had grain credits for Iraq, and there isn't any evidence that those grain credits were diverted into weaponry; none. None whatsoever. And so I just have to say it's fine. You can't say there, Governor Clinton, and say, well, I think I'd have been -- I'd have supported the minority -- let sanctions work or wish that it would go away -- but I would have voted with the majority. Come on, that's not leadership.

MR. LEHRER: The next question goes to Governor Clinton, and Gene Gibbons will ask it.

Gene?

MR. GIBBONS: Governor, an important aspect of leadership is, of course, anticipating problems. During the 1988 campaign, there was little or no mention of the savings and loan crisis that has cost the American people billions and billions of dollars. Now there are rumblings that a commercial bank crisis is on the horizon. Is there such a problem, sir? If so, how bad is it and what will it cost to clean it up?

GOVERNOR CLINTON: Gene, there is a problem in the sense that there are some problem banks. And on December 19th, new regulations will go into effect which will, in effect, give the government the responsibility to close some banks that are not technically insolvent, but that are plainly in trouble.

On the other hand, I don't think that we have any reason to believe that the dimensions of this crisis are anywhere near as great as the savings and loan crisis. The mistake that both parties made in Washington with the S & L business was deregulating them without proper capital requirements, proper oversight and regulation, proper training of the executives, many people predicted what happened, and it was a disaster.

The banking system in this country is fundamentally sound with some weak banks. I think that our goal ought to be, first of all, not to politicize it, not to frighten people; secondly, to say that we have to enforce the law in two ways. We don't want to overreact as the federal regulators have, in my judgment, on good banks so that they've created credit crunches that have made our recession worse in the last couple of years, but we do want to act prudently with the banks that are in trouble.

We also want to say that, insofar as is humanly possible, the banking industry itself should pay for the cost of any bank failures, the taxpayers should not. And that will be my policy. And I believe we have a good, balanced approach, we can get the good banks loaning money again in the credit crunch, have proper regulation on the ones that are in trouble, and not overreact. It is a serious problem, but I don't see it as the kind of terrible, terrible problem that the S & L problem was.

MR. LEHRER: President Bush, one minute.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I don't believe it would be appropriate for a president to suggest that the banking system is not sound; it is sound. There are some problem banks out there.

But what we need is financial reform. We need some real financial reform, banking reform legislation. And I have proposed that, and when I am reelected I believe one of the first things ought to be to press a new Congress, not beholden to the old ways, to pass financial reform legislation that modernizes the banking system, doesn't put a lot of inhibitions on it, and protects the depositors through keeping the FDIC sound. But I think that -- I just was watching some of the proceedings of the American Bankers Association, and I think the general feeling is, most of the banks are sound; certainly there's no comparison here between what happened to the S & Ls and where the banks stand right now, in my view.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. Perot, one minute.

MR. PEROT: Well, nobody's gotten into the real issue yet on the savings and loan. Again, nobody's got a business background, I guess. The whole problem came up in 1984. The President of the United States was told officially it was a $20-billion problem.

These crooks -- now, Willie Sutton would have gone to own a savings and loan rather than rob banks, because -- he robbed banks because that's where the money is; owning a savings and loan is where the money was.

Now, in 1984 they were told -- I believe the Vice President was in charge of deregulation -- nobody touched that tar baby until the day after election in 1988, because they were flooding both parties with crooked PAC money. And it was, in many cases, stolen PAC money. Now, you and I never got a ride on a lot of these yachts and fancy things it bought, but you and I are paying for it. And they buried it until right after the election.

Now, if you believe The Washington Post and you believe this extensive study that's been done -- and I'm reading it -- right after election day this year, they're going to hit us with 100 banks -- it'll be a $100-billion problem. Now, if that's true, just tell me now. I'm grown up. I can deal with it. I'll pay my share. But just tell me now. Don't bury it until after the election twice. I say that to both political parties. The people deserve that since we have to pick up the tab. You've got the PAC money, we'll pay the tab. Just tell us.

MR. LEHRER: All right. Mr. Perot, the next question -- we're going into a new round here on a category just called "differences." And the question goes to you, Mr. Perot, and Gene will ask it.

Gene?

MR. GIBBONS: Mr. Perot, aside from the deficit, what government policy or policies do you really want to do something about? What really sticks in your craw about conditions in this country -- beside the deficit -- that you would want to fix as president?

MR. PEROT: The debt and the deficit. Well, if you watched my television show the other night, you saw it. And if you watch it Thursday, Friday, Saturday this week, you'll get more. So, the shameless -- Mr. President -- but in a nutshell, we've got to reform our government or we won't get anything done. We have a government that doesn't work. All these specific examples I'm giving tonight, if you had a business like that,

they'd be leading you away and boarding up the doors. We have a government that doesn't work. It's supposed to come from the people, it comes at the people. The people need to take the government back.

You've got to reform Congress. They've got to be servants of the people again. You've got to reform the White House. We've got to turn this thing around. And it's a long list of specific items. And I've covered it again and again in print and on television. But very specifically, the key thing is to turn the government back to the people and take it away from the special interests, and have people go to Washington to serve.

Who can give themselves a 23 percent pay raise anywhere in the world except Congress? Who would have 1,200 airplanes worth $2 billion a year just to fly around in? I don't have a free, reserved parking place at National Airport. Why should my servants? I don't have an indoor gymnasium and an indoor tennis court, an indoor every other thing they can think of. I don't have a place where I can go make free TV to send to my constituents to try to brainwash them to elect me the next time. And I'm paying for all that for those guys.

I'm going to be running an ad pretty soon that shows -- they promised us they were going to hold the line on spending, a tax and budget -- and I'm going to show how much they've increased this little stuff they do for themselves. And it is Silly Putty, folks, and the American people have had enough of it.

Step one, if I get up there, we're going to clean that up. You say: How can I get Congress to do that? I have millions of people at my -- shoulder-to-shoulder with me, and we will see it done warp speed, because it's wrong. We've turned the country upside-down.

MR. LEHRER: Governor Clinton, you have one minute. (Applause.)

Governor?

GOVERNOR CLINTON: I would just point out on the point that Mr. Perot made, I agree that we need to cut spending in Congress. I've called for a 25 percent reduction in congressional staffs and expenditures. But the White House staff increased its expenditures by considerably more than Congress has in the last four years under the Bush administration, and Congress has actually spent $1 billion less than President Bush asked them to spend. Now, when you outspend Congress, you're really swinging.

That, however, is not my only passion. The real problem in this country is that most people are working hard and falling further behind. My passion is to pass a jobs program to get incomes up with an investment incentive program to grow jobs in the private sector, to waste less public money and invest more. To control health care costs and provide for affordable health care for all Americans, and to make sure we've got the best trained work force in the world. That is my passion.

We've got to get this country growing again, and this economy strong again, or we can't bring down the deficit. Economic growth is the key to the future of this country. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: President Bush, one minute.

THE PRESIDENT: On government reform?

MR. LEHRER: Sir?

THE PRESIDENT: Government reform?

MR. LEHRER: Yes. Well, to respond to the subject that Mr. Perot mentioned.

THE PRESIDENT: How about this for a government reform policy? Reduce the White House staff by a third after, or at the same time the Congress does the same thing for their staff. Term limits for members of the United States Congress. Give the government back to the people. Let's do it that way. The President has term limits. Let's limit some of these guys sitting out here tonight. (Applause) Term limits, and then how about a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution? Forty-three states -- more than that -- states have it, I believe. Let's try that.

And you want to do something about all this extra spending that concerns Mr. Perot and me? Okay, how about a line-item veto? Forty-three governors have that. And give it to the President. And if the Congress isn't big enough to do it, let the President have a shot at this excess spending.

A line-item veto. That means you can take a line and cut out some of the pork out of a meaningful bill. Governor Clinton keeps hitting me on vetoing legislation. Well, that's the only protection the taxpayer has against some of these reckless pork programs up there. And I'd rather be able to just line it right out of there and get on about passing some good stuff, but leave out the garbage. Line-item veto. There's a good reform program for you. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: The next question goes to Governor Clinton. You have two minutes, Governor, and Sue will ask it.

MS. ROOK: Governor Clinton, you said that you will raise taxes on the rich people with incomes of $200,000 a year or higher. A lot of people are saying that you will have to go lower than that -- much lower. Will you make a pledge tonight below which an income level that you will not go below? I am looking for numbers, sir, not just a concept.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: My plan -- you can read my plan. My plan says that we want to raise marginal incomes on family incomes above $200,000 from 31 percent to 36 percent. That we want to ask foreign corporations simply to pay the same percentage of taxes on their income that American corporations pay in America. That we want to use that money to provide over $100 million in tax cuts for investment in new plant and equipment for small business for new technologies and for middle class tax relief.

Now, I can tell you this: I will not raise taxes on the middle class to pay for these programs. If the money does not come in there to pay for these programs, we will cut other government spending or we will slow down the phase-in to the programs. I am not going to raise taxes on the middle class to pay for these programs.

Now, furthermore, I am not going to tell you to read my lips on anything, because I cannot foresee what emergencies might develop in this country. And the President said, never, never, never would he raise taxes. In New Jersey the other day, Marlin Fitzwater, his spokesman, said, now, that's not a promise. So I think even he has learned that you can't say read my lips, because you can't know what emergencies might come up.

But I can tell you this: I'm not going to raise taxes on middle class Americans to pay for the programs I've recommended. Read my plan. And you know how you can trust me about that? Because, you know, in the first debate, Mr. Bush made some news. He had just said Jim Baker was going to be Secretary of State, but in the first debate he said, no, now he's going to be responsible for domestic economic policy.

Well, I'll tell you: I'll make some news in the third debate. The person responsible for domestic economic policy in my administration will be Bill Clinton. I'm going to make those decisions, and I won't raise taxes in the middle class to pay for my program. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: President Bush, you have one minute.

THE PRESIDENT: That's what worries me -- that he's going to be responsible. (Applause.) And he would do for the United States what he did for Arkansas. He would do for the United States what he's done to Arkansas. We do not want to be the lowest of the low. We are not a nation in decline. (Applause.) My problem is, I heard what he said. He said I want to take it from the rich -- raise $150 billion from the rich. To get it, to get $150 billion in new taxes, you've got to go down to the guy that's making $36,600. And if you want to pay for the rest of his plan, all the other spending programs, you're going to sock it to the working man.

So when you hear "tax the rich," Mr. and Mrs. America, watch your wallet. Lock your wallet, because he's coming right after you, just like Jimmy Carter did, and just like you're going to get -- you're going to end up with interest rates at 21 percent, and you're going to have inflation going through the roof. Yes, we're having tough times. But we do not need to go back to the failed policies of the past when you had a Democratic president and a spendthrift Democratic Congress. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: Mr. Perot.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: You permitted Mr. Bush to break the rules, he said to defend the honor of the country. What about the honor of my state? We rank first in the country in job growth. We've got the lowest spending state and local in the country and the second lowest tax burden. And the difference between Arkansas and the United States is that we're going in the right direction, and this country's going in the wrong direction. And I had to defend the honor of my state. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: We've got a wash, according to my calculations. We have a wash. And we'll go to Mr. Perot for one minute. In other words, the violation of the rule. That's why I meant.

MR. PEROT: I'm the only one that's untarnished at this point.

MR. LEHRER: That's right, your clean. (Laughter.)

MR. PEROT: I'm sure I'll do it before it's over. (Laughter.) The key thing here, see -- we all come up with images. Images don't fix anything. You know, I'm starting to understand it. You stay around this long enough, you think about -- if you talk about it in Washington, you think you did it. If you've been on television about it, you think you did it. (Laughter.) What we need is people to stop talking and start doing.

Now, our real problem here is they both have plans that will not work. The Wall Street Journal said your numbers don't add up. And you can take it out on charts, you look at all the studies that different groups have done -- you go out four, five, six years, we're still drifting along with a huge deficit.

So let's come back to harsh reality. Everybody said, gee, Perot, you're tough. I say, well, this is not as tough as World War II; this is not as tough as the Revolution. And it's fair-shared sacrifice to do the right thing for our

country and for our children. And it will be fun if we all work together to do it.

MR. LEHRER: This is the last question, and it goes to President Bush for a two-minute answer. And it will be asked by Helen.

MS. THOMAS: Mr. President, why have you dropped so dramatically in the leadership polls, from the high 80s to the 40s? And you have said you will do anything you have to do to get reelected. What can you do in two weeks to win reelection?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think the answer to why the drop I think has been the economy in the doldrums. Why I'll win is I think I have the best plan of the three of us up here to do something about it. Mine does not grow the government. It does not invest -- have government invest. It says we need to do better in terms of stimulating private business.

We've got a big philosophical difference here tonight between one who thinks the government can do all these things through tax and spend, and one who thinks it ought to go the other way.

And so I believe the answer is I'm going to win it because I'm getting into focus my Agenda for America's Renewal, and also I think that Governor Clinton's had pretty much of a free ride on looking specifically at the Arkansas record. He keeps criticizing us, criticizing me -- I'm the incumbent. Fine. But he's an incumbent. And we've got to look at all the facts. They're almost at the bottom on every single category. We can't do that to the American people.

And then, Helen, I really believe where people are going to ask this question about trust. Because I do think there's a pattern by Governor Clinton of saying one thing to please one group and then trying to please another group. And I think that pattern is a dangerous thing to suggest would work for the Oval Office. It doesn't work that way when you're President. Truman is right -- the buck stops there. And you have to make decisions, even it's against your own interest.

And I've done that. It's against my political interests to say, go ahead and go along with the tax increase. But I did what I thought was right at the time. So I think people are going to be looking for trust and experience.

And then I mentioned it the other night -- I think if there's a crisis, people are going to say, well, George Bush has taken us through some tough crises and we trust him to do that. And so I'll make the appeal on a wide array of issues. Also I've got a philosophical difference -- I've got to watch the clock here -- I don't think we're a declining nation.

The whole world has had economic problems. We're doing better than a lot of the countries in the world. And we're going t lead the way out of this economic recession across this world and economic slowdown here at home.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. Perot, do you have one minute.

THE PRESIDENT: That's why I think I'll win.

MR. LEHRER: Mr. Perot, you have -- sorry. Excuse me, sir. Mr. Perot, you have one minute.

MR. PEROT: I'm the last one, right?

MR. LEHRER: No. Governor Clinton has a minute after you. Then we have the closing statements.

MR. PEROT: One minute after you?

MR. LEHRER: Right.

MR. PEROT: I'm totally focused on the fact that we may have bank traders and nobody answered it. I'm totally focused on that fact that we are still evading the issue of the Glaspie papers. I'm totally focused on the fact that we still could have enterprise zones, according to both parties, but we don't. So I'm still focused on gridlock, I guess.

And I'm also focused on the fact that isn't it a paradox that we have the highest productivity in our work force in the industrialized world and at the same time have the largest trade deficit, and at the same time rank behind nine other nations in what we pay our most productive people in the world. And we're losing whole industries overseas. Now, can't somebody agree with me that the government is breaking business' legs with these trade agreements? They're breaking business' legs in a number of different ways. We have an adversarial relationship that's destroying jobs and sending them overseas while we have the finest workers in the world.

Keep in mind the factory worker has nothing to do with anything except putting it together on the factory floor. It's our obligation to make sure that we give him the finest products in the world to put together and we don't break his legs in the process.

MR. LEHRER: Governor Clinton, one minute.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: I really can't believe Mr. Bush is still trying to make trust an issue after "read my lips" and "15 billion new jobs" and embracing what he called "voodoo economics" and embracing an export enhancing program for farmers he threatened to veto and going all around the country giving out money and programs that he once opposed. But the main thing is he still didn't get it, from what he said the other night to that fine woman on our program -- the 209 people in Richmond. They don't want us talking about each other; they want us to talk about the problems of this country.

I don't think he'll be reelected because trickle-down economics is a failure and he's offering more of it. And what he's saying about my program is just not true. Look at the Republicans that have endorsed me. High-tech executives in Northern California. Look at the 24 generals and admirals, retired, have endorsed me, including the Deputy Commander of Desert Storm. Look at Sarah Brady, Jim Brady's wife - President Reagan's press secretary -- who endorsed me because he knuckled under to the NRA and wouldn't fight for the Brady Bill. We've got a broad based coalition that goes beyond party, because I am going to change this country and make it better with the help of the American people. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: All right. That was the final question and answer, and we now go to the closing statements. Each candidate will have up to two minutes. The order was determined by a drawing. Governor Clinton, you are first.

Governor.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: First I'd like to thank the commission and my opponents for participating in these debates and making them possible.

I think the real winners of the debates were the American people. I was especially moved in Richmond a few days ago when 209 of our fellow citizens got to ask us questions. They went a long way toward reclaiming this election for the American people and taking their country back.

I want to say, since this is the last time I'll be on a platform with my opponents, that even though I disagree with Mr. Perot on how fast we can reduce the deficit and how much we can increase taxes on the middle class, I really respect what he's done in this campaign to bring the issue of deficit reduction to our attention. I'd like to say to Mr. Bush, even though I've got profound differences with him, I do honor his service to our country. I appreciate his efforts, and I wish him well. I just believe it's time to change.

I offer a new approach. It's not trickle-down economics. It's been tried for 12 years and it's failed. More people are working harder for less, 100,000 people a month losing their health insurance, unemployment going up, our economy slowing down. We can do better.

And it's not tax and spend economics. It's invest and grow, put our people first, control health care costs and provide basic health care to all Americans, have an education system second to none, and revitalize the private economy. That is my commitment to you. It is a kind of change that can open up a whole new world of opportunities to America as we enter the last decade of this century and move toward the 21st century. I want a country where people who work hard and play by the rules are rewarded, not punished. I want a country where people are coming together across the lines of race and region and income. I know we can do better.

It won't take miracles and it won't happen overnight. But we can do much, much better if we have the courage to change. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: President Bush, your closing statement, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Three weeks from now -- two weeks from tomorrow, America goes to the polls and you're going to have to decide who you want to lead this country to economic recovery. On jobs, that's the number one priority, and I believe my program for stimulating investment, encouraging small business, brand-new approach to education, strengthening the American family, and, yes, creating more exports is the way to go. I don't believe in trickle-down government. I don't believe in larger taxes and larger government spending.

On foreign affairs, some think it's irrelevant. I believe it's not. We're living in an interconnected world. The whole world is having economic difficulties. The U.S. is doing better than a lot. But we've got to do even better. And if a crisis comes up, I ask who has the judgment and the experience and, yes, the character to make the right decision?

And lastly, the other night on character, Governor Clinton said, "It's not the character of the President, but the character of the presidency." I couldn't disagree more. Horace Greeley said "The only thing that endures is character." And I think it was Justice Black who talked about "Great nations like great men, must keep their word." And so the question is, who will safeguard this nation, who will safeguard our people and our children?

I need your support. I ask for your vote. And may God bless the United States of America. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: Mr. Perot, your closing statement, sir.

MR. PEROT: To the millions of fine, decent people who did the unthinkable and took their country back in their own hands and put me on the ballot, let me pledge to you that tonight is just the beginning. These next two weeks we will be going full steam ahead to make sure that you get a voice and that you get your country back.

This Thursday night on ABC from 8:30 to 9:00 -- Friday night on NBC from 8:00 to 8:30 -- and Saturday night on CBS from 8:00 to 8:30 -- we'll be down in the trenches, under the hood, working on fixing the old car to get it back on the road. (Laughter.)

Now, the question is: Can we win? Absolutely we can win, because it's your country. The question really is who do you want in the White House? It's that simple. Now, you've got to stop letting these people tell you who to vote for. You've got to stop letting these folks in the press tell you you're throwing your vote away. You've got to start using your own head. (Applause.)

Then the question is: Can we govern? I love that one. The "we" is you and me. You bet your hat we can govern, because we will be in there together and we will figure out what to do. And you won't tolerate gridlock. You won't tolerate endless meandering and wandering around. And you won't tolerate nonperformance. And believe me, anybody who knows me understands I have a very low tolerance for nonperformance also. Together we can get anything done.

The President mentioned that you need the right person in a crisis. Well, folks, we've got one. And that crisis is a financial crisis. Pretty simply, who's the best qualified person up here on the stage to create jobs? Make your decision and vote on November 3rd. I suggest you might consider somebody who's created jobs.

Second, who's the best person to manage money? I suggest you pick a person who's successfully managed money. Who's the best person to get results and not talk? Look at the record; make your decision.

And finally, who would you give your pension fund and your savings account to to manage? And the last one, who would you ask to be the trustee of your estate and take care of your children if something happened to you?

Finally, to you students up there -- God bless you -- I'm doing this for you. I want you to have the American Dream. (Applause.) And to the American people -- to the American people, I'm doing this because I love you. That's it. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

MR. LEHRER: Thank you, Mr. Perot. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Governor Clinton -- for being with us tonight and the previous debates. Thank you to the panel.

The only thing that is left to be said is, from Michigan State University in East Lansing, I'm Jim Lehrer. Thank you, and good night. (Applause.)

END 8:37 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Ridgewood, New Jersey)

For Immediate Release October 22, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT TRENTON/ROBBINSVILLE WELCOME

Robbinsville Airport
Robbinsville, New Jersey

2:07 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very, very much. Thank you, guys.

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, New Jersey. Thank you, Chris. You know, everyplace I go, you see these signs that say "Clean House." If we had more congressmen like Chris Smith, we wouldn't be saying "Clean House." (Applause.)

And I want to salute not only Chris, but Governor Tom Kean. What a great job he did for this wonderful state. (Applause.) I want to thank the Mayor, Rosemary Pramuck, and everybody else who's done a superb job on this rally. (Applause.)

And may I say that I am proud to share this stage with Joe Cicippio back here, a true American hero. (Applause.) Great courage. You talk about courage and stick with -- my heavens, that man has shown us all an awful lot. And we learn from that kind of courage in this country. And I want to thank him for his perseverance. And I am proud that our policy of not negotiating has freed all the American hostages. (Applause.)

Well, I can hardly believe it, but 12 days from today, the fate of this country and, indeed, of the free world is in your hands. And I ask for your support for four more years to lead this nation. (Applause.)

It's going to spell out --

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: -- the question that Americans will answer and that the whole world will be watching for the answer to, is whose idea do you trust to lead America out of this global recession, to create new jobs and to keep trust and character in the White House? (Applause.)

For 11 months, Governor Clinton and the other liberal Democrats have been running around distorting our record. So I want to just spend a little time -- not ruin this beautiful day in New Jersey -- but a little time to remind America of Governor Clinton's own record in Arkansas. Here we go!

They are -- I think of this state and all we've done to work with the New Jersey officials to help clean up the beaches -- in Arkansas, his record is the 50th in quality of environmental initiative; 50th in percentage of adults with college degrees; 50th in per capita spending on criminal justice; 49th -- they're moving up -- in per capita spending on police protection; of their students that graduate from high school, 75

percent of those that go on to college need remedial education; 48th in the percentage of adults with high school diplomas; 48th in spending on corrections; 46th in teachers salaries; 45th in the overall well-being of children.

And the other night in that debate, he says, "I want to do for America what I've done for Arkansas." No way.

AUDIENCE: Booo --

THE PRESIDENT: No way. It makes you think of the guy that's failed -- he's 0 and 10 in the Little League and he wants to manage the Braves. You can't do that. (Laughter.)

He calls this change. He calls himself the candidate of change. Now, let's look a close look at what he offers. Chris mentioned it -- $150 billion -- this is for openers -- $150 billion in new taxes; $220 billion in new spending. That is called "trickle-down government." It goes right from the top into your pocket. And we don't need that anymore. (Applause.)

He says he's going to take it from the rich. And I think everybody's heard that one before. He's not going to take it from the rich -- if you drive a cab, teach school, trying to make ends meet in the household, watch your wallet, gang; he's coming after you. And we're not going to let it happen on November 3rd. (Applause.)

He says he can work with Congress. I remember the last time we elected a southern governor to go up there and work with this spendthrift Congress. Thank God we've got guys like Chris.

Let me remind you of what it was like, though, because that's what he wants to do -- program sounds identical. When Jimmy Carter left office -- same kind of situation -- inflation wiping out every senior citizen, every family, every saver with 15 percent. And interest rates -- remember? -- 21.5 percent. We do not need that kind of change. (Applause.)

Family budgets were wiped out, hopelessness and despair, the world standing -- not even believe in the credibility of the President of the United States. And that was changed. And if you listen to that kind of change, change is all you'll have left in your pocket. We don't need that. (Applause.)

You heard my program the other night. We're going to get that government spending down and get the tax rates under control and let the private sector provide the growth. Let small business move out and employ more people in this state. (Applause.)

I'm not the kind of guy that likes to attack the media. I like to needle them once in a while, though. You remember the bumper sticker -- who's got one of those bumper stickers? I'd like to show it to you. It's my favorite -- there it is! My favorite bumper sticker: "Annoy the Media -- Reelect President Bush. (Applause.) It's great. (Applause.) It's fantastic. (Applause.) I sure hope they've got a good sense of humor back there. (Laughter.)

But, really, let me tell you this -- we'll see how they play it tonight on the news. In early October -- this was just announced today -- the number of Americans filing new claims for jobless benefits fell to a two-year low. Now, this is a good sign. We've still got big problems, but that's a good sign. We've had three months in a row with unemployment going down. But I don't hear too much noise about it out of here. (Applause.)

I'm not saying we don't have problems, we've got plenty of them. But we're not going to improve them by raising taxes and raising government spending, I'll guarantee you that. (Applause.)

Here's what I want to do. I want to see us expand our markets abroad. You know, we've been in a global recession. The United States -- you can't tell this from Clinton and Gore, the ozone man -- (laughter) -- but I'm telling you, the United States is leading all these world economies. It's not just "my failure" if you listen to the Democrats. We're caught up in something global. And the way we'll get out of it is to increase our exports. New Jersey sells an awful lot of product abroad -- sells a lot. Open these markets is what I say. Get those New Jersey products going into worldwide markets, and you watch us lead out of this recession. (Applause.)

I'd like to pin down Governor Clinton on this one because he's got all kinds of mandates he wants to stick on small business. But one of them was his health care plan that would sock it to the small business. And instead of that, I believe that small business employs two-thirds of the people in this country. And they need relief from taxation and regulation and litigation. (Applause.)

And I said yes, litigation. We need legal reform. We spend up to $200 billion a year on lawyers. I don't have anything against lawyers. I do have something against these crazy malpractice lawsuits -- these lawsuits that keep a neighbor from helping a neighbor for afraid of getting sued. (Applause.) That keep a Little League coach from -- afraid of coaching because some crackpot dad is going to sue him with a big trial lawyer at his side. We got to sue each other less and care for each other more. (Applause.)

And, yes, we need to do something about health care. But what we don't need -- to get the government to try to run it. Congress couldn't even run a two-bit bank, and screwed up a two-bit post office. Now they want to run the health care. (Applause.)

My plan provides insurance to the poorest of the poor; says to the middle class, we're going to give you tax breaks; says that your health insurance will be portability -- leave one job, it goes with you; pools insurance so the rates come down; goes after malpractice; and it does not turn to the government for rationing. Anytime government rations, the price goes up. Let's get it down by pooling insurance. (Applause.)

Tom Kean was and is one of the great education leaders in this country. And he and I both know -- he and I both know that our America 2000 program to literally revolutionize education is the way to go. And what we are doing is trying to give parents a choice. Say to a parent, you should be able to choose, and we'll help you. Whether your kid goes to public school, private school or a religious school. (Applause.)

Governor Clinton always knocks my background but did you know that he drove in from Hope into someplace else -- a bigger place in Arkansas to go to a parochial school. Forty-six per cent of the school teachers in the public schools in Chicago send their kids to private school. If you give parents a choice, not only will the school that are chosen improve, but it will show as it has in Milwaukee that those that are left behind will pick themselves up and compete and be better for those kids that are left there. (Applause.)

I think of the police officers and the sheriff's department and those that are helping enforce the law here as dedicated Americans and we owe them a vote of thanks for trying to keep our neighborhood free of these crackheads and backing up

the law. (Applause.) And you don't get that way by coddling the bad elements.

The other day -- I told them at this last rally -- it was a very moving meeting for me, just before I left the White House -- I think it was eight guys that came up to see me. And they were your basic grassroots family people -- hard-working men -- and they came to see to endorse me for President. And they were the Fraternal Order of Police from Little Rock, Arkansas. (Applause).

The last point, we got to reform the government. We've got to get it right-sized. And I'll tell you what I'd do -- I've got a program for getting the deficit down. Let me tell you what it is. Give the nation the balanced budget amendment to make the Congress get it down. (Applause).

Give the taxpayer a check-off on his tax return. And if you feel as strongly about the deficit as your neighbor or as I do, check 10 percent of your taxes, send it in, and that 10 percent then will have to be offset by a reduction in government spending. Congress can't do it, let the people do it. (Applause).

Forty-three governors have this one -- give the President the line-item veto to cross out all this stuff. (Applause).

And I like the idea of giving the Congress back to the people, putting term limits on for the new members of Congress. (Applause).

I'll tell you something -- I think the defining movement -- the defining moment in the debate was when Governor Clinton, in Richmond, said, it's not the character of the President, he said, it's the character of the presidency. And I say to everybody here, the two are interlocked. You cannot separate them. (Applause). You cannot separate those two things.

And I'm not asking for sympathy, I'm just telling you, sometimes those decisions are tough. Sometimes you've got to make a decision that doesn't keep anybody happy. Sometimes you have to make a decision that might send somebody else's son or someone else's daughter into harm's way, as I had to do in Desert Storm. And you cannot waffle. You've got to look the American people in the eye and say, this is what we're going to do. And if you make a mistake, admit it, and then go on about the people's business. (Applause).

But in time after time, Governor Clinton waffles, trying to make one person happy and then the group opposing him happy. And you can't do it. Whether its free trade or if it's right to work or if -- whatever it is. Here's what he said on the war -- here's what he say in Desert Storm -- how's this -- try this one on for a commander-in-chief -- he said, well, I agreed with the minority -- you remember the minority were telling me you can't do this, you can't do that; you've got to let sanctions work -- I agree with the minority, but I guess I would have voted with the majority. Leadership -- that is a Waffle House, and we can't have it for the American people. (Applause).

Now, every President -- every decision the President makes, in one way or another, affects the lives of others. And let me tell you something about character and trust -- I've messed up a time or two, but Barbara and I have worked hard to uphold the public trust by living there in that White House. (Applause). We've tried to conduct ourselves with decency and honor because I do believe in duty, honor and country. (Applause).

And now we're getting down to a choice. Who do you trust to be the leader of the free world and the President of the United States?

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: Governor Clinton --

AUDIENCE: Bush! Bush! Bush! Bush!

THE PRESIDENT: Governor Clinton wants to win by saying we are a nation in decline. Somewhere -- he puts it this way -- somewhere less than Germany and a little more than Sri Lanka. Let me tell you something, we have problems. We have big, tough economic problems, and people are hurting. But we are the United States, the most respected nation on the face of the Earth. (Applause.) And I will not apologize for this country. (Applause).

I am proud that I served my country in uniform. I am proud to be serving as President. And I came here to say this: I need your support because I want to finish the job.

And may God bless America. May God bless our great country. Thank you all very much. (Applause).

END 2:23 P.M. EDT

The Cuban Democracy Act of 1992

The President signed the Defense Authorization Bill today in Miami, giving force of law to the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992. This legislation represents another step forward toward the achievement of the Administration's policy of encouraging a peaceful transition to democracy and resumption of economic growth in Cuba. It does so through a combination of sanctions directed at the Castro government as well as support and incentives for the Cuban people.

The Act is a strong statement to Castro that the United States will maintain sanctions against his regime so long as it continues to reject democracy and deny its citizens basic human rights. The legislation strengthens our embargo against Cuba by imposing sanctions for certain types of trade relationships with Cuba.

-- It bans trade by U.S. subsidiaries located in third countries, except for trade based upon contracts entered into before the enactment of the Act.

-- It prohibits commercial vessels which have entered Cuban ports from loading or unloading any freight in the U.S. for 180 days, except pursuant to a license issued by the Treasury Department.

-- It bans vessels carrying goods or passengers in which Cuba or a Cuban national has any interest from entering a United States port--a step that President Bush imposed last April.

-- It gives the President authority to strictly limit remittances to Cuba by U.S. persons for the purpose of financing Cuban travel to the United States.

The Cuban Democracy Act also states that the President may apply sanctions against any country that provides assistance to Cuba, including terminating U.S. foreign assistance and debt forgiveness or reduction programs to that country. The President has long worked to ensure that other countries do not provide aid to Cuba.

The Cuban Democracy Act is not intended or designed to hurt the Cuban people. It provides relief for the Cuban people by allowing donations of food to nongovernmental organizations or individuals in Cuba, and the export (i.e. sale) of medicine and medical supplies when licensed by the Department of Commerce. The law also permits "efficient and adequate" telecommunications between the United States and Cuba. This will facilitate contact between family members divided over the years by Cuba's harsh emigration policies.

The bill allows for direct mail delivery to Cuba, although Castro has turned this down when the Administration has pursued it in the past. It also permits the United States to provide assistance, through appropriate nongovernmental organizations, to individuals and organizations promoting nonviolent democratic change in Cuba.

Underlying the President's policy and embodied in the Cuban Democracy Act are the incentives offered to encourage a transition to representative democracy in Cuba. The bill gives the President authority to end sanctions if the Cuban Government holds free and fair elections and shows respect for the Cuban people's civil liberties and human rights. When Cuba is free and democratic, the legislation encourages the President to help Cuba gain admission into international organizations and international financial institutions, to provide emergency relief, and to take steps to end the U.S. trade embargo. The President has long said that he stands ready and willing to help the Cuban people rebuild their economy and become a full and prosperous member of the world community when they regain their freedom and restore representative democracy.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Atlanta, Georgia)

For Immediate Release October 20, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN "ASK GEORGE BUSH"

WSB-TV Studios
Atlanta, Georgia

10:02 A.M. EDT

Q We want to welcome everyone to our town hall meeting, "Ask George Bush."

Mr. President, we're delighted that you could be with us in Georgia this evening. We have, as you know, an audience of 33 people who say they are still undecided voters. And just before you came into the studio I asked them to tell me, after last night's debate, how many were still undecided. Most of them raised their hand, said they're still trying to make up their mind. So this is your opportunity to address their questions.

THE PRESIDENT: That sounds like a reasonable deal. They all look relatively sane and -- (laughter.)

Q Let me start, to get the ball rolling and then turn immediately to questions from the audience -- ask you a quick question. Coming out of the debates last night there are some people who say that the campaign schedules today say a lot about how these last two weeks of the campaign is playing out. Your opponent, Governor Clinton, is off campaigning in states that at this stage of the campaign typically would no longer be vulnerable to a Democratic candidate, but they feel they are. And you come south where many people feel you should have been able to build your base a long time ago.

The last poll that we conducted with the Atlanta Journal Constitution suggests that this is a very tough race here, but that your job approval rating has been high in Georgia. Thirty-three percent of the core Republicans said they're not particularly pleased with your job. Have you in some way let them down? And if you have, how do you get them back in these final two weeks?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the major problem has been the economy. And we're going to get them back because I think people are going to decide when they go into that voting booth on trust, on proven leadership. I think character is important. And then I think we're going to -- people are going to in the final analysis compare economic approaches.

I just don't happen to think we need to tax people more and spend more. And so I've got to get that in focus. But, look, it's not just the United States, the whole world has been through a tough economic time.

This will come as a surprise, perhaps, but we're in an interconnected world and we're leading most of the European economies, the great European economies. Japan -- our growth rate is twice what Japan's is. Yet I hear everybody comparing, talking about how great Japan is and we ought to do better. Of course, we ought to do better. But we're going to lead the way out of this -- what's been an economic slowdown.

And I think the economy has been the major problem for the working men and women in this country, for the unemployed. And I believe that our proposal, the Agenda for America's Renewal, is what's going to change it and make it better.

Q Well, I promised that I would ask very few questions and give the audience most opportunities. A number of people wanted to ask questions based on last night's debate. These people all watched the debate last night, so I wanted to first turn to a few people who said they had specific follow-ups to last night.

You started to talk before about a couple of questions that were lingering after the debate last night.

Q Well, I think that Mr. President has made it an issue of the character and judgment of one of his challengers, and Mr. Perot last night challenged him and was very adamant about maybe his character or judgment. And I would like him to respond to the allegations of "Iraqgate" or the Glaspie papers.

He said that you were dealing with Saddam Hussein, helped build him up and gave him the opportunity to move into Kuwait.

THE PRESIDENT: I heard him say -- he also strongly opposed the war and he said that we have not leveled with the American people on the Glaspie -- that was Ambassador Glaspie. Let me tell you something. Every single paper, including Secretary of State notes, which is unprecedented, was taken up to the United States Congress and looked at in detail. And after the event Secretary Baker went and explained that to Mr. Perot who said he hadn't known that.

So I think that -- I hope that one is cleared up, because you had congressional hearing after congressional hearing. And my position on Iraq was we did try to make Saddam Hussein into somebody a little more sane.

You know, when the war in Iran and Iraq ended, Saddam Hussein had the fourth largest army. Our Arab friends were saying try to bring him along; we don't need a radical in our midst; try to help him. We had letters, incidentally, from many of the people now critical on trying to sell American grain to Iraq, including the two senators from Arkansas -- please sell grain to Iraq on credit.

Q Is this an issue that still concerns you?

THE PRESIDENT: Can I just finish?

Q Yes, I'm sorry.

THE PRESIDENT: Because what happened is he then refused to come along and do what we encouraged him to do and we knocked his socks off, thanks to the sons and daughters of Georgia who did what most Americans do -- when called, they serve. And they serve with great distinction. And it was a proud moment, and people are now trying to revise it and make it something it's not.

Q Are you satisfied -- you still have some lingering question?

Q Well, no. In the second debate I think that the audience participants tried to keep the character and judgment issue out of the room.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, may I respond? Do you think character is not important?

Q No, I do think it's important, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: But they did try to keep it out of the room. And it belongs on the front page. A President must have character. You know, the way I described it last night -- Clinton said "It's not the character of the President, but of the presidency." That is absolutely ridiculous. I am judged on my character every single day. Every President must be judged on that, and so must he be judged on his character. And so must Mr. Perot. And character is vital. It is essential, because you have to have the trust of the whole world when you're President, or lack thereof.

So I'm not going to let some guy stand up and say what I can talk about or what I can't. I happen to think that every schoolchild ought to think their President has a certain degree of character. And maybe Mr. Clinton's got it, maybe Mr. Perot's got it. But certainly it belongs as a matter for discussion.

Q Let's move on to another question. We talked to some people in here earlier and some -- most of them said their decision now is between you and Governor Clinton. But a few said they still like Ross Perot, and you were one of them. What did you want to ask the President today?

Q Mr. President, my question is twofold. It involves the airline industry. I would like to know why it appears that we are being so cooperative with foreign airlines and we've abandoned the weaker carriers of the United States. One, specifically in the past involving the demise of Eastern Airlines, why did you defy the recommendation of the National Mediation Board to form a presidential emergency board to address this transportation crisis? And secondly, specifically in the present, why are you promoting policies which appear to give foreign airlines nearly total freedom to invest and operate within the United States with little or nothing in exchange for the United States airlines?

THE PRESIDENT: Tell me about the mediation board. Remind me of what that was, would you?

Q It had to do with investigating Lorenzo's actions involving the bankruptcy of Eastern Airlines.

THE PRESIDENT: I'll tell you what my philosophy is on these matters. As much as possible, it is to let the private sector work -- to let these disputes be handled by private sector. I don't believe the government ought to get in at all times. The one that Mr. Perot was hitting out about last night was an attempt for the British Airways to purchase U.S. Air. You've got a major dispute raging. The U.S. Air employees everyplace you go, they're holding up picket signs -- not picket signs, but saying, hey, protect my job. Let the merger go through. And then you've got the other airlines like Delta, outstanding airline, headquartered right here, American Airlines saying, wait a minute, it's not fair to let British come in here under U.S. Air, and then not let us have access to the British market.

Q Of course, Eastern Airlines' bankruptcy and the decision not to allow mediators to come in was of enormous concern here in the Atlanta area because we have some 5,000 Eastern employees who lost their jobs.

THE PRESIDENT: I was getting to the point. And the point is, all U.S. Air employees are saying, let British take over, and all Delta Airline people are saying don't do it. This one has to be resolved by government because of the routing and all of that. And it's being negotiated now, and I'm not hiding behind this, but it would be most inappropriate for the President to take a position on it while the Department of Transportation

is handling it. It will come to me -- everything does -- and then you have to say I'm for this or against it.

But on the other one, I just don't believe that the government ought to intervene in all of these things.

Q All right, thank you, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: That's a big difference we've got on some of this philosophy.

Q Thank you, sir.

The economy, everyone identifies as a crucial issue. Does someone in the group want to ask an economic question of the President right now? Who has something they want to --

THE PRESIDENT: -- about a baseball question -- (laughter.)

Q Well, naturally.

THE PRESIDENT: Only because we've got a serious thing I want to say.

Q Go ahead. We're calling on you because the President mentions baseball. You've got your Braves teeshirt on, you get special treatment here today.

THE PRESIDENT: You don't have to ask baseball, but I just want something to use this program, Bill, if I can to say something about the flag situation. Maybe I could do it before, then you'd be unfettered by my trying to define what you should ask about.

But here's the thing on the Canadian flag inadvertently flow upside-down. If that had happened in Canada and we'd have seen the United States flag flown upside-down, every American would have been very, very upset. This was a mistake. And certainly, nobody would ever do anything like that on purpose.

And so what I wanted to use your program for is to say how badly I feel about it, how badly all the American people feel about it, how much we value our friendship with Canada. They are our strongest trading partner in the whole world, and we would do nothing to hurt the national pride of Canada. And so, on behalf of all Americans, I simply wanted to apologize to the people of Canada and suggest we try to keep this now from now on out of the marvelous baseball rivalry between Atlanta and Toronto. And that's all I want to say. (Applause.)

Q How are you going to feel tonight? We are likely to see -- they're planning on flying a lot of American flags upside-down tonight on Toronto. How are you going to feel it you see that?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I won't like it. Because when you see the American flag flown upside-down, as a person that served in the Armed Forces and fought for my country, I would find that inappropriate. I guess I'd have to say I understand the passions of the Canadians, but I would simply ask them to have the same respect for the American flag that all Americans have for their flag, and recognize, as I said last night, if you make a mistake -- whatever it is -- hey, say I made a mistake and get on about the nation's business.

But this one -- I use this because the Prime Minister of Canada is a wonderful man. And he's a friend to the United States. And he gets pounded in Canada for his friendship. Don't mistake it; he's pro-Canadian. I suspect he's rooting hard

for Toronto. But I just wanted him to know how strongly Americans feel. End this discussion now, please.

Q I'm a lunchroom lady and this is something I'm really very privileged. How many times do we get that opportunity, you know, us little folks down here? But I am concerned about Social Security. I'm about -- well, a little less than 20 years away from it, but I'm concerned about if I'm going to have it when I get up there. And I have a two-week-old granddaughter that, in 62 years -- I know that's a long time, but she's going to be there, too, someday. I want to know that we have that available to us when we're ready for it.

THE PRESIDENT: First place, I think you'll remember that I'm the President that said in the State of the Union message, don't mess with Social Security, don't touch it. Last night, perhaps inadvertently, Governor Clinton said something about those that take out more than they put on ought to do something about it. He may have misspoken, so I want to be fair about that. That's messing with Social Security. Ross Perot has proposed some kind of tax on Social Security. We ought not to mess with it.

It was fixed in a bipartisan agreement under the Reagan administration, I think in '83 or '84, in there -- it is solvent well into the -- way after the turn of the century, up until about 2030 or something like that. If it needs further adjustments then, it should be fixed then. You'll still be alive, but I don't think I'll be around wrestling with the problem in the year 2030. And we ought not to fool around with it.

In my budget plan, this Agenda for American Renewal, I say we've got to control the growth of these mandatory programs, but set Social Security aside. It's not a welfare program, it originally was to be a supplement to people's incomes. It's sacrosanct.

So I think you can tell your daughter that the system is sound, and if it's not sound when she gets up there -- my age -- it will be made sound. But the big thing for now is, don't fool around with it, leave it separate as we try to control the growth of other spending programs.

Q All right, Mr. President. We have a question over here, please.

Q I would like to know -- as you already know, the black people of this nation and the black African American people feel that we have been made a mockery of and that our issues are not being faced and we have not been addressed and we have not had the proper opportunities that we should have in this country. We would, at this time, like to know specifically what you plan to do in order to get our vote this time around. After 12 years of being in office, what do you plan to do this time around to prove to us that you are capable of being our leader in this next four years?

THE PRESIDENT: That's a good question. What I'd like -- I'm delighted that you're undecided because so many are traditionally taken for granted by one party. They'll vote the straight lever on the other side and be had by local officials and by the United States Congress.

We've got a good urban program. I don't know if you're talking about urban America. But if you're talking about urban America, the best thing for minority Americans is to bring the jobs into urban America. And we've got this program called enterprise zones. Now we're getting a lot of lip service from the Democrats, but they've been unwilling to pass it. And they control the Senate and they control the House, and they've controlled them both for 38 years.

Enterprise zones says, look, give a tax break to businesses. Make it worth their while to come into the urban centers and create jobs. I think our anticrime program benefits minority families more than others because some of those areas are the ones that are most afflicted by bad crime statistics. I think that homeownership is a far better concept than these big public tenements where the residents don't have the pride. I think tenant management, which we have pioneered, is a much better answer to urban hopelessness than having some government official trying to run the places where people live.

So all of these things, in my view, would raise the quality of life for people. It's not just for minorities. But I think it would disproportionately help the minorities. We've really got a good urban program.

Q I apologize, sir. We have to pause for a break, and we'll be back with you in just a moment.

* * * * *

Q We're back with our town hall forum with George Bush, President of the United States. We want to get right back to questions. Go ahead.

Q My question is about homeownership. My wife and I hope to become homeowners in the near future and therefore favor the tax credit to the first-time homebuyer. My question is how can we as minorities be assured of this tax credit if we can't get equal lending from our banking community?

THE PRESIDENT: First place, the first-time homebuyer should be thrilled about my proposal. The way it works is you give a $5,000 credit to the family that's never owned a home before -- for the first time. It is hung up, regrettably, in the Democratic Congress. They will not pass it. And it is the best possible thing that you could do.

Obviously, the credit that you need to buy on the home has to come from your own full faith in credit -- your own standing. But this is a major break for homeowners. And besides that, it would stimulate the economy. Along with building homes goes a lot of other industries that outfit the houses and refrigerators and furniture. And so it really is essential. I'm not sure I fully answered your question, but your credit -- this won't help your borrowing. It will help it that you have $5,000 less you'll have to come up with. But it's really stimulated for the housing industry.

Is that it? Did you have -- did I get to it fully?

Q I'm sorry. I'm going to walk right in front of the camera to get you here on that.

Q Well, you touched on it. I'm talking about a couple of weeks ago our local paper ran an article where blacks and other minorities are being discriminated against on the lending -- from the lending community. I think it's 18 percent or so -- being denied. And the credit standing wasn't one of the biggest issues for denial.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the credit standing should be the only issue for denial. I mean, if you have discrimination against anybody in housing or in loaning, that is against the law, and it must not continue.

Q What are you suggesting we do? Any ideas -- how we enforce --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I'd go right to the local officials here and get something done about it. You're looking

at a man who, as a congressman from Texas, voted for open housing. My view was if you've got kids dying coming out of the ghettos in Vietnam, they ought not to come back and find that they couldn't live where they wanted to live. So I'm a fair housing person.

You're talking about something that is already against the law -- where people to discriminate against lenders because of their race is what I think you're saying. And that is purely against existing federal law and you ought to go get it enforced by the local law enforcement people and, if they're violating a federal law, by the federal law enforcement.

Q A quick follow up on your -- on what you've made a big issue out of it in the campaign, and that's your break, your tax credit for first-time homebuyers. How much does it cost and how do we pay for it?

THE PRESIDENT: It costs very little because it stimulates the whole industry. And when you get industry stimulated you have much more jobs. Frankly, I think it would be income productive, because housing is going to lead the way out of this slowdown -- in some areas, recession. So we there is some good news --

Q -- initially we take a pretty big chunk of income tax --

THE PRESIDENT: I can't give you the exact figure, but it's not enormous and it will be far more offset by growth. Housing sales, incidentally, were up yesterday. You get -- I don't know, I didn't hear that on the top of the news last night. It may have been in there somewhere. But it's very difficult to get any good news out. That's good news for America.

Q Let me turn to another question.

Q Four years ago, I voted for you and I was a freshman in college. And now it's four years later and I just graduated. And I was really -- I've worked really hard in school and I was looking forward to entering the job market. But I'm very undecided about the whole economic issue and I'm already discouraged before I've even started. What is your economic plan to have someone offer me who's just entering the job market?

THE PRESIDENT: You're caught up in what has been a global recession. It's not just the United States. I'll take my share of the blame for the United States -- I'm not going to take all of it because I think there's a lot of fault as to how things can be better. But this Agenda for American's Renewal that puts emphasis on investment is job-creating. I mentioned the homebuyers tax credit. I might talk about an investment tax allowance. It would stimulate job creation.

You know, I'm for the capital gains reduction. And the opposition -- except I think Mr. Perot may be for it -- but the opposition says this is a tax break for the rich. It is not. It is to stimulate entrepreneurship, the creation of new businesses. So I would suggest that the best answer to the economic recovery which is needed are these incentives that I've proposed as recently as January of this year, all hung up by a Congress that has to win by having things bad. Their man could not -- I wouldn't be sitting here probably if the economy was growing at 3.5 or 4 percent. And it's not. But I think these incentives that I proposed are the way to make the economy grow.

And herein I have a big difference with Governor Clinton. He says, grow the economy, get the government to use what he calls investment. Government investment does not create the kind of job that you're looking for. It creates bureaucracy.

Q Have you made a decision at least tentatively about which of the three presidential candidates you believe has the kind of programs that will make sure you'll find good work down the road?

Q Well, like I said before, I voted for the President four years ago. So to begin with, I was leaning toward him, but now I've gone back and forth because -- just because of the different economic plans. I'm just not sure.

THE PRESIDENT: Let me throw in another selling point. (Laughter.) Four years ago you were a college freshman. Did you ever worry about nuclear war back then? Did you? You worry less about it now. But most kids that vintage four years ago would share the same fear of nuclear war that their parents had. We've changed all that.

All I ask is to be judged on the whole record. And I really think that's dramatic. Forty-three more countries are free and democratic since I've become President around the world. You've got ancient enemies talking to themselves. That may not affect the job market, but it does affect the climate in which we're going to grow and create opportunity.

And again, I get back to -- last night I had this big argument with him about exports. Exports are going to save the job market. It's the only thing that saved it in this slow growth or in a recession.

Q Mr. President, we have a voter here who is very concerned about health care and who has said frankly that he has been a supporter of yours in the past, but needs to hear more from you about the whole issue of health care before he makes up his mind.

Q I think the American people understand your ability as a leader and to lead us in international affairs. And I think we understand that that's really second to none and we appreciate the job that you've done in the last four years. We also believe, I think, that if you understand us and our domestic problems as well as you understand the international affairs that you will do as good a job here as you've done internationally. The question is, have you lost touch with America? Have you lost touch with us?

My case in point is health care. When you have a monopoly such as the health care system -- and I do mean monopoly because you have pills that cost -- for 20 pills they cost $500 -- that's monopoly because without that this person is not going to survive. What do you do about the inequities in the health care system? You have a cap --

Q Let's have a -- I mean, I understand your concern and you're asking a terrific question. But if we could give the President a chance to respond.

Q Basically, it's the inequities in the health care system that are there. I can't afford health care in five years with the way it's going up. As a middle class person it will be out of sight. I've had somebody say to me -- a doctor say we can't do an operation for a loved one because I didn't have enough insurance. What's going to happen to the rest of us if middle class America is being squeezed?

THE PRESIDENT: That's a very good question. Let me tell you -- you know why some of the doctors say that, or why the doctors say you've got to have five tests instead of one? Because they're afraid of being sued. They're afraid of these malicious lawsuits. And part of my health reform plan is to put a cap on these malicious lawsuits.

The trial lawyers have a very powerful lobby. And you go look up where the contributions come from. People talk about lobbies and power groups -- the trial lawyers are solidly behind Governor Clinton. He refuses to do anything
talk about lobbies and power groups. The trial lawyers are solidly behind Governor Clinton. He refuses to do anything about malpractice. And you're right -- $25 billion to $50 billion in additional costs come from malpractice.

Now, that's part of the answer. But that's why the doctors are telling you this. Some of them give up practicing medicine. Some people give up coaching Little League because they're afraid of being sued. Some people see a wreck along the highway, and they want to stop and help their fellow man, and they say I'm not going to do it because I read about a lawsuit that wiped out a guy like me. I moved his head, and the next thing, he dies and I'm sued for trying to be a good Samaritan.

Q Are you convinced that eliminating frivolous lawsuits, sir, allegedly frivolous lawsuits, are the first big step, or is the problem much larger than that?

Q I don't think that's the issue. I don't think the people --

THE PRESIDENT: I thought you asked about the doctors.

Q No, I agree that that should be taken care of, but I don't believe the person at the lower income that needs just basic health care is being addressed by attacking the lawsuit issue. They're just worried that --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me finish then. I got cut off.

Q Let him respond.

THE PRESIDENT: I think we have the best health care reform plan. And what it does, it provides vouchers to the poorest of the poor. There are a lot of people, 40 million, 38 million people that have no insurance. And it provides insurance to the poorest of the poor. For the middle income, it provides tax credits and breaks, so it's the equivalent of a sustenance there to help you buy insurance, and it keeps the government out of it.

My big argument with government and Clinton -- he wants another government board to set prices. And anytime you have government intervention in the market, prices go up. And so I believe our health care plan -- and I hate guys that say, have you read my speech or looked at my program, and then make you read 30 pages -- take a look at it because it does address itself to these ever-increasing costs.

Q Mr. President, thank you. We've got to take another quick break, and we'll be back after this.

* * * * *

Q We're back with more questions for the President. We talked a little about health care before the break and we have a follow-up question.

Q I think all of your proposals for access to health care are great, but we need money now for preventative care. We need money -- our funding for AZT ran out this year, and we need money to get into the neighborhoods and teach prenatal care so that we don't have the extensive burdens on the other end. And I want to ask how you can help us with that.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I would only refer you to the fact that money from the federal government for health care has increased dramatically. The problem you have is you don't have unlimited resources. Take AIDS funding on research, for example. We've doubled, in the last four years, the federal participation in research and treatment and all of this. We're up to $4.9 billion -- 10 times as much for AIDS victims as per cancer victim, what the federal government can do.

We're operating at these enormous deficits. And so, I'd like to sit here and say, the federal government can solve this problem, or the federal government can solve the problems of urban America by spending more. I don't believe we can do it.

I think the best thing the federal government can do is to continue to be as compassionate as possible on funding for health care. And it's way up, believe me -- just look at the numbers. But it's got to be done as much as possible by participation of others, also. We cannot do it and then say, well, I'm going to get the deficit down. You can't be taxed much more.

And so the President is faced with the problem: How do you help these hospitals for the indigent, and yet, how do you protect the taxpayers' wallet. And I've concluded that we've got about the right balance for what we can do right now.

Q What do we spend at a Grady hospital on a baby who is born prematurely because of a lack of prenatal care?

Q As much as $100,000 in a year.

Q So the question, of course, is, are you robbing Peter to pay Paul on this?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't get the question.

Q In the sense that, without prenatal care and spending for prenatal care, you end up getting bigger bills down the road?

THE PRESIDENT: Spending for prenatal care -- my point is -- it's up by the federal government. My point is, I don't believe anybody can say the federal government alone can solve the problems of prenatal care. We've got a great Secretary of HHS. He comes right from Atlanta -- Lou Sullivan -- one of the outstanding medical people. He was head of Morehouse College here. I think he's reached about as good a sensitive balance in terms of support for programs like this as he can do -- if he is restricted on the funds.

And we're operating at such big deficits, I don't like to sound hopeless, but I say we have increased support for all of these things, and somebody's got to be responsible to the taxpayer or to the young woman who is trying to get a job. And they all interact. So I hope we can help more.

Q All right. We'll try to get a few more questions.

Q I'm a divorced father and I support four children. During your campaign, you've allowed the Vice President and others to make family values a political issue. And I just wondered why you did that. And if you could go back, since you're running a distant second now in the polls -- if you could go back, would you change that as being an issue?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, no. No. I think family values is critical. Now, if you're talking about am I trying to define that a one-person -- one-parent family is no good and two-parent families are perfect, that's not the case. I'm talking about when Major Bradley of Los Angeles came to see me, along with

other mayors, he said, the major concern of urban decay is the decline of family values. And he was talking about discipline. He was talking about respect. He was talking about helping people to learn. He was talking about respect for law enforcement. He was talking about strengthening the family through choice -- or I'm talking about it -- in child care or schools.

So please, I wouldn't go back because I believe family is important. When Barbara reads to these children, she's trying to say, hey, parents ought to read to kids. When you talk about discipline, federal government can't do that. But respect for the law is some -- a family value. Respect for your parents.

So I'm glad you gave me a chance to clear it up because nobody is saying single parents are wrong. My respect for you -- supporting four kids is great. My respect for the father that runs away from the mother and leaves her to do it without any support has -- I think that's disgraceful. And so we're trying to pass laws to reform the welfare system. And I'm glad you gave me a chance to clear it up.

Q Very quickly -- I want to get other people in, but you're shaking your head.

Q I still don't believe that the issue that I presented to you was answered. I mean, I --

THE PRESIDENT: What is your question again, ma'am?

Q -- but I still think you should let us know what can you do to make us believe that you are qualified to be a black Afro-American people President?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I thought I just told you that the best thing to do is to bring jobs and hope to the inner city -- to do things different. And to get some people in the Congress that agree with me instead of trying to perpetuate the hopelessness that's brought to bear on some of these neighborhoods.

I think welfare reform is important. I believe making people learn and work when they're on welfare is important. Now, you may disagree with me. But I think dependency on welfare is terrible. Give people a better break in education. Give them a better break in health care. But then let everybody else pitch in and be part of the American Dream. I think we're doing tremendous amounts in terms of helping people, and I want to make it so people can help themselves more.

Now, I've told you housing programs and all of this. But maybe we just disagree. But I'd say to black Americans, don't be taken for granted all the time. Don't vote that straight lever and go right down the way your predecessors did, and then wake up in despair. Try something different.

Q I'm sorry, another question if we can.

Q My statement and question is about education. Seeing that some middle class taxpayers are actually saving the government state and federal money by making great sacrifices, like my husband and I who send our daughter to private school, could it be possible for some of us that we work so hard to give our children a good education, get a tax break, such as a rebate in school taxes?

Q I think you've just been served up a home run pitch here, Mr. President. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: I have. Forty-six percent of the public schoolteachers in Chicago send their kids to private school. I have a big difference with Governor Clinton on this

one. I believe, and our G.I. Bill for Kids suggests, if it worked for the G.I. bill for people coming after World War II -- the government said, here's the money, to the family, to the soldiers, and you go to the school of your choice -- private, public or religious. And the state schools got better if they weren't chosen. Public schools, exactly the same thing -- give the parents a voucher. If they go to public school or private school, or religious school, and that then starts, as it has in Milwaukee, competition.

And the schools not chosen, the public schools are getting better. There's a black woman up there named Polly Williams, a big, strong Democrat, and she thinks that her kid was maligned by the public school system. She was given, under their program, choice. She sent that kid to a private school, and now he's a high attainer. And the school that wasn't chosen is doing much better because they have to compete. So we've got the program for you.

Q As far as my question goes, I don't think I quite get -- what I was asking is, we, as middle class taxpayers trying to make a sacrifice to send our daughter to private school. It's a misconception that people seem to think that everybody that sends their children to private school is well off or rich, and we are not.

My question was, is it possible that in the future you will have a program that will look at us, at middle class Americans trying to work hard --

THE PRESIDENT: Our program gives you a break. Our program gives you a break so you can get assistance in sending your child to the school of your choice. Schools choice -- religious, private, public. That's what I favor, and you're just exactly the guy that would benefit from our program. Help me get it through the Congress.

Q Well, we have so many people, Mr. President, who would like to still ask you questions. Their hands are in the air, but unfortunately, we've come to the end of our time. So what I want to do is finish by saying, thank you very much. We are truly delighted you could be with us tonight.

THE PRESIDENT: It's like the last inning. I love baseball. Played it; love it. Remember the last inning of the Braves game when everybody went to the exits, and the Braves knocked it out of the park. Now they're in the World Series. Great pride. That's exactly what's going to happen in this election. So stay tuned.

Q Last two weeks. We'll watch you carefully. Thank you, sir, very much. (Applause.)

And thanks to our audience for all their wonderful questions.

END 10:47 A.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Georgia)

For Immediate Release October 20, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT GAINESVILLE WELCOME

Gainesville, Georgia

2:25 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Dot Williams. And thank you, Gainesville. What a fantastic rally. I am grateful to you and it makes me think we are going to win this election. (Applause.)

Let me just say how pleased I am to be accompanied on this trip by two of America's greats -- Governor Campbell, the Governor of South Carolina; and Senator Strom Thurmond, the great United States Senator. (Applause.) And you know, everyplace I go I see signs that say, "Clean House." Let me say let's also clean Senate and send Paul Coverdell to the United States Senate. (Applause.)

And may I thank Dow Williams, who's our master of ceremonies, and everybody responsible for this fantastic rally. And let me say this: One left me in Norcross. I expect I will see her in the White House Thursday night, but I am very proud of our First Lady, Barbara Bush, who sends you her very best. (Applause.)

And it is great to be in the land of the free and the home of the Braves. (Applause.) You know -- you got it. This is what we're going to do to Governor Clinton. Clinton-Gore -- (laughter.) You know, baseball's exactly like politics. So you forget about all these crazy polls. Don't let these newscasters tell you what's happening or how to vote. (Applause.) And on Election Day we're going to show America it ain't over til Cabrero swings. And that's exactly the way it's going to be. (Applause.)

Anybody see that debate last night? (Applause.) Well, it seems to me we had a chance to lay out the difference before -- the differences before the American people. And I was talking about a difference in experience, a difference in philosophy, and, yes, a difference in character. And I think all three of those things matter. (Applause.)

The scariest moment of that debate was when Governor Clinton said he wanted to do for the United States what he's done to Arkansas. That scares me. We cannot have that. I hate to ruin a beautiful rally on a sunny day in Gainesville, but let me tell you something: Arkansas is the 50th out of 50 states in environmental initiatives; 49th in high school diplomas; 45th in well-being of children; and incomes and jobs and wages lag the entire nation. We do not need that for the greatest country on the face of the Earth. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: I thought --

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: Four more.

You know, I agreed with one thing that Ross Perot said. He said, the grocery store is no preparation for Wal-Mart. And I think he's right. This is the big leagues. You can't have it both ways on every issue. You've got to say what you think, admit your mistakes, and lead and not waffle. I am that kind of a leader and the other man is the waffler. (Applause.)

I had a chance to point out last night -- he didn't like it a bit -- that Governor Clinton has already said he wants to raise your taxes by $150 billion. He wants to spend --

AUDIENCE: Booooo.

THE PRESIDENT: I'm sorry. He wants to spend $220 billion. He says he'll take it all from the rich. All you cab drivers, all you nurses, all you Boys Club workers, all you watch out, because he's coming right after your wallet -- coming right after it. And we are not going to let him tax the American people anymore. (Applause.)

He wants trickle-down government. We do not need bigger government in Washington, D.C. We need to control that growth in spending, give the over-taxed taxpayer a little relief and get this deficit down. That is my program. (Applause.)

Georgia is a great export state. We create a lot of export jobs here. And I think exports are going to lead our way to a new prosperity for the entire world. Let's not go back to protection. Let's open up those foreign markets to Georgia's goods. And our American workers can outproduce any workers any part of the world. We are the best. (Applause.)

Everybody here knows this -- but it is small business that creates the new jobs. Two-thirds of the new jobs come from small businesses. And the small businesses need relief from taxation, regulation, litigation. Clinton would sock the taxpayer with more. I say lighten up on small business and let it create jobs. (Applause.)

Last night, I can't remember whether we talked about it in the debate, but one big difference I have with this man is he doesn't care about these lawsuits. My view is we are suing each other too much and caring for each other too little. And we ought to do something about these crazy lawsuits. (Applause.) We spend over $200 billion a year on lawyers, and that's too much. We've got some darn good ones, and I hope they're here. But we've got to put a cap on these crazy lawsuits. (Applause.)

Last night we showed a big difference on education. We've got a lot of kids here. I think it's time to give the parents the choice and the help to send their kids to the schools they want -- public, private or religious. (Applause.) And I think it's time we have a new health care system that makes insurance available to the poorest of the poor, gives the middle class a tax break, but does not turn it over to the federal government. The federal government can't run the post office too well, and we ought to do better in health care. (Applause.)

And on crime, I've got a fundamental difference with the Governor, because I believe we ought to be a little more sympathetic to the victims of crime and a little less sympathetic to the criminals themselves. (Applause.)

In Arkansas, prisoners spend 20 percent of their term in jail. In the federal system it is 85 percent. We do not need to be more lenient; we need to back up the families and the law enforcement officers and bring law and order back to our communities. (Applause.)

You know, one of the best visits I've had as President of the United States is when a group of young men from the Fraternal Order of Police came to see me, and they were from Little Rock, Arkansas, endorsing me for President of the United States. (Applause.)

Last night we talked about reforming government. I do believe we need to get this deficit down, and here's three ways to do it: Give me what many of the governors have. Give me a balanced budget amendment and make this Congress save money. (Applause.) Give me a line-item veto. Forty-three governors have it; let the President draw a line through those wasteful programs. Congress can't do it; give me the chance.

I want a check-off on the tax returns so if a person says, "I'm concerned about the deficit," they can check off 10 percent of their tax they send to the government, and then the Congress and the President must reduce the deficit by that much. Discipline the federal government. (Applause.)

And one other idea where I have a big difference with the status quo and with Governor Clinton and Mr. Gore is I believe that we ought to have term limits on the members of the United States Congress. (Applause.)

And I do believe character counts. This is -- we're talking about the presidency. We are talking about who is privileged and honored to serve in that hallowed White House. Character counts.

And when I -- (applause) -- and I don't believe you can flip-flop on every issue. Governor Clinton is on one side of the war. He was saying "Well, I agree with the minority but I guess I would have voted for the majority." When you're President, you've got to make a tough decision. And we did it, And Georgia's sons and daughters behaved with honor and we kicked Saddam Hussein all the way out of -- (applause) -- out of Kuwait. And we restored the honor of the United States. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: My objection --

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: Four more! My concern about Governor Clinton is there is a pattern of deception. It flip-flops. It's on the right to work laws, it's on free trade, it was on the war itself, it was on term limits. You cannot be all things to all people. You can't say one day, well, I'm for the Blue Jays, but maybe I'll be for the Atlanta Braves. I'm for the Braves and that's the way it is. (Applause.)

Listen, you guys --

(Audience chants Braves cheer.)

THE PRESIDENT: Wasn't that great? You know, I'll make one serious comment here that transcends politics -- but I know all Georgians -- everyone in the United States was upset when we saw the Canada flag inadvertently, by mistake -- everyone's human -- make an error and their flag was flown upside down. This morning I apologized to the people of Canada. They understand. They are out friends and our allies. They have respect for our flag and we have respect for theirs. (Applause.) They are great people, and I hope they come in second in the World Series. (Applause.)

In conclusion, let me say this: In the Richmond debate -- maybe some of you had to suffer through that one --

Governor Clinton said, it's not the character of the President, it's the character of the presidency. And I said, no, you can't separate the two. (Applause.) When I see these kids out here -- I see these kids out here, I am more determined than ever not only to serve with honor, not only to show compassion and concern for the people of this country, but to enact the programs that are going to help the young people and lead them to a new prosperity and a new hope.

We have literally changed the world. These kids go to bed at night without the same fear of nuclear war that their mothers and their dads and their older brothers and their sisters had. That is dramatic change. And because of our leadership we are, indeed, the most respected nation in the world. And now help me take that same leadership and lift up the American people, because our best days are ahead. We are the United States. (Applause.)

And may God bless the United States of America. Thank you all very, very much. (Applause.) What a great rally. Thank you. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you so much. Thank you all. Great rally. Thank you, Gainesville. Thank you, Georgia. Thank you, the United States of America. We are going to win this election. (Applause.) Thank you so much. All aboard! (Applause.)

END 2:40 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Miami, Florida)

For Immediate Release October 23, 1992

The President today made available emergency appropriations for the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, the Interior, and Labor. These funds will provide assistance in Florida, Louisiana, Hawaii, and Guam to victims of Hurricanes Andrew and Iniki and Typhoon Omar.

These funds were appropriated in Public Law 102-368, the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, which was signed into law on September 23, 1992. The funds were made available contingent upon the President submitting budget requests to the Congress and designating the amounts requested as emergency requirements. Forwarding these requests, which total $56.4 million in budget authority and $803.5 million in loans and loan guarantees, to the Congress will automatically make the funds available. No further congressional action is required.

The amounts made available are as follows:

- For the Department of Labor, $30 million in budget authority for job training assistance, particularly for dislocated workers.

- For the Department of Agriculture, $1.4 million in budget authority to support the disbursement of $3.5 million in low-income housing repair loans, and $4.1 million in budget authority in state assistance for restoration of damaged urban forests.

- For the Department of Commerce, $5.1 million for shellfish and fishery habitat restoration in Louisiana, and $3.6 million to promote tourism in those areas affected by recent natural disasters.

- For the Department of Housing and Urban Development, $10 million in budget authority to support $800 million in loan guarantees for the Federal Housing Administration's (FHA) general and special risk program. Also included is $200 thousand in budget authority to cover increased management and administrative costs associated with disaster relief activities, including the processing of these FHA loan guarantees.

- For the Department of the Interior, $500 thousand in budget authority for the Geological Survey for repair and replacement of Federal property, and $300 thousand in budget authority for the National Park Service to save historic structures. Also included is $1.2 million for the Minerals Management Service for activities related to pipeline and oil and gas platform safety in the Gulf of Mexico.

# # #

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Lafayette, Louisiana)

For Immediate Release October 24, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN SIGNING OF ENERGY ACT POLICY

Jack-Wade Drilling, Inc.
Maurice, Louisiana

5:05 P.M. CDT

THE PRESIDENT: Please be seated. And I want to thank Jack -- Jack Wilson -- for making all this possible. He ain't making any money while we're standing here, with that rig waiting for a little more action. But it's very, very nice of him to do this. And I'm grateful to him, to the superintendent, the tool pushers -- all the guys here and those from Arco, a company for whom Jack is drilling this rig.

And Chip Rimer and Leon Smith, particularly, I want to thank. Also I want to single out Secretary Jim Watkins, our Secretary of Energy, my mate in the Cabinet. (Applause.) He is doing a superb job. And we invited several members of the United States Congress who have been interested in this, and I don't know that they're here. But I want to thank the Louisiana delegation who worked hard, and all of you have fought hard to strengthen America's energy future. And it's an honor to have you here today and to be with you.

Two years ago our administration proposed a National Energy Strategy. And it was a blueprint to promote economic growth and make the country more secure. And our strategy was based on the simple premise that the greatest signal energy resource America possesses is the wisdom and enterprise of its citizens.

And the last two years have seen much hard work, many hundreds of hour of hard study and negotiation. And we know, and I know especially because I used to be in this business, how rough it's been on those who have been working the oil fields and the drilling business and, yes, in the production business as well.

But now our efforts have borne fruit and this afternoon, right here -- and it's fitting it happens in the shadow of a drilling rig -- we're going to sign the Energy Policy Act of 1992. (Applause.)

We're in a political year, but I think it's only fitting to say that it's a tribute -- this bill is a tribute to many, the work of many people. And it's not a Republican accomplishment or a Democratic accomplishment, it's an accomplishment for all America. And the Senate -- to be very fair about it -- I wish the guy would see the light on the rest of the things, but Bennett Johnson deserves great credit because he's been working closely with Jim Watkins on this. (Applause.) So give credit where credit is due and I'll talk to him about something else later on -- you know what I mean? (Laughter.)

But I salute him and I salute Senator Malcolm Wallop, the Senator from Wyoming, who also was very active in all of this. (Applause.) And in the House, the Democratic chairman over there, John Dingell, deserves credit, and Phil Sharp and then Republican Carlos Morehead. So I mean it when I say it's a team effort. Jim can bring that out and talk to you about that.

He'll certainly confirm it because he's working with all of them, as well as with his colleagues in the Cabinet.

Another -- but this one, that I mentioned earlier, deserves very special praise -- and a man of vision and integrity, and that's Jim Watkins. I'll tell you, he has stayed in this thing from day one, fought against a lot of political odds, changed and worked and given and taken, but we've ended up with good, sound national energy. So once again, I want to thank Jim Watkins for what he's done. (Applause.)

For three years, he's been fighting this battle, working to strengthen America's energy industry through more than 90 -- 90 administrative actions, so that we may compete in this new world economy. And he's already made great progress but the bill, in our view, will accelerate progress. And it's a crowning achievement.

And the Energy Policy Act will increase domestic energy production and in the process we all -- you know this better than most American -- that means there will be less reliance on foreign oil, foreign energy and it will promote conservation and efficiency. (Applause.) And it will create American jobs. (Applause.) The IPA -- what was that figure?

SECRETARY WATKINS: Forty-five thousand jobs just next year.

THE PRESIDENT: All right, Jim is telling me there's a new estimate by IPAA, which is the Independent Petroleum Association, that will create 45,000 American jobs next year, 7,000 wells. (Applause.) And we're doing this not by resorting to the failed methods of government control but by unleashing the genius of the private sector -- guys like Jack, tool pushers and roughnecks like these guys standing right here. (Applause.)

And the act -- now, it's got other facets to it that get across the broad energy spectrum. The act increases competition in a way that electricity is generated and sold. And that will cut prices, reducing the strain on family budgets across the country.

And by the year 2010 -- and most of you look young enough to think you'll be around by then -- our reforms will save the average family -- average household -- $150 a year in annual electricity bills. The act also improves licensing procedures for new nuclear power plants, safe use of nuclear power, guaranteeing that this safe and clean resource will help meet our needs for the next century. (Applause.)

It also encourages the development and use of clean-burning alternative fuels so that the robust production of energy will go hand in hand with a clean environment. The act provides much needed tax relief for you, our nation's independents, independent oil and gas producers.

By far the most important change that we make as it affects the independents is to reform the alternative minimum tax -- (applause) -- to better reflect the risk, the risk that it takes to explore for oil. And that will create good jobs, as Jim has pointed out to me just once again -- good jobs all across the oil states.

The reform will allow producers to keep more of your hard-earned money to reinvest the production of some domestic fossil fuels. And the facts are simple: We must work to produce more of our energy here at home and import less from abroad. And our national security demands it. Future generations deserve it. And now we can make sure that it will be done.

I spent much of my life, and Barbara at my side, in the oil business, starting out in West Texas in the supply

business and then in the land drilling business, in the offshore drilling business, as well as the production business, doing some wild-catting and producing some oil. And I saw firsthand how the government can sometimes help. But I also saw firsthand, particularly when I was in the offshore business, how the government can hinder things with too darn much regulation.

And so what we're trying to do is cut through the regulation. And I believe that I do understand the men and women who are out there trying to meet America's energy needs. I believe that this act opens a new era in which government acts not as a master, but as a partner and the servant.

And once again, to the families in south Louisiana and other places who have been hurting, we understand that. And I do think that this act, with the repeal particularly of the alternative minimum tax, offers a much, much brighter future. And I'm proud to be back in this wonderful part of the world. Thank you all very, very much. (Applause.)

Now you're going to see how it works when you sign some of this legislation. (Applause.)

END 5:16 P.M. CDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Detroit, Michigan)

For Immediate Release October 25, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO 99TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF INTERNATIONAL
ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE

Cobo Arena
Detroit, Michigan

10:20 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Chief Vaughn, and all of you -- thank you very much. (Applause.) Thank you so much. I'm just delighted to be here. Thank you, Chief Vaughn, the president, for that kind introduction. And may I salute Steve Harris, who I understand is the incoming leader of this most distinguished group.

I don't know where you get that enthusiasm. I fell asleep in the ninth inning and I'm sure some of you stayed up until the 11th. (Laughter.) But nevertheless, may I salute the distinguished members of the board. And a special welcome to the Chiefs of Police from around the world.

You'll have to excuse me if I'm not talking today about the importance of international cooperation. But don't think I've lost it. I understand. And I hear it from the domestics chiefs, from the local chiefs, how important cooperation is with the international component represented here today. Whether it's in antinarcotics, or whether it's in antiterrorism, we are very, very grateful to those law enforcement officers from overseas who are here today, and to your colleagues who may not have made it to this wonderful convention.

I would simply say to you that you're choosing, or you have chosen a very interesting time to visit our great country -- the weather's turning colder, and if you turn on the TV you can't help but notice that there's an election going on in just -- and Barbara and I were talking about this a few minutes ago -- just nine days. In fact, some of the U.S. police chiefs here may ask if they can go back with you to your country until all this hectic yelling and shouting is over with.

But we are getting down to the home stretch, and so let me talk this morning about government's first and foremost domestic responsibility -- function, and that is to protect every citizen at home and on the street.

Let me start with a story that most of the domestic chiefs have heard about, probably the kind of story you hear about every day, but one that just sickened Barbara and me when we saw it on the news I believe it was about a month ago.

In broad daylight in a neighborhood near Washington D.C., a woman was forced from her car at a stop sign by two men, who then drove off. But the woman got tangled in her seatbelt outside the car. Or maybe she hung on. What mother wouldn't? You see, her baby was locked inside.

And that woman was dragged almost two miles before the thieves crushed her to death against a fence. And then they tossed her little baby out by the roadside, like some kind of a piece of trash.

And I know that on this special Sunday in this special audience I am preaching to the choir, but this sort of thing must provoke outrage. People who act like animals have no place in decent society and they should go to jail, and stay in jail. And I strongly support you and your effort to do just that. (Applause.)

I think when the history of this century is written, America -- it will see -- it will be clearly seen that America got too soft on crime in the 60's, and for twenty years you and your brothers and sisters in law enforcement paid for it. But we fought back, and for the first time in decades -- the overall crime index is actually down.

And with your help, your leadership, we've slowed the rate of violent crime the past 12 years. We are turning the tide on drugs. I take heart from the fact that there's 60 percent use of cocaine by teenagers. But as you can tell by comparing our crime statistics with other nations, we still have a way to go, a long way to go. And that's what I really want to talk to you about today.

There are so many issues in this presidential campaign where the voters have a clear choice. And crime is one of the most important. And I do have big differences with Governor Clinton on crime and law enforcement. And I would only ask a simple, objective look at the record. Records reveal it. And here are some facts. Under Governor Clinton, Arkansas' violent crime rate went up about 60 percent in the 80's -- more than twice the national average. They had the nation's single-biggest increase in serious crime during the decade.

In '83, there were about 300 violent crimes for every 100,000 people in Arkansas. Last year, there were almost 600 violent crimes. It has doubled on the Governor's watch. The average inmate there served less than one-fifth of his sentence last year. But the federal inmate, as I'm sure most know here, an inmate for which I had responsibility -- he served 85 percent of his time.

You can't obviously -- and I don't mean to leave that impression -- blame the dedicated law enforcement officers from that state. Because you've got to look behind that at the statistics. Arkansas ranks near the bottom for every important per-capita crime dollar that it spends -- 46th -- for police officers: 49th. Spending on judicial and legal systems, Arkansas ranks 50th. Dead last in the country.

And so, no wonder crime goes ballistic there during the 80's. You're supposed to handcuff criminals -- not tie the hands of the police.

It's obvious -- (applause) -- and I firmly believe, and I'll get to the positive aspects of this in a minute -- that that crime record, that Clinton record is wrong for Arkansas, and, clearly, it would be wrong for America. And if you don't believe me, ask the Fraternal Order of Police in Little Rock. They know the Clinton record better than anyone, and they're joining hands with their national organization -- to endorse me for President of the United States. (Applause.)

And I think they did take the time to look at the overall record -- the good news that you don't hear out there on the network news every night. And let me just tick off a few of our priorities.

Start with money. Since I took office, we've increased the crime budget by almost 50 percent. We've hired more than 1,200 new federal prosecutors since 1989, assigned 300 FBI agents to help you get the gang members off the streets -- and proposed a program to double federal spending for prison

space in the 1990's. We're working to stop the abuse of our appeals process, to enforce the death penalty, and to let your cops use evidence seized in good faith. (Applause.)

Since 1989, we've taken more than $400 million from criminals and used it to help the victims of crime. And we've also targeted the violent repeat offender, putting over 3,000 of those most dangerous fugitives in America behind bars in just a couple of months last spring.

Finally, we're helping to take back 20 worst inner-city neighborhoods. And, again, I salute the police chiefs and the law enforcement officers for this. Take it back with our acclaimed "Weed and Seed" program. Weed out the criminals and the drugs, and then seed the neighborhood with education and training. And, hopefully, if we can ever get enterprise zones enacted into law with jobs in the private sector.

Now, listen to Bernie Edwards, a 70-year-old resident of a tough neighborhood in Fort Worth, Texas -- Tarrant County. He saw Weed and Seed help to keep the young kids in his neighborhood off drugs and out of gangs. And he says, "For the first time in years I can sit on my porch. It sure feels good." There's example like example all across this country. And you know them far better than I do.

We've fought for these initiatives, though. Not just tough talk -- and we're taking action. But our action would be stronger if it were part of a national crime strategy supported by Congress.

That's why, 1,228 days ago, on June 15, 1989 -- the same day Mikhail Gorbachev first hinted that the Berlin Wall might someday come down -- I sent a comprehensive crime bill to Capitol Hill up to the Congress. And I extended my hand in partnership to Congress, and I asked for help fighting crime on a national level.

Since I first sent that bill to the Hill in 1989, 60,000 Americans have been murdered. There have been 260,000 rapes, 1.6 million robberies and 2.6 million assaults. And 69,000 of those violent crimes took place, regrettably, right here in Detroit.

Think about it. Enough Americans to fill Detroit's Cobo Hall four times over were brutalized by assault, rape or murder while that bill languished on Capitol Hill. No wonder Americans stare at every news every night, shake their heads and ask, why doesn't somebody do something about this incredible mess? People are dying in the streets.

Well, as frustrating as this crime bill has been for me, it is still my job as President to get results. And so we've fought and won a couple of big battles the past few weeks. And today I'm proud to announce that right after this speech, I'm going to sit down here at Cobo Hall and sign two of the crime initiatives that I've fought for -- two tough new federal laws.

The first one severely punishes carjackers. And we told -- (applause) -- and we told the Congress that I wanted to make armed carjacking a federal offense with harsh penalties. And thugs who take cars at gunpoint should sit in a cell so long that when they get out they're going to be too darn old to drive. (Applause.)

And the second one deals with parents -- mostly fathers -- who refuse to make child-support payments -- they're called "deadbeat dads". And right now, a single mother in Detroit can struggle to keep the kids fed on a small salary while their father's on a lark in Chicago. And he could be way behind in child support, but no one can touch him across state lines. Well, that's a disgrace, and now the long arm of the law can

reach over that border, and tell that dad to pay up, or go up the river.

Why did these two ideas become law? Because national attention created national outrage that brought pressure on Congress to act. It's a formula I want to use again and again in the next four years.

You see, there are at least six other initiatives that Congress didn't pass -- that I care a great deal about and that I think would benefit your work. So next year, with a new Congress -- and there's going to be a new one. You might ask why and I would say to some of the foreign officials here you have been spared the sight of a Congress controlled by one group for 38 years that can't even run a two-bit bank or a two-bit post office. And so there's going to be a lot of new members. (Applause.) And those members, regardless of what party, are going to do what the people want. They'll be listening to the same voters I do. And so, then we're going to go after them and we're going to be given a new Congress. And with 150 new members next session -- maybe up to that many in the House -- we're going to pass those six items into law, too.

And here they are: Number one, I want to strengthen the laws dealing with sexual and domestic violence. It's bad enough -- (applause) -- it's bad enough when a woman is brutally attacked in the first place. Then, she takes the stand for testimony and gets attacked by some clever lawyers. And I say that's two attacks too many. And so we're going to go after tightening up these laws. (Applause.)

Two, I want repeat armed offenders behind bars until trial. Today, even a repeat rapist can get arrested and be out on bond hours later. I say, detain him until the trial, let the prosecution use past behavior against him. (Applause.) Right now, certain little details often can't even be mentioned in court. Like the fact that everyone within a country mile knows the guy's done this before. And that's wrong. Let him face what he's done and pay for it.

We've got to -- on the second major point here, we've got to crush gang violence. I want the gangs to be treated like the criminal enterprises that they are, so we can go after the leaders with federal medicine that they deserve. And I want to toughen penalties for using juveniles in crimes. (Applause.) I've talked to many chiefs about this, and they tell me that gangs send out these under-age kids -- send them out to do the dirty work of the leaders, and because they're minors who will get off easy if they're caught. That's disgraceful.

I remember going out to South Central in L.A. and hearing about two that were apprehended by the law enforcement community. I think they were 13 or 14. And they had been assigned targets to fire bomb during the outbreaks -- two little kids. It's a heartbreak. It's disgraceful. We've got to go after the big guys, make the big boys pay -- those that would use little kids in this way. (Applause.)

And, three: Protection for the elderly. It's absurd that the folks who have contributed to society all their lives have to live in terror just because some young punks see them as an easy target.

And I want to beef up the laws, so instead of stalking the streets -- (applause) -- and mugging grandmothers, they're down at the precinct, mugging for the police camera. (Laughter and applause.) Four -- and I've heard from many of you on this one, and we promise you we're going to keep on trying -- habeas corpus reform. (Applause.) Habeas corpus? Yes, habeas corpus should protect the innocent. But it's turned into a perversion of the law.

Some petitions can drag on for more than a decade, more than 10 years. And criminal lawyers are abusing the law to postpone justice, and it's time we put a stop to it. Let them have one habeas petition and be done with it. (Applause.)

Five -- and I know this one's controversial, but I'll tell you exactly how strongly I feel about it -- and I'm talking about a federal death penalty. I think certain acts of violence deserve the ultimate penalty. The sentence should be carried out fairly, but swiftly. Assassinations, murder for hire, terrorism, random drive-by shootings, gang massacres, and certainly and especially the killing of a police officer. All must pay with the death sentence. (Applause.)

And there is another collateral point here, and that has to do with justices. And I notice that Governor Clinton is here today with Mario Cuomo. But Governor Clinton has mentioned Cuomo for the Supreme Court. And it is my conviction to get this kind of tough crime legislation through, that we must not go back to appointing judges to the Court who oppose tough anticrime measures, who oppose the death penalty for these most heinous of crimes. (Applause.)

And the sixth one is firearms. This one's short and sweet. I want much tougher penalties for the criminal use of firearms.

So there's a lot of work to be done. But America's worth it. For every hardened criminal you face down, there are countless thousands of good and decent Americans out there with strong values and big hearts. And you don't hear much from them. But I happen to know on good authority that they certainly appreciate you, and I know because so many people tell me this.

So, in conclusion, let me just pass it on to you: America stands behind you. And you should never understand some of these crazy liberal appeals as an attack on our law enforcement officers. And I am with you 100 percent, bringing to bear the full weight of the federal government. And on behalf of all those unheard but grateful Americans, I really do thank you. I thank your families.

I know sometimes it must be a real strain when your chief or your officer goes out there and you're not going to know how he's going to be treated by these thug elements out on the street. So we can identify with that. And I really came here to say thank you to every single one of you for putting your lives on the line for us every single day.

Now you pass it on -- that support -- and go back and tell your brave men and women that we appreciate you and we need you all. You've done so much already. But let's face it, there is much more to be done. And to do it, I'd be remiss if I saw this many voters out here if I didn't say to you I need your support and I ask for your vote on November 3rd -- (applause) -- because I want to be in Washington for four more years.

Thank you. And may God bless our great country on this beautiful fall day. (Applause.) May God bless the United States. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END 10:40 A.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Denver, Colorado)

For Immediate Release October 26, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO ACE HARDWARE CONVENTION

Colorado Convention Center
Denver, Colorado

10:55 A.M. MST

THE PRESIDENT: What a great welcome. (Applause.) Thank you very, very much. Thank you all. (Applause.) That was just first-class. Roger -- please be seated -- and, Roger, thank you. My heavens. What a wonderful -- I'm kind of glad I'm running against Clinton instead of this guy, I'll tell you. (Laughter and applause.)

No, but when he was citing those values and what you all stand for about hard work, it really resonates. And I'm very grateful to Roger Peterson. I want to thank your chairman, who just met me, greeted us out there in the hall -- Richard Laskowski; say to your executive vice president, David Hodnick -- thank him for, I'm sure, a lot of the arrangements in all of this. And I am just really pleased to be here.

I was accompanied here today by one of Colorado's congressmen, Congressman Dan Schaefer, doing a great job for our country in the Congress. And also with Terry Considine, a great friend, who I'm convinced is going to be the next senator from here. So we brought a little political clout to this nonpolitical meeting. (Applause.)

And somewhere over here also is one of the unique characters in the whole United States Senate, a legend not only in this time, but I expect will live forever as a great down-to-earth American. I'm talking about Wyoming's Al Simpson, who is here -- one of the great, great U.S. senators. (Applause.)

And so I'm delighted to be here. And, you know, hardware stores are viewed -- I listed carefully to Roger, but I knew it -- hardware stores are viewed as the typical small business, literally the foundation of our economy. And when you talk hardware -- okay, I've heard it -- Ace is the place. (Applause.) So put it down this way: I'm the guy that honored and I'm the one that's very, very pleased to share a few minutes here with you and to salute those men and women who really are the backbone of small business in this country.

I would say that my friends over there in the national media -- we've got a little bit of a thing going here, because I like holding up a bumper sticker. It says "Annoy the Media; Re-elect Bush." (Applause.) And I say it with total good humor, but great conviction, I might add. (Laughter.) So I'm sure some of them want to know why I stopped by this convention. And the truth is -- I need a few tools. You see -- (laughter) -- I've got some work to do around my house, and I don't plan moving out for another four years. (Applause.)

Oh, heavens. But now let me just try to put things in perspective. One week from tomorrow -- it's hard to believe that one week from tomorrow American voters are going to choose a President -- not just the President of the United States, but really the leader of the entire world, given the demise of international communism. In many ways we're going to be choosing a future. And I believe that this election comes down to three fundamental questions. Who has the vision for America's future? Who has the road map to get us to that future? And then, fundamentally, who can you trust -- when we hit those unexpected bumps, those crises that lie ahead, inevitably?

Let's begin by talking the question of philosophy -- whose vision makes more sense to you. My opponents say that this election is about change, and I agree. But being in favor of change is like being in favor of breathing. The real question is not who is for change, but whose change will make life better for all Americans.

And a philosopher once observed that "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." And so let's see where we've been over the past four years. We won a 50-year Cold War because we stood up for ideals. Communism versus freedom -- (applause) -- freedom finished first. (Applause.)

You know, the Cold War was defined for half a century, in ways large and small. It claimed literally millions of lives -- and crushed the spirit of millions of others. And here in America, the Cold War defined us -- financially, economically, even psychologically.

And my kids -- and many of you out here -- grew up crawling under desks in these "duck and cover" drills. In the '60s during the Cuban Missile crisis, we stood on the brink of Armageddon. In the '80s, families huddled together in fear to watch a TV movie called, "The Day After." And always, the shadow of the Cold War lingered right outside our windows.

You talk change -- well, all that has changed with our leadership. And because of that change, our children go to sleep tonight without that same fear of nuclear war. And we should be proud that we gave this gift to them. (Applause.) But if we were the Cold War victors, we have yet to receive the spoils. There's little celebration in America today, instead a nagging anxiety. A feeling that it's time to turn our attention to challenges at home -- to creating new industries, and better schools, and affordable health care. And whose philosophy should we follow to get there?

Well, we've seen in recent years the power of a tank or a gun, but the power of a simple idea is what we've really seen -- an idea called freedom. In Asia, in Eastern Europe, South America, Mexico -- people are coming to understand that government is neither superior nor savior -- it is and must be their savior -- their servant.

And in the midst of a worldwide economic slowdown -- our free-market economy remains afloat, while many nations are drowning. We are growing faster than Japan, faster than Germany, faster than Canada. But here's the irony. At the very moment when the rest of the world is moving our way, my opponent, Governor Clinton, wants us to move their way.

Governor Clinton says he is -- quote -- "different" than the old tax-and-spend liberals. But if you look at the details of what he offers, you see $150 billion in new taxes -- more than Mondale and Dukakis combined. And you see at least $220 billion already in new spending -- just to begin to pay for all the promises.

With each program Governor Clinton puts forth, you see a philosophy where bureaucrats in Washington or some entrenched members of Congress carve out the exact same programs -- to try and solve problems facing people in Denver, and Dallas, or Dover, or Delaware. And I believe Americans understand that these old liberal solutions are not right for our new postwar era.

It does not make sense that hardware store owners will somehow get richer by giving more of your money to the IRS. (Applause.) And it doesn't make sense that we will get this terrible deficit down by giving more money to the government to spend. At a time when every organization is decentralizing power, why turn back to a central bureaucracy in Washington? (Applause.)

And yet, saying that is not enough, because, of course, we have real problems. Our children won't be able to compete unless our schools are literally reinvented. The cost of health care is skyrocketing. We have to get it down. And so government can't just keep the tanks running, government must help people.

During this campaign, many have sought to portray the choice between a -- quote -- "activist" government and a trickle-down approach to government. But that is wrong. The real choice is not between activism and passivity. The real choice is between a liberal, activist government that seeks to impose solutions on individuals, families and the private sector -- and a conservative, activist government that gives individuals, businesses and families the means to make their own choices through competition and economic opportunity. (Applause.)

We know one size does not fit all. We know the American people are individuals -- each with their own needs and skills and, yes, dreams. And so our activist approach gives more power to individuals, families and businesses -- so you can choose what is best.

Let me give you just a couple of specific examples here. Start with education. Governor Clinton worked with me -- and I give him great credit for this -- when we set six national education goals -- the very first time in history that the governors came together with the President to set these national education goals. And as I say, Governor Clinton deserves credit for that.

But if elected President, Governor Clinton wants to pour more money into the same failed education system -- a system where funds are controlled tightly by central bureaucracies; where powerful teachers unions block real reform; and where we spend as much per pupil as any nation but Switzerland -- but don't get an adequate return on our investment.

But if the system is broken, tinkering around the margins won't do the job. And so I want to use competition to improve our schools. I want to provide scholarships for elementary and high school students so that every parent, rich and poor alike, can choose the best schools for their kids -- public, private, or religious. (Applause.) Give the parents a choice. And competition will make all these schools better. (Applause.)

This same principle -- you live by this principle on your work. You see the same thing in health care. Governor Clinton has offered three plans in this campaign. One said to all of you, either offer care -- small businesses, remember -- either offer care on your own or pay a new payroll tax -- at least seven percent. Many experts said it was a back-door way to government directly involved in running health care.

And now he offers a slightly different plan, but he still wants to control the price of health care by setting up a gigantic board in Washington -- not unlike what the government tried to do with gasoline in the 1970s.

And I say we don't need to sock you with a new tax, and we don't want to tell you what doctor to see, and we don't need to inflict you with any more mandates from Washington, D.C. (Applause.)

How about tax incentives for small businesses, so that you can afford to buy health care on your own. Or let small businesses pool coverage, to get the advantage, so you can get the same price breaks as the AT&Ts and IBMs. Government can't control prices by fiat, but competition can bring prices down. And for people who are too poor to pay taxes -- we will give vouchers -- the poorest of the poor will receive vouchers so that they can choose the care that best suits them.

Freedom. Power -- choice for people. You see this philosophical difference in every area. I trust you to choose the best child care for your kids. My opponent says trusts the government. I trust you, with the right incentives, to figure out how to give your employees parental leave -- my opponent says government should tell you how to do that. I favor parental leave. I do not favor more mandates on small business. (Applause.)

I trust entrepreneurs to place their bets on the growth industries of the future -- you've got a big difference here -- my opponent thinks government can do as good as job, if not better.

Governor Clinton talks about government -- and here's the word he used -- "investing" your money. I talk about cutting capital gains taxes, investment tax allowances to small business, because you know what to do with your money -- better than any bureaucrat. A big difference between government investment and investment in the private sector. (Applause.)

Governor Clinton says we need professional politicians in Washington, who won't get anything done. I trust Americans' judgement so much that I want to limit the terms of members of Congress -- and give the government back to the people. (Applause.) The republic has been able to survive with the presidents having limited terms; I'd like to try it out on some of these old geezers in Congress -- wouldn't hurt them a damn bit. (Applause.)

You see -- here's my point -- there's a conservative agenda for helping people. It's an activist agenda -- that empowers people not the bureaucracies. It gives people power to make their own choices, control their own lives, create their own destinies.

And I believe that even in these challenging times these ideas make more sense to the American people than the siren song of higher taxes, more spending, bigger government in Washington. Now, it all sounds great -- but how do you translate words into action? After all, people are sick and tired of gridlock and they want to turn Washington into a "bicker free" zone.

Well, many of the ideas that I've talked about are already underway. In child care, for example, we succeeded in passing legislation that literally allows parents to choose their kids' care, whether it's a government agency or a church down the street.

But with a new Congress -- and it's going to be new not just in the sense of reforming, a new Congress is going to have 150 new members maybe; certainly over 100 -- we have a historic opportunity, to push this agenda even further, literally to renew America.

In September, I laid out what we call an Agenda for American Renewal. It's a comprehensive, integrated approach to fixing our schools, reforming health care, right-sizing government and creating here in America the world's first $10 trillion economy. My agenda includes 13 first-year priorities, but three really dwarf all others.

First -- America needs jobs. Not two years from now, not next fall, we need them today. I understand what it takes to create jobs. I built a business myself -- small business -- met a payroll. And I have a big difference here because Governor Clinton wants you to send more of your money to Washington, remember, to invest, and say the government will invest it for you. And I say, let's cut out the middle man. We don't need that. (Applause.) We'll put together a package to give you incentives to grow, to further cut -- and I've got to do well on this one in the next four years; we've made some progress -- but further cut red tape and regulation, and make more credit available.

Right now, we have $150 billion -- one of the things we did get passed in the last Congress, Senator Simpson and Congressman Schaefer taking lead roles in this -- $150 billion in money for highways. We'll make sure that that money gets to the states just as soon as possible -- and get those steamrollers moving quickly, so that your customers will have more money in their pockets.

While we're strengthening -- while we're strengthening our business, we must -- and I will -- open new markets for our products by winning congressional approval of our free trade treaty with Canada and Mexico. (Applause.) This is the bottom line: More trade creates more American high-paying jobs -- jobs for all Americans. It is exports that have saved us in this global slowdown, global recession. And is exports that are going to lead the way out of this with jobs for American manufacturers and American services.

Our immediate third priority is health care. And I already mentioned some of the ideas, but the need for action is urgent. And we simply cannot control the deficit, we can't make our companies even more competitive, until make health care more affordable and more accessible for you and all that work with you. (Applause.)

As we are working on these priorities, we're going to be working on others. We'll take new steps to reform our education and legal system. Our children will not be able to compete unless we reinvent -- literally reinvent our schools -- K through 12. And our society will be drained of precious resources unless we start suing each other less and caring for each other more. (Applause.)

It is a crying shame that these crazy lawsuits have gotten out of control. I have tried for three years to get the Congress to move on tort reform and on limiting some of these outrageous claims. Because when a doctor can't deliver a baby for fear of being sued or has to run the price of your health care up to protect against a suit; or when a Little League coach won't dare coach; or when a guy driving along the highway sees an accident on the side and says, well, I better not stop because somebody might sue me if I move the body here -- move this poor guy off the road -- we've got to do something -- stand up to these trial lawyers, and get these lawsuits under control. (Applause.)

My plan includes reducing the deficit, not by raising taxes, but by getting control of spending. And we need a balanced budget amendment. We need a line-item veto. And we need to cap -- (applause) -- and we need to cap the growth -- the growth of these mandatory programs, except Social Security. And we need a check-off on your tax return, so you, the taxpayer, can earmark up to 10

percent of your taxes to be used for nothing but to get the debt off our children's shoulders. (Applause.)

Some of you are from urban America, and to you I say we must restore hope to our inner cities. And so I will work with the new Congress to get tougher crime laws, to fight the drug problem, to reform the welfare system, and to attract and keep business -- all using this principle of putting faith and power not in bureaucracies, but in real people.

And we'll further -- we will further expand free trade -- using our stature as world's number one superpower -- to reach new trade agreements with countries in Europe and Asia.

And perhaps most important, we'll reform and right-size the government -- subject it to the same discipline as every other large organization in America. And we'll cut the White House staff by a third -- and look to Congress to match our action. (Applause.) And until we get all these things under control, we'll -- at the outset we will take five percent off the salary of the best-paid federal employees. Unfortunately, that includes the President, too, but I'll do my share. And we will abolish these political action committees -- get rid of them. (Applause.) We will limit the term members of Congress -- (applause) -- we will limit the terms of members of Congress and we will try in every way to give the government back to the people. (Applause.)

I know some of you come from communities that have been heavily impacted by defense cuts. And one of the great things about our performance in the Cold War -- yours and ours -- has been that we've been able to cut back on some defense. But a critical part of this reorganization will be to help our defense industry adjust now to a peacetime economy. Immediately following the election, I will assemble a defense conversion council. And it will include every necessary Cabinet agency and work closely with key members of the United States Congress.

And we're already directing more weapons research in our great labs -- our great national labs -- to civilian use and retraining military personnel. And to support this plan, this effort, I plan to create in my next budget submission a fund for future generations. And that fund would provide seed monies to help defense sector and civilian firms form joint partnerships to use the knowledge we've gained from building weapons to building a stronger economy.

And that is my immediate agenda -- and it builds on the foundation that we have laid for the last four years. It's what I've been talking about on the campaign trail -- and what I will fight for in my second term.

But I believe each candidate owes you more than his agenda, but what specifically will he do to get it done. As the support for Ross Perot has made clear, there is a strong desire for a new coalition in America -- to overcome gridlock, to get the job done. And with 150 new members of Congress from both parties, we will move quickly to respond to the demands of the people.

And I plan to use the time from November 4th through convening of the new Congress to meet with all the new members of Congress, regardless of party, and to shape a legislative package in a way that will guarantee swift passage. (Applause.)

You know, the best time to move is when you're reelected. No more elections ahead. No worry about the future politics. Just get the people's business done and do it fast. (Applause.)

A committee has been called a cul-de-sac -- down which ideas are lured and strangled to death. And if this is true, than the modern Congress has become a giant subdivision --(laughter) -- good ideas go in and they never come out again. (Laughter and applause.) And so we will seek agreement with the congressional leaders to form a steering group that can help ride herd over Congress, to make sure our legislative package does not get bogged down. And we'll set deadlines for decisions, and we'll meet them. And we can mobilize for war. We can mobilize for hurricanes. Let's mobilize for our economy -- and get this country moving again. (Applause.)

And if we need to, we'll go beyond Washington. Already, our American 2,000 education reform effort involves parents, teachers and business leaders in over 1,700 communities. And this will be a model for other efforts. America's desire for positive change requires building new coalitions, taking advantage of grassroots power -- and we will.

Now, that's the action plan. But what about Governor Clinton? Well, in June, he promised to present his 100-day plan even before the election. It's eight days away -- we have not had a sighting yet. (Laughter.) No plan has been sighted.

And here's why: His plan simply does not add up. He's promised too much. And his new congressional friends want to raise the ante even higher. The result will be much higher spending and taxes and a much bigger deficit, or continued gridlock in Washington.

And my agenda can break the gridlock without breaking the bank. And it is ambitious, but is doable. And with it we can start to make progress on our fundamental challenges and match the peace of mind in the world, with the peace of mind right here at home.

Finally, a word about character. In the final analysis, it is my view that this election is going to be decided on character and trust. Horace Greeley -- I mentioned this in the debate out in Michigan -- Horace Greeley once said that character is the only thing that endures. And I think that's especially true in the presidency. Character matters, not just because of the plans you make, but the crises that you never foresee. A friend of mine says character is real simple. He says it's acting alone the way you would act with a million people watching.

And as President, you're never more alone than at times of crisis. And while nobody may be watching in the Oval Office, millions, literally millions, will feel the impact of your judgment.

And it is easy in the aftermath of Desert Storm to portray the decision to go to war as an easy one, but it was not. And it was not uniformly popular. And the Democratic Congress had spent much of the fall parading experts up there, if you'll remember, to Capitol Hill, who said we'd get into -- quote -- "another Vietnam." And the thing that hurt the most or that made me think the most was the horrible tales of the numbers of body bags that we would be responsible for if we made a commitment to send somebody else's son, somebody else's daughter to war. The critics said a war would kill any hope for peace in the Middle East.

And the vote in the Congress -- it was a cliffhanger; not overwhelming. And many said, let's give sanctions more time. But I made a decision to go to war because I knew it was right, not because I knew it was popular.

And I remember well the cold, rainy February day at Camp David when ground war to liberate Kuwait began, and how fervently I

prayed that our plans would work and our young men and women would return home, victorious and alive. This is an awesome responsibility to ask our young people to knock early on death's door. And it is a responsibility I have tried to fulfill with honor and duty and, above all, honesty, integrity to the American people. But that's your call. (Applause.)

That's the wonderful thing about this system. And, yes, I confess it's been an ugly year. But that's the wonderful thing, because it is your call on November 3rd. Then the polls and all these deadly talking heads we see on these Sunday television shows, each getting $500 bucks to tell us what we think -- it doesn't matter anymore. They don't matter anymore. It's up to the American people.

And when you enter that voting booth, ask yourself three common sense questions: Who has the right vision for America's future? Who can get us from here to there? And which character has the character? And who would you trust with your family or with the United States of America in a crisis?

Ideas. Action. Character. I have tried very hard to demonstrate all three. So I came out here to Ace to ask for your support on November 3rd. (Applause.)

Thank you and may God bless -- (applause) -- may God bless our great country, the United States of America. Thank you very, very much. (Applause.)

END 11:33 A.M. MST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Miami, Florida)

For Immediate Release October 23, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN SIGNING CEREMONY FOR H.R. 5006,
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Omni Hotel
Miami, Florida

5:48 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very, very much. And may I thank Armando for that warm introduction -- and all of you for this reception. I am very, very pleased to be here. It's great to be among so many friends. And this is a very special day, and we've got one standing up here who deserves very special credit -- our great Senator Connie Mack. (Applause.) And also a great friend, Congressman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen -- (applause) -- joined in the Congress now by Lincoln -- Lincoln Diaz Balart. (Applause.) And may I salute the veterans of the 2506 Brigade who are here -- (applause) -- heroes of America and heroes in your homeland. (Applause.)

Tomas Garcia Fuste and Armando Cadina, Perez Roura -- (applause) -- Ariel Remos, and, of course, let me recognize another old friend, Carlos Salman -- (applause) -- and Al Cardenas and Jorge Mas -- (applause.) Where's Jorge? Hey, Jorge is the only guy that can take on that 60 Minutes crowd and come out ahead. You know, that was very good. (Laughter.) He did. he did just great, and he's one of the key forces, of course, as so many in this room -- but he was one of the very key forces behind this Cuban Democracy Act. And let me offer a special recognition to the representatives of La Unidad -- champions of a free Cuba. (Applause.)

Now, we share a history -- a commitment to struggle. We've worked years toward this single goal -- common dream -- because everyone here wants a free and democratic Cuba. Today I am delighted to take the next step toward that dream with the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992. Our policies and principles rest on a single belief: For freedom to rise in Cuba Fidel Castro must fall. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Viva Bush! Viva Bush! Viva Bush!

THE PRESIDENT: In today's democratic world, communist governments no longer hold sway. And Cuba's special relationship with the former Soviet Union has all but ended. And we've worked to ensure that no other government helps this, the cruelest of regimes. (Applause.) And the result: literally, you look around the world and you see that Castro has literally become an outcast among dictators. He's not a leader, he's what you call a warden. His beaches are not borders -- but his confines of freedom.

And the tide is running out. For years, this Cuban community has energized Miami. Someday freedom-loving people will change that island for the better -- just like America has changed the entire world. (Applause.) And none of should rest and relax until we stop those who mock the rights that we treasure: Rights of speech, religion, assembly, and economic freedom.

One hundred years ago the Abraham Lincoln of Cuba, that great patriot Jose Marti, said simply, "To beautify life is to give it an aim." To beautify life is to give it an aim -- and I agree with that. Our aim is human liberty -- (applause) --

AUDIENCE: Viva Bush! Viva Bush! Viva Bush!

THE PRESIDENT: People are choosing liberty all over the world by their votes. The Cuban people deserve no less. That's why this Cuban Democracy Act strengthens our embargo. It will speed the inevitable demise of the Cuban Castro dictatorship.

The legislation that I sign today reflects our determination -- mine and yours -- that the Cuban government will not benefit from U.S. trade or aid until the Cuban people are free. And it reflects another belief. I'm not going to let others prop up Castro with aid or some sweetheart trade deal.

All of this is not designed to hurt the Cuban people. I am saddened by their suffering and loss of freedom. Many of you in this room have families there, and I'm saddened by families that are split apart. Sons and daughters lost at sea. And let's make it clear: Cuba suffers because Castro refuses to change.

Our policy and this bill allow for humanitarian donations of food and medicine to nongovernment organizations in Cuba -- help that will get to the Cuban people. And it allows for improved communications between the United States and Cuba, so that all of you can maintain contact with family members.

Our policy is the only way to put it plain and simple: "Democracy, Mr. Castro -- not sometime, not some day, but now. (Applause.) Put it this way -- put it this way -- we simply will not provide life support to a dictatorship which is dying. There will never be normal relations with Cuba as long as Castro sustains this illegitimate regime -- as long as he intimidates and does violence to a brave and courageous people.

I have challenged him before, and now I challenge him again. Mr. Castro, let a United Nations human rights representative come to your island nation. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Viva Bush! Viva Bush! Viva Bush!

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Castro, put your leadership to the test of the ballot box and let your people decide. (Applause.) And call off your secret police -- and let the Cuban people choose their leaders and their future. Let your people live in freedom. That is the message to Cuba today. (Applause.)

You know, when Cuba is free, a million free Cuban Americans will be united with their long-suffering Cuban brothers. Nowhere has the pain and anguish of family separation been more eloquently stated than in a letter that Barbara received from Major Orestes Lorenzo, who is with us here today. Where is the Major -- right here. (Applause.)

As all of you know, he heroically escaped from Cuba when he flew his MiG to South Florida a year and a half ago and asked for political asylum. But he could not free his family. Despite humanitarian pleas from the world over, Castro keeps Vicky, Major Lorenzo's wife, and their two little sons, Alexander and Reyniel, hostage there in Cuba.

I want to say to the Major here today, and to all of you, that I will keep working until all Cuban families are united again in freedom. (Applause.) You know, Castro likes to say that any person who wants to leave Cuba may go. Well, all it takes, he says, is an American visa. Well, over a year ago, we issued a visa for the Major's family -- and still they're barred

from leaving that country. And the answer is today to Mr. Castro: Do what's decent. Do what's right. You say everybody can leave -- let the Lorenzo family go. (Applause.)

One cannot help with the emotion, looking around this room and seeing the commitment here. I get it in a very special way, obviously, through my son, Jeb, who's a friend to many here; and through my dear friend, Armando Cadina, who introduced me, who makes -- who sensitizes me to this struggle that everyone in this room has been involved in.

And we've been in this. And I say "we" proudly. We've been in this for a long time, and we are not going to back away from this commitment. We're not going to listen to these editorials that tell me how to run the foreign policy of this country and to change this policy. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: We are not going to quit until -- we've got a little enthusiasm over here -- until that is achieved. And you must remember that this administration -- and I am the President who pressed the Soviets and the Russians to cut back their support and pull out their troops and send an unmistakable signal to Cuba of its complete isolation.

And we're the ones, you and I together, who urged our friends in Latin America to let Castro know that he's out of things, he's a has-been. And it is my firm belief that during -- I really believe this -- that during my second term as President, you will be reunited with your loved ones. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Viva Bush! Viva Bush! Viva Bush!

THE PRESIDENT: And I am certain in my heart that I will be the first American President to set foot on the soil of a free and independent Cuba. (Applause.)

Thank you. Thank you all. And God bless you. And now I will sign the Defense Authorization Act -- giving the force of law to the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992. (Applause.)

END 6:15 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Lafayette, Louisiana

For Immediate Release October 24, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN "ASK GEORGE BUSH"

Acadiana High School
Lafayette, Louisiana

5:50 P.M. CDT

THE PRESIDENT: Kind of the Phil Donahue of southern Louisiana. (Laughter.) But let me just say to all the people in this great state, a state in which I used to work and in an area -- this one -- an area in which I used to work, that we have just come from signing a very important piece of national legislation. I signed the National Energy Strategy Bill. (Applause.) And those who work in the oil fields and do either drilling or production or the service work should know that the IPAA has just suggested that the legislation we signed will result in 45,000 more jobs in the oil patch next year and -- (applause) -- many more rigs running.

That brings us to a major difference that I have with the Clinton-Gore ticket on this question of energy. Senator Gore was quoted in California -- and I don't have -- I didn't write down the exact quote, but it is going to be played verbatim with his voice tomorrow -- that he thought the ban on offshore drilling that exists in California should be extended to all the coastal waters of the United States.

AUDIENCE: Booo --

THE PRESIDENT: And I don't agree with that. And that's an exact quote. It will be played with his voice. Obviously he is now doing what Governor Clinton is doing, and that's waffling -- say, well, I didn't mean it like that. But you can't do that. You cannot go to Santa Barbara, California, and say one thing and then come to southern Louisiana or the coast of Texas and say another. Not if you want to be President of the United States. (Applause.)

I am -- you caught me on an up day. I am absolutely -- I am going to get to some questions but I've got to finish this one pitch. (Laughter.) We've had a long, long, long trail here and one of the worst years I've ever seen in terms of politics. My favorite bumper sticker is "Annoy the Media -- Reelect Bush." (Applause.)

And people know what I mean. People know fair play when they see it. But the great thing about this kind of event is you can take the questions, you can take your case directly to the people. In this instance, the people of Louisiana. So I'll be glad to take -- I don't know how we're going to proceed here but I'll be glad to follow my leader.

Q I personally think some good things are going to be in store for you in this great country of ours November 3rd. How do you do feel about the election on Tuesday?

THE PRESIDENT: Better than I do about this mike. (Laughter.) No, I do feel that, I have said all along, I believe we're going to win. I believe we're going to win for -- (applause) -- because we have the best program.

We are caught up in a global slowdown, a global recession. To listen to Clinton and Gore, they would say it's all my fault. Unlike them, when I make a mistake I say so. But we are caught up in something global and what we're trying to do is lead the way out of this by increasing our exports, by holding the line on government spending and taxes, and by providing incentives to small business. That will get this economy going. (Applause.)

And that is why I believe I will win. And also there's another thing, and it's called character and trust. And in the debate -- (applause) -- in the debate Governor Clinton said, in Richmond, Virginia, "it's not the character of the presidency, it's the character of -- he said, it's not the character of the President, but the character of the presidency.

Wrong. They are interacted. They're locked. (Applause.) And you better be -- if you're going to be there in the Oval Office and a situation comes up like Desert Storm, you can't have it both ways. He said, I favored the minority position -- that's a paraphrase; and this is the exact quote -- "but I guess I would have voted with the majority." You cannot do that if you want to lead. You can't be all things to all people.

And so I believe character and trust are making a difference. And I think Barbara and I -- we've tried very hard to uphold the trust that any President gets who is privileged to serve in the Oval Office. And I think in the final analysis, when people go into the voting both, that is what's going to make me reelected for four more years. (Applause.)

Go ahead, get them going. (Applause.) You've got the question? There's one right behind you. He's next. This guy's next. Go ahead.

Q I just want to say that we're rooting for you. And I want to ask you how you like AHS so far? (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: Like what?

Q How you like Acadiana High so far?

THE PRESIDENT: All right. I like it so far. A very compatible group and very friendly people. And I would repeat -- I used to have offices down here along -- our company -- a little companies down in Morgan City and Cameron and Ulma, and indeed for Lafayette for a while. And so I feel comfortable and at home here.

All right. Yes, sir.

Q Clinton and them can't touch you on foreign policy, so they're trying to play this game that somehow or the other they have something better for us in the economic area. And what I don't understand is that for years you've been sending plans on education, on the economy and so forth to Congress, but it doesn't seem to get out to the people. And I would like to know -- get some comments on that.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me comment. And it's a very important point. We were able to get some key things done in the early days before the Democrats -- and I'd say liberal Democrats -- who control both Houses of Congress made a determination. And that determination was about a year-and-a-half ago that nothing good was going to happen on my watch. Early on, I held out my hand to them. In the first State of the Union, I said, let's leave -- put aside the bickering and let's get something done.

We did. We got a child care act that gives parents the choice of where to put their kids and what kind of child

care. We've got an ADA, an Americans with Disabilities bill, the best piece of civil rights legislation in a long time. And it says to somebody disabled, we're going to help you get into the mainstream; not be on some program, but work your way into the mainstream with the kind of assistance we can give.

And we had several other accomplishments. We got a good highway bill last year -- $150 billion to start building the infrastructure. We got homeownership going.

But in the last few, couple of years -- the last year or so, they've made a determination. The only way they can win is if they convince the American people how bad everything is and that I'm not doing anything about it. And so I have had to veto legislation that's come my way to protect the taxpayer.

We've got a good energy program. Fortunately, we did get through, and to give credit, it was bipartisan to get that passed. We've got a good energy program. But we're hung up on things that would help the city. I believe in enterprise zones to bring jobs into the cities, give tax credits. I believe in much more in the way of homeownership. I believe our Weed and Seed program to ferret out the criminals and then help people in the neighborhoods stay -- a fight against drugs is a very important program. And we're not getting the support from the Congress and there's a gridlock.

But here's why it will change. Because the Congress, controlled by one phase of the Democratic Party for 38 years -- 38 years they've controlled the House of Representatives. Those guys can't run a two-bit post office or a lousy little bank. (Applause.) And now, though -- now, though, because of that you're going to see at least 100 new members. And I'm going to say, look, the country is tired of gridlock. Here's my Agenda for America's Renewal. Here are our priorities. Now let's work together -- Democrat, Republican, whoever. Form new coalitions. And in that first 120 days, let's get something done for the people, the people that are hurting in this country. (Applause.)

Q Mr. President, I'm a senior here at Acadiana. I was wondering, we've been hearing all this talk about the middle class. What parts of Governor Clinton's economic policy should the middle class America be worried about?

THE PRESIDENT: I'd be worried about tax increases. He says, I want to raise taxes $150 billion and I want to spend $200 billion. And he says, don't worry about it, though, this will come out of the rich. There aren't enough rich guys around. There aren't enough to make that two percent of the -- raise the -- out of the top two percent, raise the revenues he wants.

I believe -- and I was told this. I don't watch these deadly talk shows any Sunday anymore. I can't stand them. All they do is make me angry. (Applause.) But I heard that one of them that his spokesman kind of admitted that they were going to have to sock it to people that made over -- I don't know what it was -- $40,000 or $50,000. I'm telling you it's going to hit $25,000 if you do all the things he talked about on top of the $220 billion that he's got.

Health care is a good example. We've got a good program through tax credits and through vouchers to bring insurance to the poorest of the poor. It keeps the quality of medicine up. It goes against these crazy malpractice lawsuits that are costing medical care $25 billion to $50 billion. (Applause.) And it does not sock a tax on the middle class.

But the Clinton program was at one point -- I don't know whether it's changed recently -- but was at one point aimed directly at about a seven percent tax on the middle class, the

small business people that would end up hitting the middle class. Small businesspeople are not big, rich guys with over $200,000.

So we've got big differences in those and many other areas.

Q Mr. President, I just want to say it's an honor to be in this room with you. Concerning small business, my family owns a small construction company. We do a lot of federal highway work. And I want to know when you're reelected how you can help us to cut back on insurance, because insurance is eating all small businesses alive.

THE PRESIDENT: Andy, I wish I had an easy answer for you on that one. I'm thinking here as to how that can be done. The only way it's going to be done is through more competition. Maybe that will come with more growth. But in terms of saying to you there's a government program to do it, I must tell you I don't think there is.

Q Is there any way small businesses can be grouped together?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that's the program we're using in health care, and yes, that might be a very good approach for business. But I believe it ought to be done through the auspices of business without the government in it. But it can be done, because when you pool like we're talking about for health care a small grocery store in a -- somebody, a mom and pop shop across the street, that they all get together, and we facilitate, that prices will go down and the insurance coverage will be more extensive.

So the principle is good. I'm just not sure that I can say that the government ought to do it. But it's a very valid principle.

Q Mr. President, in 1988, when you were running, you said no new taxes. And then you sought to compromise with the Democrats. In hindsight I think we all see that we can't compromise with serpents. Are you willing to stand fast when you are reelected and say, override my veto?

THE PRESIDENT: I've done that many times. And he's right. I made what I admitted was a mistake. At the time I thought it was the right thing to do, because we -- one good thing about that 1990 bill, we got a cap, a firm cap on the discretionary domestic spending.

For the kids here, two-thirds of the budget is mandatory spending; the President never gets a shot at it. It's called entitlements. One-third of it is the rest of the government spending. It's very extensive, but it's not as much as the two-thirds.

There we did out of that bill, we got a cap on it so that they cannot spend more than provided under the budget, which is something that's quite different. But to go with a tax increase I think was a mistake. And since then I have vetoed bill after bill, and I'm going to keep on vetoing, but with a new Congress I believe we can do much better. (Applause.)

Q Mr. President, first of all, I'd like to thank you from the bottom of my heart for my family and my two daughters for what you did with Reagan's great years and what you've done for the last four years, first of all. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Butch.

Q I have a two-part question and I don't presume to know what your national campaign does or knows or how they try to run their business. But it seems like on the national and

local news here in this area that the Clinton-Gore commercials are running three and four to one of your commercials. So I don't know if you have people who are supposed to monitor that and take care of it -- and wait -- the second part is, in the last debate, Slick Willie -- pardon the term -- said that -- when he summarized the debate, said that his differences with Perot were, number one, how long it would take to bring down the deficit; and number two, how much to tax the middle class. How could -- why has that not been made into an ad and run it -- run it, run it, run it?

THE PRESIDENT: We need this guy up there telling our -- (applause.) Butch, I don't know, Butch, the answer to the numbers of ads that are running. I'll tell you this, though -- Louisiana is priority. I must and I believe I will carry this state. But I can't give you the formulation on it.

But on the major ads we are running we are spelling out as clearly as we can the differences that get to this gentleman's question about socking it to the middle class. And I did have a chance in the debates to spell that out. We're going to keep on hitting it because the fundamental philosophical difference is tax and spend versus constraint on spending and taxes. So we're going to keep hitting that theme.

And I don't know the numbers of ads that are being used but we're not neglecting this key state. It's a battleground and we've got to win it.

Q I'm about to graduate from college in journalism. And you started out by saying annoy the media, vote for Bush, and that sort of thing. What exactly is your problem in detail with the media, and what advice could you have for me as I start out in that field?

THE PRESIDENT: My advice to you in the field is be objective. (Applause.) And -- if you want to be a journalist, if you want to be a journalist. If you want to be a columnist or an editorialist, then, of course, that's a different ball game. But I think be objective. I have never seen media having these programs at night analyzing each other, saying, are we being fair? They know very well they wouldn't be having these programs if there was some question about that. (Applause.)

Look, they got the last word. I'm going to pay for telling you this, because they've be all over me like ugly on a whatever it is out here. But nevertheless -- (laughter) -- but I've gotten tired of it. And everybody knows it's been unfair. But the great thing about winding up a campaign is, you get out and take your case to the people.

But seriously, there's a new wave of journalism where the journalists themselves slant the stories. And it's not a -- this isn't a charge, this is a fact. And you say how to do it? I would like to see more objectivity in the news columns and let them slug me in the cartoons and the editorials and the columns and these nuts that come on there on these talking heads. (Applause.)

I'll tell you one other thing -- I'll tell you another thing while I'm at it -- the minute these debates are over you have a commentator saying who won it. Why can't -- let the American people decide who won? (Applause.)

Q Mr. President, after you are reelected would you consider using Ross Perot as one of your advisers?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it depends what he would be advising on. I mean, I've got some differences with him because, for example, I don't believe that we need a 50-cent a gallon gasoline tax. I just don't think that is -- (applause.) But on other things, he's a successful man. He's been a big success.

He's been very -- be fair about it -- he's been very helpful on the prisoner of war thing at various times. And so, you know, the door would be open to a lot of people. I'll reach out as best I can across a wide spectrum, because God knows I don't have a lock on all the answers.

But there are some differences. I don't believe we need to tax Social Security benefits. I've been the President that said Social Security is sacrosanct; leave it alone; don't mess with it. (Applause.) And I have a difference.

So on your question generally, look, I could take all the advice and all, especially from very successful people. So the answer is affirmative.

Q Mr. President, with a little more than one week until election, will your campaign focus on the continuing signs of improvement in the economy?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we will do it, and we need some help, because for three straight months, unemployment has gone down. (Applause.) And I see -- all I hear is: Bad news for President Bush; job market shrinks. For five straight quarters -- I'm talking quarters, a year-and-a-half, maybe six, because those figures will be out, I believe this week -- we have had growth in this economy, albeit anemic growth. It's been very slow. But there hasn't been any negative growth.

Germany was down this past month, a negative growth. Japan -- we're growing twice as fast as they are. Our economy with interest rates down and inflation down is far better than most of the European economies. But to listen to Clinton-Gore and their friends jump on me, they say it's all my fault. I'll take the blame. I make a mistake, I admit it.

There's -- 93 percent of the people are working. Now, they're afraid. They're scared they might not have that job tomorrow. So I'd like -- all I ask is a fair presentation and then an objective look at who has the best answers to stimulate the economy, particularly small business, and lift these people out of this fear that I understand they have. And I believe it can be done.

One last point: Governor Clinton can only win if he convinces everybody that things are really bad, worse than they are. He says that the American economy is something -- I can't -- I don't have the exact quote, but I'll paraphrase with accuracy -- less than Germany but something more than Sri Lanka; and that we are the "mockery" of the world. That is not right. We are the most respected nation in the world, and we are going to lead -- (applause) -- we are going to lead the world into recovery, if we don't go the tax-and-spend route.

Q I'd like to welcome you to Lafayette. And before I ask a question, I'd like to thank you for your concern and personal help during our recent hurricane. (Applause.) That was quite an experience for our state. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Let me interrupt just simply to say in fair -- one thank-you, and I think the federal government did respond. But in fairness, a lot of the local officials, some Democrat, some Republican, responded masterfully. And something else happened -- something else happened in that hurricane. And I saw this community. The community responded. And sometimes it's what we call the points of light -- one citizen helping another. (Applause.) So I think the congratulations should very well go to the people of the community -- excuse the interruption. (Applause.)

Q That leads into my question. Each evening when I get home, I watch the 6:00 p.m. news or the 5:30 p.m. news, and I see stories about what's wrong with out country. And yet in

that same news hour, I look at the coverage of what's going on in the rest of the world and how many countries are in turmoil, and their economies are in trouble. You mentioned the points of light. How can we send a message out to the Americans that we live in the best country in the world? We may have our problems from time to time, but things are good here.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think -- (applause) -- I think people have a fundamental confidence in the United States. And our points of light program, where we recognize a thousand -- it could be -- it's just a sample of all the good that's being done for others -- I think helps in that regard. Volunteerism helps. But I don't know the answer to how to project it out across the world.

I do know this -- that most countries still look to us with envy in terms of the economy and with gratitude because we do respond like in the suffering in Bosnia and Sarajevo and the suffering in Somalia. It's the United States. It's us; it's you; your money that responds.

So we'll continue to do that in a -- showing the concern we feel whether it's for the hurricane victims. But in terms of the overall status, I think people just have to have a quiet confidence that the United States is not in decline and that with the programs we're talking about and with a new Congress we can really lift up the kids and give them a little more hope.

You know -- you didn't ask for this, but let me just say, they ask me a lot and they ask Barbara a lot, what is it that you -- maybe you're failure, or what did you do wrong or sometimes what did you do right? One of the things that gives me the greatest sense of pride and joy, literally joy in my heart, is that the young people go to bed at night without -- because of a lot of the way my predecessor worked and the way we've worked -- without that same fear of nuclear war. (Applause.) And I think that's a major accomplishment and I think it's significant.

And yet, if you listen to these critics out there that are on my case all the time, the accomplishments in world peace and the demise of international communism -- they say don't talk about that, nobody cares. I think there's a feeling in America, well, we've done something noble; we've done something good. And it's the taxpayers and the citizens who stayed with the policy of peace through strength that finally can say, we've made the world a little better for others.

And there's something there. It doesn't help the guy that's out of work, but it's good for our soul to know that there is some decency around.

All right, now, where? We're coming to this side? Yes, ma'am.

Q Hi, Mr. President, I'm so happy you came to Lafayette to give a personal visit to us. But my concern is how do you plan to help middle-class Americans with funding their child's education -- their college education? And what about the soaring health costs for middle-class Americans? I'm really concerned about that.

THE PRESIDENT: Everyone is in both areas. Education, we have doubled -- almost doubled Pell grants. Education -- I happen to believe for K through 12 that before you get to K, Head Start is important. We have increased dramatically the funding for the Head Start program, which is a really good program.

On education generally, we've got to revolutionize education. We simply can't go with putting a Band-Aid here and a Band-Aid there. And we have a program -- I hope you've heard of

it -- called America 2000. And what it does is to literally -- it bypasses the educational establishment. It says to the community, we're going to help you, federal help, to literally reinvent the schools. Some are going to want longer hours, some shorter. Some are going to want different size classrooms. Some are going to want to try a different curriculum. Some are going to want -- okay, you kids hold your nose -- to have year-round schools. Some are going to want to try it one way or another. And we've got to do that in this country. We have to innovate and make that elementary part of education better.

What was the second part? You said education and --health care.

Health care -- our health care proposal provides insurance through vouchers to the poorest of the poor and to the middle class you asked about, tax credits. And it does what this gentleman was asking about in small business, but in health care it pools the insurance, which will get the cost down; it goes after malpractice. And I believe that that is the answer.

And the reason I like this one better than pay or play or the Canada system is we do have the best quality of health care, and we've got to keep that quality by keeping the government's role to what I've said it is. (Applause.) I think both would bring relief to families that are really worried about health care costs.

Q One last question.

THE PRESIDENT: My gosh, it goes fast when you're having fun.

Q Thanks for coming, Mr. President. I'm a small independent producer and operator in this state, and I would like to focus a little bit more on the energy policy, which I also endorse. Thank you for being here on that.

I produce and operate here in this state. I live in this state. I work in this state, I work other people in this state and I spend my money in this state. My point is, one, we need to come home. And secondly, about that energy policy, how is it going to affect me here in this state? And secondly, what is it going to do? I know it's going to do a lot internationally and create jobs here and focus our economy here, but where is that going to come back on us -- coming home on that?

THE PRESIDENT: You mean the energy strategy, or what?

Q What's the timetable on that?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the estimate by the IPAA -- you know who they are -- and they estimate 45,000 jobs. Our Secretary of Energy is here, got much more detail. But the reason they do that is we changed the alternative minimum tax. And that alternative minimum tax, as you know, just took the incentive right out of doing any drilling. And it just slammed the oil industry in the effort to try to level out all taxes. It was a tremendous mistake back several years ago.

So that is the biggest thing that's going to help the domestic drilling and producing business. And it's not -- that one won't help internationally. I mean, it will make us less dependent on foreign oil because we'll stimulate drilling and production in this country.

One thing it did not have in it that I favor is the opening up of ANWR. (Applause.) And I think that can be done, but it doesn't help us -- a small independent or an independent. But it does help the national security because it will have more energy coming from inside the United States.

And the super-environmentalists, the ones way out on the extreme use the same argument against that that they used against the pipeline. They kept talking about those -- what was that animal -- the caribou --they said if you put the Alaska pipeline in you're going to have -- the caribou is going to be extinct. The caribou are having one hell of a time up in Alaska with that pipeline. (Applause.) There are more of them around than you can shake a stick at. It's the best thing that ever happened to those caribou.

And the same arguments are now being used on ANWR. And I have a good record on the environment, but it is not an extreme. I don't -- I believe you need to find the balance between good strong environmental protection for the future of these kids and for growth and families.

I've got a big argument out there with Gore and Clinton on the spotted owl. I mean, I'm all for the spotted owl; a feathery, fine looking little bird, but I'm also worried about those 30,000 families that might be thrown out of work. (Applause.)

Well listen, I see that the rip cord has been pulled and thousands of hands -- I'm sorry. I really do have to run, we're going back to Washington -- my last night tonight in Washington before the election. Then we'll be campaigning and ending up in Houston, Texas on Monday night. (Applause.)

But thank you all for this wonderful welcome. And please go to the polls. Do not neglect it. The guy that stays home is not doing his part by citizenship. And I am absolutely confident that if you go to the polls and you work the phone banks and you do the sometimes tough, but always effective things in politics, that you have seen the man who is going to be President for four more years.

Thank you and God bless you all. (Applause.)

END 6:24 P.M. CDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Montgomery, Alabama)

For Immediate Release October 24, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT MONTGOMERY WELCOME

Atlanta Crossing Shopping Center
Montgomery, Alabama

10:40 A.M. CDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Wow. Thank you very much. And I am so very pleased to be back in this great state on this beautiful Saturday day. (Applause.) Let me just say I want to pay my respects to your Governor. I want to thank Mayor Emory Folmar, my long-time, longstanding friend. I'll tell you -- give you a little advice. If you want to win a state and if you want to win it with conviction and honor, get Emory Folmar at your side. I am proud he is at mine. (Applause.)

And also, I want to salute my bass fishing friend, Ray Scott, who has made this great Alabama pastime a national pastime. And I have threatened to him that when this election is over, with a much more relaxed attitude, I'm coming back to Pintlala, Alabama, and catch some bass. (Applause.)

And, of course, I would be remiss if I didn't single out Bill Dickinson, who has served this area with such distinction in the Congress. If we had more like him they wouldn't be holding up these signs everywhere I go saying, "Clean House." We must clean House. (Applause.) We'll get this guy up there -- get Terry Smith up there and we'll clean the House out, I'll tell you. (Applause.)

Now, also while we're at it, let's clean Senate and elect Rick Sellers to the United States Senate. (Applause.) And I want to say -- here's the guy. Now vote for this man. Come on, Rick. (Applause.)

Another man, Don Sledge, running in another area for Congress. Good luck to you. (Applause.) Terry Everett is running for the Dickinson seat and we've got to get him elected there. (Applause.)

So thank you all. And I'm told that we had a -- hey -- (applause) -- for the 7th District. (Applause.) Hey, listen, we get these guys elected and we won't see those signs saying "Clean House." We will have done our part. (Applause.) Besides, he's big enough to whip 'em all up there, so -- (laughter) -- that's good. We need that man there, I'll tell you.

Now, may I thank the Jefferson Davis and Lee High School participants around here. Great job. (Applause.) And finally, Bart Starr. You know, I look over my shoulder and see a great son of Alabama, the legendary quarterback, Bart Starr. You know, many years ago in the frozen tundra of Wisconsin, Bart Starr led those Packers to a stunning playoff victory against the Dallas Cowboys. And let me tell you something, he is here today because that accentuates the fact that we are going to achieve another stunning upset victory and represent these people in the United States for four more years. (Applause.) Thank you, Bart.

Now, I hate to ruin this beautiful Saturday, but I do think we must get in perspective before the American people go

to the vote -- go to the polls the Arkansas record. The people in Arkansas, everyone in Alabama knows it because we have friends -- we in Texas, you in Alabama have friends in Arkansas. They are good and decent and honorable people. But let me tell you what the record has been with Bill Clinton.

They are the 50th in the quality of environmental initiatives; 50th in percentage of adults with college degrees. They are 50th in per capita spending on criminal justice. They are 49th in per capita spending on police protection; 48th in percentage of adults with a high school diploma; 48th in spending on corrections; 46th on teachers' salaries; 45th in the overall well-being of children.

And the other night, Governor Clinton said in that debate in Michigan, he said, "I want to do for America what I've done for Arkansas." No way!. We cannot let him do that. (Applause.)

It's like sending the guy who finishes last in managing the Little League in Montgomery telling him to manager the Braves. We don't need that kind of change. (Applause.)

This guy talks about change -- that's all your going to have left in your pocket if we listen to his program. And here it is -- (Applause.) Here it is -- all right, you taxpayers, get ready -- this is before he's even gotten started -- $150 billion in new taxes, bigger than McGovern and Dukakis put together; $220 billion in new spending. And I call that trickle-down government. Give it to the government and you never see it again. (Applause.)

He says he'll get it from the rich. But the rest of you guys out there that have to work for a living -- you nurses or you teachers or you cab drivers or you truck drivers -- watch your wallet. There aren't enough rich people to pay for this guy's promises and all Al Gore's extreme environmental positions -- there are not enough so he's coming after you. Watch your wallet, America. This guy is coming after you. But I'm not going to let him do it. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: All right, it's fine to stand up and point out all the things that are wrong. And, yes, we've got problems and, yes, people are hurting and, yes, some people at work want to know where they're going to get the jobs, how they're going to keep them. But let me tell you something. The last time we tried his kind of change, when you had a liberal Democrat in the White House and that same old crowd controlling the Congress, who remembers -- he changed inflation, all right; he changed it up to 15 percent. He destroyed the family budgets and the interest rates -- some of you homeowners remember what they were -- they were 21 percent. We do not need that kind of change for America. (Applause.)

And my view is to cut that spending, get the government spending down and the taxes down, and then stimulate investment in small business -- not in government, but in small business. They create two-thirds of the jobs -- two-thirds. Give them a tax break and get America back to work. (Applause.)

The doom and gloom crowd is a little too much. You know, my favorite bumper-sticker -- I don't know whether we've got any of them around here -- there's a marvelous -- yes, it's here, right over there. That's over there. (Applause.) "Annoy the media." They wouldn't know good news if it hit them in the face. (Applause.)

Have you gotten this from your television yet? Have you heard this on the television at night, that unemployment

claims have gone down to the lowest in two years? Have you heard that inflation is down, that interest rates are down, that total employment is 93 percent; inflation 2.5 to 3 percent; home mortgages are eight percent? Now, ask yourself this: Can Bill Clinton do better than this, or will he make things worse? I think he'll make things worse. (Applause.)

Here's what we're going to do. We're going to increase our exports. We're going to create more jobs right here in Montgomery, Alabama, and all across this country that are concerned with exports. Exports have saved us in what is essentially a global recession or a global slowdown. Our economy -- don't listen to Governor Clinton, you'll never hear this; nobody will report it on the news -- is doing better than Japan, doing better than Germany, doing better than Europe, doing better than Canada.

It's not good enough -- it's not good enough. We're going to create export jobs by barging into those foreign markets. And that means prosperity for people in Alabama. Not protection -- exports. (Applause.)

And I'll tell you another one where I've got a big difference with the Governor from Arkansas. That is on legal reform. I think it's a shame when people don't dare touch Little League because some crazy trial lawyer is going to come along and try to sue them, or when somebody sees an automobile accident and they don't dare stop along the highway because if they move a person, trying to help them; then and it doesn't work out, somebody's going to sue him for caring. And when a doctor is afraid to practice and deliver babies because of a crazy suit. We've got to sue each other less and care for each other more. (Applause.)

I heard Mayor Folmar talking about health care. And, yes, he is right, we need health care for all. And our program provides health care insurance to the poorest of the poor. Then it gives tax breaks to the income bracket above that that are trying to make ends meet. It gets pooling of insurance, works with managed care, does something about malpractice insurance. But it does something else. It provides the best quality of health care. We have the best. And I don't want to drive these doctors out of medicine by putting the government further into medicine. (Applause.)

There's another area where I have a big difference with Governor Clinton and that is on crime. Arkansas prisoners spend 20 percent of their sentences in jail. The federal, the one I'm responsible for, 85 percent. (Applause.) I believe we need tougher laws that back up these dedicated people on the highways, these police officers in the neighborhoods, the sheriff's people. We need to back law enforcement. And in doing that, we will be strengthening the neighborhoods for every single family in this country. (Applause.)

One of the great meetings -- one of the great meetings we had was in the Oval Office, I think it was last week. I think it was eight people came to see me. And they were up there, and said, we are supporting you. And they were from Arkansas. And they were from the Fraternal Order of Police in Little Rock who endorsed me for President of the United States. (Applause.) Good, decent, hardworking people. (Applause.)

We talk about reforming the Congress -- let's challenge Governor Clinton to say where he stands on these items: I want a balanced budget amendment to make the Congress get this deficit down. (Applause.) I want a check-off, to check off on the taxpayers' -- to have a check-off on the income tax form. You can check up to 10 percent. And then you put it up there and add them all together across the country, and that is the force of law to make Congress reduce spending by that amount. And I believe it will work. (Applause.)

And another one is -- time has come for it -- 43 governors have it. I get legislation by this crazy Congress coming down there everyday -- two good things in it, eight bad. Give the President what the governors have, get the deficit down by giving me that line-item veto. Cross it out. (Applause.)

I'll tell you, I'll tell you there's another thing. I'll tell you what's going to really decide this election at the last minute. It's going to be a question of character and trust. And I believe -- I hope I have earned the trust of the American people. (Applause.)

What you do -- you represent the American people's interest in that Oval Office and you have to make tough decisions. And sometimes you make a mistake. You're human like everybody else, and you say, I make it. And you look people in the eye and say, we're going to go forward together. But you cannot be on every side of every issue. And it is a question of character -- if you try to whisper one thing here and do something else there. (Applause.)

Governor Clinton tries to have it both ways. And yes, it's a fair issue. Flip-flopping on right to work. He's from a right-to-work state, says he's for it there; whispers up to the big labor unions -- I'm against it. Term limits -- one place he's for it, one place he's against it. Free trade -- one time he's for it, then he's against it and in the debate you heard him say, well, I'm for it but I'll have to -- you can't say "but", you've got to make a decision. (Applause.)

And the biggest difference I have with him was on the war. I had to make a tough decision. And Alabama responded with pride, great strength. (Applause.) And the sons and daughters did something noble -- they busted up the fourth largest army and kicked this agressor out of Kuwait. And now we're having a lot of revision coming out. It was a noble moment and where was Governor Clinton? He said this: Well, I was with the majority -- I'm paraphrasing -- I was with the majority -- and this I'm not paraphasing -- but I guess I would have -- with the minority, but I guess I would have voted with the majority. You cannot waffle. You cannot make the White House into the Waffle House. (Applause.)

And so I do beleive that character and trust matters. I've got a big difference with him and I know people here might or might not agree with me. I was a product of World War II and I fought for my country -- (applause.) -- and I think that's made me a good Commander-in-Chief.

I don't think everybody had to do that, to be Commander-in-Chief -- I don't believe that's the way to do it. I still think it is wrong when your brothers are held prisoners in a Hanoi prison camp, or kids are drafted out of the ghetto of Birmingham and Montgomery or New York City to serve their nation -- to be over in another country organizing demonstrations against your nation. (Applause.)

I just think it's wrong. I think it's wrong. But what I think is -- do we have the word "wronger" -- (laughter) -- but what I think is worse, what I think is worse is if you don't level, if you don't tell the truth. One day he says he got a draft notice; the next day he didn't. One day he said well he wanted to go into the ROTC; the next day he didn't. You've got to level. If you make a mistake, look the American people in the eye and say, I was wrong about that. And the American people forgive, but they are entitled to have something other than waffling and a pattern of deception as President of the United States. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you for this great rally. I have -- excuse me for drinking all this water up here, but I had

two miles running out by your magnificent Shakespeare Festival Building out there. It was superb. (Applause.)

But let me tell you this. I'm very sorry she's not here, but very candidly, I think we've got a great First Lady in Barbara Bush. (Applause.)

We have tried very hard to exemplify what's right and decent about America; exemplify the trust and faith we have in the American family. Liberals don't like it, but it's right. We've got to strengthen the family -- read to the kids, teach them right from wrong, support the law enforcement people and the teachers, teach discipline, give choice in child care or choice in education. We believe in these things. And when Barbara reads to those kids she's saying every parent should read to their kids, take the time to lift them up and to make them better. And that's what we're talking about, and we've tried to do it. (Applause.)

But now -- and life has been good to the Bush family. There's no question about that. We're very, very lucky with our grandkids and a wonderful four sons and a great daughter. And so I have no complaints on the personal side at all. People say, well, why do you want to do this? It's ugly out there. You're getting clobbered by the national media over and over again. Can't be any fun. The answer is, something transcends your own personal well-being. And what transcends it for me is we have literally changed the world.

These kids here go to bed at night without the same fear of nuclear war that their parents had. And that is a major change. (Applause.) And now what I want to do through the programs I've touched on today is make life better and more challenging by creating more opportunity in employment or education for every young person here today.

That is why I want to be your President. I ask for your support and your trust. And may God bless the United States of America. (Applause.) Thank you very much. (Applause.) Thank you all. A great rally and a beautiful day. (Applause.)

END 11:00 A.M. CDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Miami, Florida)

For Immediate Release October 23, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN "ASK GEORGE BUSH"

WPLG-TV Studios
Miami, Florida

8:00 P.M. EDT

Q The President of the United States George Bush faces Florida voters in 11 days. Tonight he is here in Miami to answer their questions.

Q Good evening with Tom Wills. I'm Ann Bishop, and tonight from across the state, President Bush will be answering the concerns on the issues on the minds of Floridians. We're going to get right to it, and our first question is from Jacksonville.

Q Good evening, Mr. President. During the first debate you acknowledged that while the present economy is nowhere nearly as bad as your opponents would like for the American people to believe, there is room for improvement. My question is, if you're reelected President, would you be willing to offer an invitation to Ross Perot or to Bill Clinton to discuss their economic plans?

THE PRESIDENT: That's easy. I think the answer is, yes. But if I'm elected it will be to put in my economic plan. And I think I will be because I think we've got the best plan. But I meet with opposition leaders all the time as President of the United States, and certainly I'd be willing to discuss it with them.

Q Good evening, Mr. President. Excluding your tax increase decision, if you could rewrite the history of the last four years, what one decision would you change?

THE PRESIDENT: I gave you the main one. My view is if you make a mistake you admit it. It's a little unusual in politics, but I think it's the thing you do. And I made a mistake going along with that major Democratic tax increase. I say a mistake -- it had some good things in it -- put the caps on the discretionary spending program. But it raised taxes. And it was my belief that that was something we ought to do that would help the economy. I don't think it did at all.

I can't think of anything that fits into that league of something that I would view as a mistake of that proportion. I'm sure I make plenty of them, but give me some time and I might get back to you with it. I'm not sure this is a good time to be pointing out all your weaknesses, either. (Laughter.)

Q Just before President Bush came to be here with us tonight he was in downtown Miami, and he signed into law the Cuban Democracy Act. Now, Mr. President, as you know, the Democrats have accused you of trying to make some political hay on this issue.

Our first question, sir, tonight, here in Miami, is concerning Cuban American relations.

Q Good evening, Mr. President. Welcome to South Florida. My question is, within the next four years, Cuba will join the nations that have democracies. What will you do and what will your administration do to help the people of Cuba?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think -- I hope you're right. And I think you're right, because I don't think Castro can continue to swim against the worldwide tide. The tide in this hemisphere is against him, but so is the worldwide tide. Everybody wants democracy, freedom, market economies. Of course, Castro's got none of that. And I think the answer is in to move forward with investment support for him.

You see, it's going to be private. The thing that's going to make Cuba move forward fast is you have so many Cuban Americans who have done well and want to invest and create businesses. It's going to be less -- it's not going to be a drain on the American taxpayer. It is going to be investment that solidifies their democracy.

I don't think we're going to need special programs. We've got programs in the Caribbean for those countries -- Caribbean Basin Initiative. We've got a debt forgiveness program that has helped move Argentina and Brazil and other countries towards democracy. Many countries -- 43 more countries have become democratic since I've been President -- 43. And Cuba will be the next one, I hope.

But it's not going to require a lot of government aid. Everybody hates foreign aid. It's not going to require that. It's going to require investment. These are industrious people. We've seen what they can do here in this country. With freedom down there, they can do the same thing.

Q Good evening, President Bush. In 1980, my home mortgage was 18.5 percent. We had a Cold War, hostage problems and global inflation. But my family and I had good jobs, savings with high interest, and excellent health insurance. Today I have inadequate health insurance, no savings. My children and their children are without jobs. My oldest daughter is losing her home with a 7.5 percent mortgage. My home in a mobile park is facing liquidation. There is a global recession and homelessness.

Granted, with the Cold War over my family could sleep better at night. But now, my own party's opening speaker at our convention tells us we're facing a religious and cultural war. Can you tell me why I am any better off today than I was four years ago?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you're better off in the sense of interest rates, clearly. We've got to go back to the days when the Democrats controlled both the White House and the Congress, which they've controlled for 38 years. Interest rates were 21 percent. Clearly, it's better to have them at where they are now. You can refinance homes, inflation is lower -- that's the cruelest tax of all -- if you were a saver. I'm not sure you were a saver.

I don't, I'm not sure I understand what you mean about a cultural war. I had the mayors from the leading cities come to see me. They were the board of directors of the National League of Cities. You know what they told me? They told me the major cause for urban decay was the decline in the American family. These were not right wing nuts or left wing nuts. Mayor Tom Bradley of Los Angeles is one of them. Small-town mayors from the -- that were Republicans from North Carolina. Plano, Texas mayor -- and this discussion of family is not something that I'm going to be driven away from. We got to find ways to strengthen it. And that's talking about driving drugs out of the community.

And in some ways we're worse off, if you've got all those problems for your kids. But in many ways, you're better off. And I would cite some of the statistics that I've given you. And I just hope that with this new job training program we've got, a program to get the burden of government off of people like you -- that we can do better.

But you're right, it's a global recession. I don't know how many people know this -- our economy is growing twice as fast as Japan's. People don't believe that. Our economy -- Germany had a negative growth and we have grown, albeit anemically, for five straight quarters. So when you're going through a tough economic time, you're going to -- bound to have hardships. And I'm sorry you've got those, but I believe that job retraining, education and stimulation of this economy for small business is the answer. I really do. Very good question.

Q Good evening, President Bush. My name is Jill Hobbs, and my father's name is Navy Commander Donald Richard Hobbs, and he has been missing in Vietnam since 1968. As you can imagine, this has been a very painful, heartbreaking, frustrating situation for my family for the last 24 years. And now with all the new information that's coming out of Vietnam, I would like to know what you plan to do to ensure that all the live prisoners are returned, that all remains are repatriated, and that complete and truthful accounting of all our POWs and MIAs is given. I want to know what hope I have that I'll find out the truth about my father's fate.

THE PRESIDENT: You have a lot more hope today than you did yesterday because this announcement that I made in the Rose Garden with General Vessey is a very significant breakthrough. Here's General Vessey, who is the former head of the Army -- marvelous man -- head of the Joints Chiefs, too. And he went over there and came back with a lot of pictures, a lot of information that they had denied even existed before.

And we think that today, the announcement I made in the Rose Garden is a significant breakthrough, and I hope it leads to evidence that will be comforting to your family. But we just have to keep pressing on, and we're going to keep pressing on, trying to follow every single lead.

You're talking to somebody whose comrades died in combat. My roommate -- this is ancient history, but my roommate was missing on the very first flight that I was in combat in the Pacific. And so I hope it sensitizes me a little. I can't say I really know what you're going through. But I think you ought to take some heart from this breakthrough today, because I really believe that Vietnam now is going to -- we're going to follow up to be sure they do this, but that they've turned over a new leaf and they're saying no more obfuscation; that we're going to -- we've put people in the archives. They've come out with 5,000 pictures. John McCain, a former prisoner, now a Senator, he came back with -- they gave him, handed him pictures that he didn't know existed of his being pulled out of the water.

So I hope it leads to clues and certainly we will follow up any leads on anybody that might be alive. But we've got to get the remains back, too. It's a breakthrough and I just hope it proves to be something that is comforting to your family.

Q Good evening, Mr. President. My question is, what does your administration plan on doing to help the middle class as far child care? It's beginning to look as though the poor and the rich are the only ones that can afford to have children. If reelected, what does your administration plan to do to help the middle class?

THE PRESIDENT: One of our accomplishments was passing a child care bill adequately financed that gives parents the choice. When I came into office there was a prohibition

against all but mandated -- almost all but mandated child care centers. In other words, the Congress would say here's the kind of child care you have to have. I think it strengthens the family to do what we've done -- get legislation through a not-altogether friendly Congress at times, and get it through to give the parents the choice for child care.

And it is funded. And I hope that it's of benefit to you. There are limits in terms of how much a person is making. I don't remember the exact cutoff price, and maybe you're a little beyond that. But I believe that we've taken a major step forward in child care, and I hope that it will benefit your family. There are no new bills planned for it.

Q Mr. President, we have tried to bring together here in our four cities voters -- citizens from all walks of life. And this next question comes to you, sir, from a man who is 17 years old.

Q Good evening, Mr. President. Mr. President, I am planning to go to college within the next year. But my family may not be able to afford my higher education. It is a problem that many students and their families face in this community. As President of the United States, what will you specifically do if you are reelected to provide my generation with the educational opportunities that we need to succeed in life?

THE PRESIDENT: In the first place, we've already doubled the funding for what they call Pell grants -- that's for university. And I hope you've applied for that. Maybe -- I don't know, again, what your circumstances are. But we've doubled the funding on the Pell grants, which is the major way of going forward for college students. And, again, as I say, I hope that really helps.

Our main education program relates to getting kids ready for college. Frankly, we haven't done a good enough job for that. And many can't simply get into the college. And so our program is called America 2000. It revolutionizes -- literally revolutionizes education. It bypasses the old educational bureaucracy. It puts choice in the hands of parents for public, private or religious schools.

Now, some say to me, hey, that's going to weaken the public schools. It hasn't worked that way with a woman named Polly Williams, a black woman up in Milwaukee. The Mayor, a Democrat in Milwaukee, strongly supports it. And we believe that if you get the quality of elementary and K-12 education that more people will be able to qualify for existing scholarships.

And then I think the answer to your question is keep trying to do as much as we can in the scholarship field and the student loan field for kids like you that probably need some support to go through the college of your choice.

Q My five-year-old had this question. One of the perks afforded you as President is what basically amounts to universal health care. Since you don't believe in universal health care for the American people, why is it that you utilize this benefit when you can clearly afford to pay your own medical bills? And why isn't this same program good enough for the American people?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you've go a bright five-year-old with very good English -- "utilizing my benefits." (Laughter.) That kid's not going to have any trouble getting a scholarship.

I'll tell you, I'm Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces, and the Armed Forces provide this. And this has traditionally been provided to the President. I have no apologies for it. But the kid is wrong in one thing -- I hate to

say that about your kid; she's very bright if she's that interested. My plan provides insurance for all. For the poorest of the poor you get a voucher. For the next group -- like this guy's family back here -- you're going to get assistance. You're going to get tax credit.

What I don't want to do is go to a plan that nationalizes -- in some areas they call it socialized medicine -- but say nationalizes medicine where you lower the quality of health care. The answer is to provide insurance to all, do more in the -- do more in terms of preventative medicine. And we're -- under Doctor Lou Sullivan, our HHS Secretary, we've moved out very well on that.

We've got to do more to get the costs of all this down. And one of the things where I differ with Governor Clinton is, I think we've got to do something about these malpractice suits and these awful lawsuits that are raising the costs to the tune of $25 to $50 billion.

But your child -- put it this way: If your five-year-old thinks the only what they're going to get universal health care coverage is to have mandated government coverage, I disagree with her. I think it's better to use this whole brand-new system of pooling insurance to provide insurance to the poorest of the poor and right on up. So we just have a philosophical difference. No difference about wanting to get it done, though.

Q Good evening, Mr. President. Your firm stand against legalized abortion has been clearly stated in the past and during this campaign. I'd like to as you this: If the Supreme Court reverses the Roe v. Wade decision during your next term in office, do you think that states that outlaw abortion should make it a capital crime --

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q -- that is, equating abortion with murder? And if so, do you think that women that receive the abortions and the doctors that perform them should be subject to the death penalty and/or life imprisonment?

THE PRESIDENT: No, no. The answer is no to all of the above. But I do oppose abortion.

You know, I think it's wrong to have 28 million abortions over the last few years. I don't believe you ought to have abortion for a -- put is this way, if a 13-year-old kid can't even get her ears pierced without parental approval, don't you think we ought to have some restraints? Don't you think that that kid ought to have to get permission from the parents? I believe in adoption. I believe in life. I know my position isn't particularly popular with some, but this is something I feel in my heart -- take your case to the American people.

But no on the criminal penalties you're talking about.

Q Mr. President, good evening. How is your proposal on allowing people to designate income tax proceeds toward debt reduction and spending cuts supposed to work? And do you believe a citizen would be willing to spend his or her own money toward debt reduction?

THE PRESIDENT: Debt reduction -- I'll get to his -- there's three things we need: We need a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. A lot of the states have it. We need a line-item veto that says to the President, if Congress can't cut it, you can cut out the pork by drawing a line through whatever line you want in the veto, in the bill. And then they can override you if they want to.

And on this proposal he's talking about, it's a new one that I have made. And what it says to the taxpayer is, when you go fill out your tax form -- if you care as much about deficit reduction as other things, you can then kick off 10 percent -- a little box on the tax return. That will all be added up. Say it comes to $40 billion of all the people that fill out the tax return, added to $40 billion. Then you have to use that money to reduce the debt.

And that's going to mean, then, that Congress is going to have to, working with the administration, reduce spending by that much. And that gets to be difficult. But it forces it; it forces the equation. And if they can't do it in negotiation, then you do what they call a sequester. And the sequester goes right across the board, not touching Social Security, but right across the board to get the spending down.

It's rather simple, and some of the liberal economists ridicule it. But I believe those three things together can make a significant difference on getting this deficit off the backs of young people like you. And when your kids come along, if we don't we're going to be in real problems for the future.

And that isn't easy. I mean, I can't stand here and tell this audience, or the audience in Orlando and Jacksonville, or Tampa that it's going to be easy. I want to control the growth of the mandatory spending program -- not cut them, control the growth to inflation and to allow for population. But that means they're not going to be able to grow as fast. They can grow, not be cut, but not grow as fast.

Those things together I think are the way we're going to get this deficit down. And that check-off ought to be tried. If it doesn't work change the law.

Q Sir, as you know, the people here in south Florida for the past many weeks now have been trying to recover from the devastating effects of Hurricane Andrew. The next person you're going to hear from really tonight is in the category of a special guest.

Q Mr. President, city manager of the city of Homestead.

Q And I should add, Mr. President, that he is a nonpartisan officeholder, neither Democrat nor Republican.

THE PRESIDENT: I'll tell you what I think about him in a minute. (Laughter.)

Q He wants to tell you want he thinks about you.

THE PRESIDENT: I know he does.

Q Mr. President, first of all, on behalf of all the South Dade community, we really thank you from the bottom of our heart for your support in these last few months. As a matter of fact, tomorrow will be the two-month anniversary of Hurricane Andrew, which we all know the devastation caused in our community.

Although your leadership was unwavering, you know the outcome of what happened with the Congress with Homestead Air Force Base. One of the biggest concerns that we have now is if the medical facility and the PX isn't built immediately, this community, South Dade, Dade County, Monroe and West Palm Beach and Broward, have the chance of losing as much as 80,000 retirees because those facilities aren't there. What can you do to move that along so we can keep these people in our community?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me answer Alex's question. Let me tell you about this guy because -- and this is not a slow ball. He's an independent. He's strong out there. He does what he thinks is right. Here's a man who, when his own home was devastated, was out looking after people in the community. And that said an awful lot to me. I think it said a lot to the people of Florida and the people across the country. And I think it stimulated a lot of support not just from us, from the federal government, but it served as an inspiration to what I call the points of light, the people here where they got this program Rebuild. You see a guy like this -- do it.

I hope we can push it. What Alex is talking about is, I made a decision that we were going to rebuild Homestead. And I got hit by congressmen and senators from different parts of the country because they saw -- in a shrinking defense budget they saw a chance to get this money to build the installations in their area, or keep the bases in their area, or transfer the facilities for anti -- you know the intelligence facilities -- antidrug facilities somewhere else.

We got beat on it. You got some money. You got a little, not near as much as we wanted. On this one, I think we just have to push on it and get it done. And I don't think it's to be controversial. I mean, I think it's something we can get through our bureaucracy, is what I think the problem is.

But we'll keep pushing. I mean, it's been an inspiration to the whole country and I will say this to the audience: government can do a lot. And when the government's spending over it's head it can't do as much as it would like. But the private sector response on this is absolutely amazing. You go out and you see people from North Carolina who were helped by you all when Hurricane Hugo came along and now they've responded. I went to Louisiana, there was a bunch of people from North Carolina and South Carolina over there so that America spirit of helping one another is still there and I think you all demonstrated it as vividly as anything out of this hurricane situation.

Q With your present tax policies, what will you do to assist major cities and counties with their over-crowded prison populations on a state and local level?

THE PRESIDENT: We have put more money into state and local police than ever; spending is up for federal. But we can't do the whole police corrections facilities bit -- that can't be done by the federal government. We have expanded the federal prisons. The federal prisoners -- you know this as given your life to corrections -- have spent 85 percent of their time in jail. A lot of the states have a much less rigorous program.

We have an assistance program to corrections institutions, but I just hate to stand here and try to promise you that we can increase it. What we have done is increase the funding considerably for federal prisons and we've increased it for local law enforcement support. But not as much in the prison field.

Now the answer, I guess, is to continue to see -- try to help as much as we can, and then press forward with programs that are going to reduce the incidents of crime.

I come back to a program we call Weed and Seed, where you weed out the criminals -- I don't know whether you've had any working with it at all. But it's a good new approach, gets across partisan lines and it says weed out the criminals and then seed the communities with hope. And then that gets to our whole urban agenda, so people have jobs in these cities through enterprise zones and tenant management, homeownership, as opposed to the hopelessness and despair that results in the crimes that you, fortunately, are helping on.

Q Women's health should be a prime area of research for the National Institutes of Health, especially in the areas of breast, ovarian, and cervical cancer. However, Dr. Healy, the director of the NIH, has stated that focus on women's health was not necessary. How would you in your next term insure that the NIH increased research and funding in women's health?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, again, I don't want to be under false colors. Every question almost says how much more money can you spend from the federal government. Every one. And I can understand it, and there is a new program for breast cancer. And it's pretty well financed out of HHS.

I'll have to look at the NIH funding, and I don't remember Ms. Healy saying that -- Dr. Healy. She's a very able head of NIH. But -- and I'm not trying to put you down at all, because, look, that is a tremendously important cost. The next question I'll get will probably be on AIDS. We're spending up from $4.2 billion to $4.9 billion. And people say, well, you got to do more.

I'm standing here telling these guys how we're going to get the deficit down. And you can't do it painlessly; you can't do it by slapping more taxes on an overtaxed population. So we're dealing with somewhat of a restricted budget in doing all these things.

But let me check on NIH. I'm not just putting you off, but I don't believe that NIH is opposed to any women's health care efforts. And our early prevention programs that Dr. Sullivan is sponsoring can help get the problem -- you're a nurse so you know much more about it than I do -- but can help before you have to be putting the serious treatment to people.

Q My regards to you, President Bush. My question to you is, why is there such an integrity vacuum in today's government? The silent majority, like myself, can find more answers and solutions to the problems in America today in a book written by Ross Perot, United We Stand, than by any of the present elected officials. And why haven't you initiated a special group of highly trained individuals to address these problems one by one until each department has been corrected?

THE PRESIDENT: That's a good question. But, you see, I differ with Mr. Perot. I don't want to touch Social Security. He has in his program doing something about reducing Social Security for some. I don't think we ought to do that. I think we ought to set Social Security aside. It's not just another guaranteed program, it is a rather sacrosanct program with a trust fund. And so I have a difference with him on that.

I don't think we a 50-cent -- in your hand there in that plan is a 50-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax. Now, a lot of people have to ride to work. And where you have big distances, that is overwhelming. Or if you're a cab driver. The poor guy's trying to make ends meet -- or a truck driver -- he doesn't need to pay 50 cents more per gallon.

So I don't want to spend a lot of time looking at things that I'm opposed to. Now, in terms of what Perot is suggesting in terms of really having to do something on the spending side, I think he's on to something there. But not in these specifics that I've given you. And so I'm not going to spend the taxpayers' money with having a whole new group of people coming in to study something that I'm certainly not -- going to oppose, or that people will oppose if they elect me. I mean, I don't think a Social Security increase or a gasoline tax is the answer at this time.

So that's why I would -- but don't let me try to put you down by saying there's no good ideas in there; there are. I

think we've got enough study groups. What we need to do is get something done.

And I'll tell you -- I've got one difference with him -- you just can't open the hood, say fix it. I mean, you've got to work with the Congress. And I don't mean to put the blame -- I'll accept blame. But when you're working with Congress, it ain't that easy -- believe me. Look at Alex's problem. Here we had a problem that would have helped the community just to keep something that was there -- rebuild it.

And you've got all these contrasting interests. I go up as President, say restore Homestead, and you can't dictate to them. They're tough. You've got to hit them over the head like that mule with a two-by-four. But the good news -- there's good news. They screwed up that two-bit bank up there and that post office so bad that there are going to be 100 new members of Congress. And maybe we can get things moving much quicker the next term.

Q Good evening, Mr. President. I bring a question that comes from clients and other professionals in my agency. They'd like to know why over the last four years when the Names Project has been in Washington three times you have not visited the Names Project, which now contains more than 26,000 panels for those who have died of AIDS?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that's a good question. I have felt a little bit unloved by the AIDS community. And we have spent, as I say, far more money on research, far more, I think, money on compassionate programs. We've got the NIH with their great researchers out there geared up. And what happens to me when I go out -- and I shouldn't judge the whole community by the excesses -- but they've got an outfit called ACT-UP. And they come to my home and throw condoms around and behave in a very bad fashion. They break up your political appearances.

And I don't think that helps the cause any. And I don't want to be a lightening rod in a compassionate project like this quilt project by going out there -- I can take it. Good God, I've seen worse characters than those. But they don't help the cause any. And for me to go as a lightening rod out on to those grounds to be yelled out and screamed at and as a symbol, I don't think it helps the AIDS problem.

The AIDS problem requires compassion, requires understanding. Both Barbara and I have been to clinics and held AIDS babies and tried to demonstrate the concern we feel. But to be a lightening rod for the excesses, I don't think that is good for the President of the United States. And that's my very frank feeling on it.

And maybe we differ. Maybe you can make a case for ACT-UP; I can't. When they come to a guy's home -- little home village and stand there with outrageous behavior, I'm afraid I just have to say I don't agree with that. I don't agree with them going into a Catholic cathedral when people are on their knees worshiping, and start throwing condoms around. And I don't want to be the symbol for that kind of behavior. I want to help that. I want to help with research. I want to see compassion. But I don't want to be the catalyst for excess. That's why I didn't do it.

Q As a major foreign policy accomplishment, you have consistently maintained in this campaign that you deserve credit for the dissolution of communism. How can you prove that communism is virtually dead when more than one million Chinese, and importantly, more than 10 million Cubans in our backyard are still committed to undemocratic government?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I don't say communism is totally dead. I say imperial communism is, if not dead,

stretched out on the slab there about to be buried, because you don't have the Soviet Union anymore. For years we had a Cold War going on between the Soviet Union. That ended. That ended when I was President. And I think our policies had a lot to do with it.

Do you remember -- do you remember about 12 years ago people were saying "nuclear freeze." The only way you're going to solve nuclear terror for the kids is to freeze in -- stop right where we are. If we'd have done that, there would have been no driving force to get the Soviet Union moving towards democracy and to get rid of their nuclear weapons.

I stood out there in the East Room of the White House and made a deal with Yeltsin to get rid of every single SS-18 -- those are the big destabilizing, multi-warheaded nuclear missiles. That is a major accomplishment for all the kids.

But you're right. I gave a big speech here today on Cuba. They're not outreaching anymore to their -- the guy's trying to keep his snorkel out of the water. Castro, he's not reaching out trying to corrupt the Dominican Republic and these other people.

And China -- we've got big differences with them. What's happening in China, though, is their economic side of the house is moving toward market forces. And that's going to lead them to political change. That's why I don't want to cut off relations with China.

But let me -- I'm glad you asked it, because if I left the impression that I think there's no more communism anywhere I should clear that up. There is, but it's not what I call imperial communism that's trying to take over its neighbors.

Thanks for giving me the opportunity. I didn't realize I'd been that unclear on it.

Q I'm an aerospace worker, and in obtaining funding for the space station it's been tough going through the Democrat-controlled Congress. My question is, specifically how committed will your new administration be towards funding our space station and our future space programs at Kennedy Space Center?

THE PRESIDENT: Rick, I'm committed. And my word is on the line on that. It's in every budget we've sent forward. We're going to continue to fight for it. And one of the reasons, one of the places I might be able to do better on is to convince people that the research that goes into the space station and the space station itself will benefit not just those interested in space, but all mankind.

Now, you guys know this. And the fallout in medicine and other fields from our space effort already has been appreciable. Agriculture has benefited. So I am committed. I will keep fighting for it, and we have a big fight with Congress because when money is as tight as it is you've go to set priorities. But research and development is going to lead this country to a brand-new level of prosperity for young people. And you guys are on the cutting edge. So we're going to fight again in the next Congress for it.

Q Mr. President, Diane Tass is with us and she has a question not only important to the country, but terribly important to this community.

Q I wanted to know, Mr. President, how do you plan to support some of these airlines that are being edged out by the big three or four, and especially for just the average traveler who, once we get down to three or four airlines, we're

not going to be able to travel on vacations? Also I want to know how you feel about the U.S. Air-British Airways alliance.

THE PRESIDENT: Good questions. And first I've got to start off with we may have a philosophical difference. I don't believe it's the government's role to say how many airlines there are going to be, where those -- which ones are going to survive, which one's not. The market has to do that for the most part -- unless you want to go to a state-owned airlines. And I don't want to do that.

On the -- and so we're just going to have to be as competitive as possible. The problem with my argument is, a little bit, is that there are some government controls on airlines because the routes are set. But I still don't want to see government saying who's going to get in, who can't get in, who's got to get out.

On the U.S. Air deal, it's a tough one right now. And it boils down to this -- that British Air wants to take over U.S. Air. U.S. Air workers are picketing me out here in the field when I land, wherever I land, wherever there's any U.S. Air. And standing next to them in the field are the American Airline pickets -- all decent, wonderful Americans; all concerned about their jobs. And American airlines are saying, don't let British come in and take over U.S. Air unless we get access to the European markets.

Now, here's what will seem like a hedge to you. This matter is now under adjudication with the Secretary of Transportation. And to prejudge what his decision is, I would be -- I wouldn't be run out of office, but I'd have a lot of explaining to do in the legal community, and I'm not going to do it. But it is being heard. The interests are very difficult because you've got people whose jobs are going to be threatened one way or the other. And we'll just -- it will come to me. I'm not ducking it; it will come to me. But I have to wait until we hear from the department before I tell you what I think is going to happen on the British Air-U.S. Air-proposed merger.

On balance, on general statement, please discount airlines, I think we need more access to foreign markets in everything, whether it's agriculture or whether it's textiles, or whatever it is. Exports have saved us in an extraordinarily difficult global recession, and exports are going to lift us up and lead us out of it. But they aren't if we don't get -- hammer away and get more access to foreign markets.

Thank you.

Q Good evening, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: Hi.

Q Good evening, Mr. President. I'm Sergeant Oliver, stationed at McDill Air Force Base. What type of program or help will you offer those military members who are now being forced out of the military?

THE PRESIDENT: Just signed a bill today, the Defense Authorization Act, which also included this Cuban Democracy Act, I might add -- signed it in Miami. And that has a significant number of millions, up in the hundreds of millions for retraining and relocation.

And so -- the sergeant puts his finger on something. Because we were successful -- Desert Storm, around the world -- we are cutting back on defense. I've cut back on it significantly. My opponent, Governor Clinton and Ross Perot want to cut it $50 billion more. I'm not going to do that. I'm going to wait until I get a recommendation by Colin Powell and Dick Cheney, in whom I have total trust and whom the nation trusts,

because I think, even though there are problems in this world -- I mean, a lot of the problems have been solved -- there's still are wolves out there. And we'd better be strong.

But back to your question. The new Defense Authorization bill authorizes significant funds for exactly what you're talking about. But let's not let them cut into the muscle of our defense.

Q It is my understanding that capital gains tax reduction is actually supported by Bill Clinton. Is he not letting the public know this because of reduction of capital gains would actually help the middle class as much, if not more, than it would help the so called wealthy? And isn't it true that the only time we should be happy about taxes is when ours are going down and not when anybody else's are going up?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you're my kind of guy. That's what I think. (Laughter.) But for years the Democrats have been beating up on me saying capital gains is a tax gain for the rich. Let me tell you something. For months I've been asking the Congress to pass an investment tax allowance, a tax credit for the first time homebuyer and a cut in capital gains; not to help some rich guy, but to create new small businesses.

Small businesses employ two-thirds of the people. Jobs in the private sector would have been enhanced. And I'm going to keep on fighting for breaks for small business and one of them is capital gains.

I cannot get that point across and if Governor Clinton is for it, he whispering in one place and then -- the first bad thing I've said about the guy tonight -- but look, you can't be on all sides of every issue. And if he's for it, stand up a get his members of Congress, who are allegedly are -- who are opposed to it, to say I will support this man. I will get it through. I have big differences with him and this may be one of them. But if he's for it, I think he's whispering it to the business guys, but not saying anything to the rest of the people down there.

Q Mr. Bush, Bill Clinton and Al Gore have reached out to young voters with their recent appearances on MTV. Why have you and Vice President Quayle rejected such opportunities to reach out to 18-to- 24 years old voters?

THE PRESIDENT: Hey, we're trying to reach out to them with programs. I'm not too much of a mod MTV man. But I don't think what program you appear on -- I can't play the saxophone, but I know a good deal about issues. And so you can't be everywhere. I think our programs have strong appeal for young people, whether it's education reform, or whether it's on the health care so their families have a much better break on that. Whether it's on college scholarships, where our record is superb, in terms of these Pell grants.

But look, there's something funny going on in American politics. I've been doing this kind of program since 1978 in forums that were called "Ask George Bush." And I like it; I feel comfortable.

Some of the programs to get out there and kind of out do Oprah or Phil Donahue -- that's not my style. And maybe MTV would be a good one and I'll think about it. But you can't do them all and you shouldn't be judged by whether you go on one single network or one single program. That's my answer.

Q Good evening, President Bush. How do you envision American life and standard of living in five to 10 years if the national debt isn't controlled?

THE PRESIDENT: Not good, but I think we can control it. And you've got to start by controlling the growth of mandatory spending and not do it by raising people's taxes. And I think that will stimulate economic growth.

We're limping along. We've had five straight quarters of economic growth. The definition of recession is two straight quarters of negative growth. We haven't had negative growth for five quarters. That's over a year -- maybe six now, because the end of September, I think we'll find we had -- we grew. So we've had very anemic growth -- caught up in an economic global recession in some countries, slowdown in others.

We're going to come out of that. And the way we're going to come out of it, I believe, is by controlling the growth of our spending, by stimulating through the kinds of tax proposals I told him about, and getting this country growing. After the last recession, we grew at 5.4 percent. Now we're growing at 1.7 or 1.8 percent, maybe up into 2 now. And it's too anemic.

So you've got to have economic programs that are going to stimulate growth. And when that happens, then the standard of living -- the standard of living goes up. Personal income is up in this country. Agricultural income has reached a high under our administration. Please don't wait to hear about that on the top of the CBS Evening News or NBC or ABC -- I've got to be careful here -- because it's not -- you don't get much good economic news out there. The unemployment claims went down yesterday, the biggest since, I think, two years. And I didn't even hear about it on the news.

I'm not saying everything's perfect. A lot of people are hurting. But don't despair about the future standard of living if we get in there and bring a lot of new members of Congress and say now let's do what the people want done. I don't think they want their taxes raised. I do think they want to stimulate the economy.

Q Mr. President, time and time again you have used your veto power to go against the wishes of the American public. You did this by vetoing the family leave bill, something that I feel our country really needed. At a time when your campaign has pushed for family values, how could you veto the bill? And please don't tell me that it was to -- so it wouldn't hurt small businesses. From what I understand --

THE PRESIDENT: That's a good answer to it.

Q -- those with less than 50 employees would have been exempt. Is that true?

THE PRESIDENT: They would have been exempt, but we have a better idea. In the first place, I keep telling everybody here -- and I'll tell them up there -- the thing that's going to lead us out of this into recovery is small business. They do not need any more mandates from Washington.

My approach was a tax credit approach. And that includes -- what are those eyes going up? You don't agree with it. (Laughter.) I saw you rolling your eyes. And some doubt -- but my approach says why not the lower than 50? Why not the mom and pop store? Why not others? And my program would have covered them all. And you want to go with having the government dictate all this. And to say that that veto makes me less on family, I'm sorry, I reject it. It's a philosophical difference. And let's get a little more support out of those who think the government can do it all for some ways to strengthen the American family, as those mayors urged us to do.

I'm for family leave. I am not for needlessly burdening small businesses. So I am telling you what you don't want to hear. Sorry about that.

Q I'd like to ask you, considering the financial constraints facing cities yet the increasing need, would you support a plan to offer low or interest-free loans to local or state governments for infrastructure improvements?

THE PRESIDENT: I'd rather do it through enterprise zones. I'd rather do it through tax breaks to bring jobs into the inner cities. That's my priority. And it's a program -- when L.A. blew up, L.A. Central -- South Central -- the Mayor, the Governor and Peter Ueberroth all came back. I arranged for a meeting in the Cabinet Room with the Speaker and Gephardt, the leader of the Democrats in the House, and the Senate leaders. And all three of those people from California said, the way to help the cities is through enterprise zones, urban enterprise zones. So that's my preferred approach, rather than the one you suggest. And I really think it will work. I believe it will work.

Q My question is as follows: Do you believe that the United States must invest a significant amount of money in the Russian economy in order to help Mr. Yeltsin's newfound democracy, prevent a resurgence of the hard-liners, and perhaps initiating a new Cold War? And part two of the question is, how do you think this would influence in balancing the budget?

THE PRESIDENT: The answer to your question is, yes, I believe it. We have already passed on a bipartisan basis a thing called the Freedom Support Act. It's like an insurance policy. It says we spent trillions of dollars in the Cold War, and now Boris Yeltsin, the guy that stood on the tank and brought democracy forward in Russia, needs support. The Russian people need it. And we've already done it. I don't think we need more of that regard.

But you raise a good point. Anything we do of that nature makes balancing the budget more difficult. Any spending. All these programs we're being asked about makes getting the balance down -- getting the deficit down hard. So what you have to do is put together a budget, as I do every year. Four straight years I've had budgets that get in balance, putting to the Congress over five years -- you can't do it in one. And included in the last one is funding for the Freedom Support Act.

But the man's on to something. I mean, I happen to think that this is an insurance policy with Russia. And I don't want to see them go back to totalitarianism. And let's hope that this approach keeps them from doing that. But it costs money. And we've got to recognize it -- every time, whether it's a program here or a program there, the taxpayer is bearing the burden.

Q Mr. President, your own immigration officials interviewed Haitian refugees and found 40 percent were not economic migrants, but had credible fears of political persecution in Haiti. We correctly give asylum to Cuban refugees. Why since May have you ordered the Coast Guard to repatriate all of the Haitian boat people to a dictatorship we don't even recognize and which the State Department says executes and tortures its own people and which actually fingerprints the arrivals in Port-of-Prince and photographs them? And lastly, if you're really serious about restoring Haiti's ousted democratically-elected government, why do you let oil and other essential supplies reach Haiti's dictators from Europe?

THE PRESIDENT: Let me answer the last part first. We're not trying to starve the people of Haiti and we're not trying to freeze them or cook them or anything of that nature. On the first part of your question, this information that 40

percent are considered political refugees -- I'd like to see the documentation of that because our program says the law will apply; political refugees have access to asylum.

What I don't want to do is to see these merchants of death, these guys that rent these leaky boats or build them then sell passage to poor people, who offer them the hope of coming to America and then have a rescue operation -- some of them not rescued -- at sea. And we had a program to screen these people in Haiti. And I must have different information than you, but I've got pretty good information as President of the United States that these people are not being persecuted when they go to file their claims for asylum. So we've got a factual difference there.

Q In the Embassy, a case has come to our attention -- it's not the first one -- of a man who applied in June at the Embassy; three months later they invited him for an interview but he'd been dead nine days. Earlier a man's toenails had been ripped out -- there are 11,000 people that your own asylum officers in Guantanamo for six months before June said had credible fears of persecution in Haiti, and they'd been allowed to come here and ask for asylum. But now you send everybody back.

THE PRESIDENT: That's exactly my point. If they find cases like that, they're allowed to apply.

Q But now you're sending them back with no asylum interviews whatsoever, right to the docks to get fingerprinted by the Haitian military.

THE PRESIDENT: But I am told that when they go back there, there is not this persecution. You've raised it; let me take a look at it. Aristide, going back, we support that. I've got to be a little careful as President on what I say about him and how it works and what he's doing here.

Our policy has been to support the OAS -- the Organization of American States -- to get this man back, not because of a great love for any individual, but because of a commitment to democracy. I don't like to see democracy aborted by a coup. It isn't working too well because you don't have the public support that he once had. But we're going to stay with that for a while. But shutting down the oil is not that easy either. You ask the naval people about that.

Q Mr. President, I hate to stop this --

THE PRESIDENT: Kind of interesting debate, though.

Q -- but I've got to move on to Tampa-St. Petersburg for our next question.

Q Good evening, Mr. President. I wanted to find out from you what is the goals of your administration for the next five years? And also, I am a person who served in the military and my father served before me, and I want to find out your thoughts on the integrity of the person who will serve in the White House?

THE PRESIDENT: The goals are restore economic prosperity to this country. That is the single overriding goal. As Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces, as custodian of the national security, I've got to guarantee against threats to the United States or threats to the free world really, and I take that responsibility very, very seriously.

In terms of the next person to serve there, I have had differences with Governor Clinton. And some say to me, "you're old-fashioned." I find it difficult to understand how the Commander-in-Chief reacts, taking the position that he did,

that it's okay to organize demonstrations against your country when your country is at war in a foreign land. People say, what's the difference in a foreign land? I don't know, I make a distinction. If you want to protest come to the White House and do it, that's the American way. Everybody else does. Why don't you come along and do that? But I have big differences.

But my differences with Governor Clinton in terms of the custodianship of the -- or the being Commander-in-Chief is the problem that he has with kind of coming down on one position. On the war he said, "I agree with the minority but I guess I would have voted for the majority." You can't do that in the Oval Office. You have to make a decision. And sometimes it's painful, and you'll make a mistake and you say, look, I fouled that up, I made a mistake.

But on the war, we did the right thing and I thought his position was waffling around out there. So I can't pass judgment on how anybody else would behave. But I've tried to uphold the honor. I'm -- honor, duty and country -- I believe in that. And I believe in service to country. And I think I'm a better Commander-in-Chief because I fought for my country. I don't think it's a mandatory requirement, but I just think it's made me more sensitive when you have to commit somebody else's son or someone's daughter to combat, having been there.

Q Mr. President, we've run out of time. Thank you so much for being here with us tonight.

That was our last question. We know there are so many others, we'd like to get them all in but we have used up all of our time. We hope that the Florida News Network, through their town meetings, has helped you make an informed choice on November 3rd.

Q I'm sure last month you saw Governor Clinton on our town meeting and the Florida News Network has issued an invitation to Ross Perot. We are waiting his response. We thank all of you for joining us on television. Thank you here in our studio and our other studios around the state.

And, of course, thank you, Mr. President, for being with us.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very, very much.

END 8:59 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Georgia)

For Immediate Release October 20, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT CORNELIA WELCOME

Cornelia, Georgia

4:15 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very much. Thank you. four more. Thank you all very, very much. Thank you for this great Cornelia, Georgia welcome. It's a beautiful day in Georgia, and it's a bright day for the United States. We are going to win this election. (Applause.)

You know, all across the country I see signs, "Clean House." I'd like to see a new congressman in Washington -- Dan Becker. But while we're talking about it, while we're talking about it, let's do something great -- let's clean Senate and send Paul Coverdell to the United States Senate. (Applause.)

I was so pleased to be accompanied on this trip by one of the truly great American public figures -- Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina. What a great American he is. (Applause.) And also proud to have at my side in this campaign, as in the last, one of the great young, upcoming governors of the country, Governor Carroll Campbell of South Carolina. (Applause.)

And may I thank Russ Spangler for arranging all of this, being our master of ceremonies. And let me say this. I am sorry that she's not with us. She was in Norcross and is now off in another state, but I think in Barbara Bush we have the best First Lady in a long, long time. And she sends her love. (Applause.) And she sends her love. And let me put it this way: It's great to be in the land of the free and the home of the Braves. (Applause.) Chop 'em.

Forget all these polls. Forget them. We are going to win on Election Day. We're going to show America it ain't over til Cabrera swings. (Applause.) And by the way, I'll make a confession. I don't like -- I don't watch them anymore -- I don't like these Sunday morning inside-the-beltway talk shows emanating from Washington. And I'm going to sic Rick Flair on some of those talking heads. (Applause.) And I'm glad he's here with us today. Great American sports figure and a wonderful guy.

Now, I've got to ask you a question: Did anyone see the debate last night? (Applause.) Well, it seems to me we had a good, clean shot to go right into the living rooms across Georgia and across the United States, and to lay out a choice for the American people -- a vast difference in experience, a vast difference in the philosophy, and a vast difference in character among those who want to be President. (Applause.) A scary moment in the debate came when Governor Clinton said "I want to do for America what I've done to Arkansas." (Laughter.) We can't let that happen.

AUDIENCE: Booooo.

THE PRESIDENT: Hey, listen, we've got a lovely day out here. But let me just click off a few statistics. I don't want to sound like Governor Clinton, but I've got a few statistics of my own. Fiftieth -- here's Arkansas for you --

50th in environment initiatives; 49th in schools -- students with high school diplomas -- 45th in the overall well-being of children, income, jobs; wages lag the entire nation. We must not let him do to us what he has done to Arkansas. (Applause.)

My feisty little friend from Texas, Ross Perot, had one thing right. He said the grocery store is no preparation for Wal-Mart. Well, I think the man's on to something. (Applause.)

But, you know, on the economy, we've had a tough time. We're caught up in a global slowdown -- in some areas, a global recession. He talks about -- Governor Clinton talks about the United States being less than Germany and more than Sri Lanka. He ought to open his eyes. We are still -- in spite of our problems -- the envy of the world. And what I want to do is help America -- jobs recover. And the way not to do that is do what Clinton wants. He wants to raise your taxes by $150 billion and spend $220 billion more just for openers out of Washington, D.C. And we cannot let him do that to the American people. (Applause.)

He says, oh, let's let the rich guys pay it. There aren't enough of them. There are not enough Ross Perots out there. The middle class is going to have to pay. So do not elect somebody that starts out of the box saying, I want to raise your taxes and I want to increase spending. (Applause.)

It is my belief that government taxes too much and spends too much and help me right-size the Congress, right-size the federal Executive Branch, and right-size the government. With the new members of Congress coming there, we are going to be able to sit down with them and change things and protect the taxpayer and the young people of this country. (Applause.)

I want to create more jobs. Exports have saved us. We have the most productive workers in the entire world, and I want to see us create more jobs in this country that will sell more competitively abroad. We can do it, and I believe we will. (Applause.)

We've got to reform our health care system. I think it's a crying shame that doctors don't dare deliver babies because they're afraid of a lawsuit, or some of you guys won't coach Little League because you're worried some nutty parent's going to sue you, or some lawyer will get ahold of them. Or you pass an automobile accident on the street, and you're afraid to stop and help somebody because you're afraid a lawyer will come along, get the family of the victim to sue you. We can't do that. We've got to sue each other less and care for each other more. And I need your help to make that change in this country. (Applause.)

The hope of the country is the young people here. The hope of the country are the Raiders. (Applause.) And we ought to give them the best possible education. And that's why I favor school choice for parents -- public, private or religious schools. Help the parents strengthen the American family. The liberal don't like it when I talk about family values, but let me tell you something: When you come here to the state of Georgia, I think the nation understands what I mean. We need to strengthen the American family through choice, teaching discipline, respect for the law enforcement officers. Help me strengthen the American family. (Applause.) And one way you do that is by getting better, tougher anticrime legislation.

Let me tell you this: In Arkansas, people go to jail, and they spend 20 percent of their term in jail. Under the federal law, it's 85 percent. Let's pass some laws that have a little more concern for the police officers and the victims of crime and a little less for the criminals. (Applause.)

You know, one of the great meetings -- I have been privileged to be your President and have a lot of fascinating meetings in that marvelous Oval Office. And one of the very best was when I met with eight men from Little Rock, Arkansas the other day. Grassroots -- they could be the neighbors of everybody here in Cornelia. They came and said, we are for you, and they were the Fraternal Order of Police of Little Rock, Arkansas. That says something about who's going to support the law enforcement. (Applause.)

Now, give me your help in this next term in reforming the government. Give me a balanced budget amendment. Make us live within our means. (Applause.) Give me a check-off that says every taxpayer can check up to 10 percent of his tax returns to go to lowering the deficit, and make the Congress adjust. And if they won't, cut it across the board. Give the people the power. And give me those line-item vetos so I can cut out the pork and protect you, the taxpayer.

And while we're at it, I'd like to see term limits for the United States Congress. They've been around there too long. (Applause.) The President of the -- the presidency's term is limited. Let's give the Congress back to the people by limiting those terms. (Applause.)

You know, I had a chance last night in the debate to point it out, but Governor Clinton in the Richmond debate says, it's not the character of the President, it is the character of the presidency. Let me tell you something. They are inseparable. They are locked. And Barbara and I have tried to be good stewards and custodian of the American Dream and of that precious White House. And we have exemplified, I hope, enough courage and enough statesmanship to merit the trust of the American people.

But character is important, and you cannot in that Oval Office be all things to all people. You go forward, and if you make a mistake, you say, hey, listen, I was wrong about that one. But you keep on going serving the people. And Governor Clinton tries to be on every side of every issue. And you cannot have that as President of the United States. (Applause.)

I am very proud of the courage and backing I got from Georgia when I had the toughest decision of my life to make. And that is whether you send somebody else's son or daughter to fight for this country. I fought for my country, and that helped. But I'll say to you as President, it is not an easy decision. And Georgia backed me. The people here did.

But Governor Clinton said, well, I agreed with the minority -- meaning let sanctions work and all of that; let's not commit ourselves -- but on the other hand, I would have voted with the majority. You cannot waffle as President of the United States of America. (Applause.)

If he were a baseball fan he'd say, well, I'm for the Blue Jays. But then, on the other hand, I may be for the Braves. I'm for the Braves -- taking a firm commitment here. (Applause.) Give it to 'em. (Applause.) You're right.

Let me say this -- (applause) -- it's like Harry -- remember Harry Truman -- they'd say "Give him hell, Harry." And he said "Look, I just tell the truth and they think it's hell." I just tell the truth and he thinks it's hell. (Applause.)

You know, I believe we're going to win this election. I'm absolutely confident in my heart of hearts. (Applause.) Don't believe these crazy polls. Don't believe these nutty pollsters. Don't let these guys tell you what you think. You have a debate, you see what you think. And then two seconds later some crackpot comes on and tells you what you think. We don't need that in the United States. (Applause.) They don't like it, but that's the truth.

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: Four more -- that's what we need to get this job done.

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: Let me tell you something. You know, these days have been some difficult times. I've been blessed. You saw one of my sons here and my twin granddaughters here. And like a lot of people in this audience, I've been blessed by strong family -- a wonderful wife to back you up when the going is tough. I want to serve four more years because I really want to help people.

I think we've got the best answer in health care. I think we've got the best answer in education. And there's another reason: I don't believe for one single minute that this nation is a nation in decline. I've served. I understand the world. We're caught in something international here, and it is the United States of America that is going to lead the way to better lives for our people here, but also for a better world. And I want to continue this job.

I am grateful that these high school kids here -- (applause) -- go to bed at night without the same fear of nuclear war that their older brothers and their sisters had. And that happened under my presidency. (Applause.)

And so don't let people try to get into the White House by saying everything that is wrong with this great country. We are the greatest, the fairest, the best nation on the face of the Earth. And may God bless our country. (Applause.) And thank you for this tremendous support. (Applause.) Thank you so much. I'll never forget it. (Applause.) A wonderful day in Georgia. (Applause.) Thank you. This gets me fired up for the next one. I can't tell you what this has done for my spirits. Thank you very, very much. (Applause.) God bless you all. Thank you.

END 4:32 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(North Carolina)

For Immediate Release October 20, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT SPARTANBURG WELCOME

Spartanburg, South Carolina

8:20 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Wall to wall people. Thank you all. This has been a wonderful day, taking this train through Georgia and South Carolina. This is the icing on the cake. I am delighted to be with your great Senator and my great friend, Strom Thurmond. (Applause.) When you talk about a national leader, you've got a great Governor in Carroll Campbell, respected all across this country. (Applause.) And I salute him, and I salute Iris, and I'm delighted to have Rick Flair on our side. (Applause.)

I want to thank Barry Wynn and all of you who helped make this rally such a fantastic success. (Applause.) You know, everyplace I go, I see signs that say, "Clean House." Well, I've got an idea -- send Bob Inglis to the United States Congress. (Applause.) Get a good man up there.

And while we're at it, let's clean Senate, and send Tommy Hartnett, my old friend, to the United States Senate. (Applause.) We need a change. That institution's control hasn't changed in 38 years -- the Congress. It is time to clean House and send us these two good new people. (Applause.)

Well, I'm told that the world's entire supply of Pepto Bismol is made at the Proctor and Gamble camp, right down the road in Greensville. And after the past couple of months of campaigning, I'm sure sales must be soaring.

But look at it this way: Two weeks from tonight, all this will be over and I will be reelected President of the United States. (Applause.)

And let me give you a little advice. They've been so wrong before. Don't listen to these pundits telling you how to think, and don't listen to these nutty pollsters. Remember: Things are decided in the last couple of weeks in this campaign. And now people are going to decide: Who do I trust to be the leader of the free world and the United States? (Applause.)

I wonder if any of you saw the debate last night. (Applause.) Well, I think --

AUDIENCE: George Bush! George Bush!

THE PRESIDENT: -- I think the country saw a vast difference there -- a difference in principle, a difference in philosophy, a difference in experience, a vast difference in character. And I ask for your support on the basis of all of those. (Applause.)

You know, for 11 months, Governor Clinton and the rest of those liberals have been running around criticizing not only our country, but me and my record. And I think before people go to the polls, they need to know a couple of statistics

about his record. Arkansas is the 50th out of 50 states in environmental initiatives.

AUDIENCE: Booo!

THE PRESIDENT: It's deceiving. They are the 49th in students with a high school diploma. They are 45th in the overall well-being of children; and in incomes, in jobs and in wages, they lag the entire nation. We do not need that for the United States of America. (Applause.)

You know, let me tell you what he said last night in case you didn't hear it. He said, I want to do for the United States what I've done for Arkansas. We can't let that happen. No way.

Ross Perot was right on one thing. He said the grocery store is no preparation for Wal-Mart. I thought that was a good line. (Applause.) But here's the dangerous part: Governor Clinton wants to raise your taxes by $150 billion and increase spending by $220 billion. We're not going to let him do that. (Applause.)

I don't know how many people standing around here make over $200,000, but I'll guarantee you one thing: His figures don't add up. And to get that $150 billion he's going to have to go after your wallet. So when he says tax the rich, you taxpayers, you hard workers, you people that believe in the American Dream, watch out -- it will turn into a nightmare. (Applause.)

I've got a different philosophy. I believe the federal government is too big and it spends too much. He wants to see it spend more and tax more.

We've been caught up in something global. The global economy has slowed down. And though it hurts when anyone is out of work, I think it's fair to note that the American economy, in spite of our problems, is still a lot better than all the European economies or Japan or Canada. We are the United States. And I want to make it better, not worse. (Applause.)

I want to expand our exports so our textile products and our other products made in this great state can find free and fair markets all around the world. We are leading in exports; let's keep it up.

AUDIENCE: USA! USA! USA!

THE PRESIDENT: Let me remind you that it is small business that creates most of the jobs, and it is small business that doesn't need to pay any more taxes. It needs relief from regulation and taxation and litigation. Let's get the job done. (Applause.)

We've got too many crazy lawsuits, and Governor Clinton is owned by the pocket of the trial lawyers. We ought to sue each other less and care for each other more in this country. (Applause.) Governor Clinton wants to slap a tax on foreign investors. Well, let me ask right here in South Carolina. You do that, and you don't get a BMW plant. I would welcome BMW to South Carolina because they know our workers are the best anyplace in the world. (Applause.) And I congratulate your Governor for taking a lead role in bringing that great business to this state. (Applause.)

I want to promote that kind of investment in the United States of America. That means jobs for the American people, and we're going to keep on working for that.

Another area we've got a big difference is education. I told you about Arkansas' sorry record. But I'll

tell you a big difference. You see, I believe parents ought to have the right to choose and the help for money to choose private, public or religious schools for their kids. (Applause.) And I think we need more support for the teachers in the local communities and a little less for the bureaucrats. (Applause.)

And on health care, my plan provides insurance for the poorest of the poor, tax breaks for the middle class. But it does not turn the health care of this country over to the government. We don't need that. We need market forces. (Applause.)

And on crime, I believe we ought to be a little tougher on the criminal and have a little more concern for the victims of crime. (Applause.) And nobody in this country has fought harder for good, strong anticrime legislation than your own and my friend, Senator Strom Thurmond. (Applause.)

You know, the other day in the Oval Office, I had a visit from about eight guys from Arkansas. And they came up to pledge their support. And they represented the Fraternal Order of Police of Little Rock, Arkansas. They are supporting me for President of the United States. (Applause.) And so is the national Fraternal Order of Police -- because they know that I back up the law enforcement officers. They are fighting for us every day of their lives, and we ought to support them. (Applause.)

You heard another difference last night -- talking about reducing and reforming government. I'll tell you how to get this deficit down: Give us a balanced budget amendment to this Constitution. (Applause.) Give us a check-off so that people that care about the deficit can say, hey, I'm going to check in this box 10 percent of my taxes must go to reduce the deficit. If Congress can't do the job, make them do the job. (Applause.)

And I strongly support a line-item veto. Forty-three governors have it. Give it to the President. Let us try to make it work. (Applause.) And I like the idea of getting the power out of the congressmen and back to the people. I favor term limits for the Congress. (Applause.)

And lastly, Governor Campbell touched on it, but let me say I've got a big difference with Governor Clinton. He says it's not the character of the President, but the character of the presidency, and I say they're one and the same thing. They're locked in. (Applause.) And you cannot -- you cannot sit in that Oval Office and waffle. Do not turn the White House into the waffle house. You've got to stand up. (Applause.) You've got to stand up and make a tough decision. And when I had to make that tough decision on Desert Storm, Governor Clinton was saying this -- here's what he said: I'm for the minority, but I guess I would have voted for the majority. What kind of commander-in-chief would that make?

AUDIENCE: Booo!

THE PRESIDENT: I worry about the pattern of deception. On one side of an issue one day and then the opposite side the other. You cannot do that as President of the United States. (Applause.)

And let me tell you another one -- and this concludes it -- Governor Clinton and Senator Gore, the Ozone Man, is going around the world -- (laughter) -- you listen to some -- hey, this guy is strange. They've got Gore muzzled back now. You have no timber workers, only a bunch of owls, if you listen to him. You'd have no farmers, only a great, big wet hole out there somewhere if you listen to him.

But here's the point: They differ. They differ. They want bigger government. He talks about growing government. I want to grow the private sector. I want to grow jobs in the private sector. (Applause.)

But the big difference is to get elected they've got to convince the American people that the United States is a nation in decline, and we are not. We are number one -- in the economy, in security, in standing up for freedom and democracy. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: We're number one! We're number one!

THE PRESIDENT: I believe in the American people. And I have had the honor, and my family shared it with me -- one son here tonight and my daughter-in-law, twin granddaughters. And, certainly, I happen to think we've got the best First Lady that we could possibly ever have -- Barbara Bush. (Applause.) And we have been privileged as a family to live in that White House, and I've been privileged to serve as President. But I now want to do this: We've literally changed the world. And Carroll was very generous in his assessment. But when I look around here and see these young people, we've got lots to do. We've got all kinds of opportunity, and I want to take that same leadership, and with a brand-new Congress lift up the lives of the young people here tonight. We are not a nation in decline, we are a nation on the move. (Applause.)

And with our education and our job retraining and our caring for people, we are going to make America better. We're going to create jobs worldwide, and I will see that we continue to be the most respected leadership country in the entire world.

Thank you all, and may God bless the United States of America. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. God bless you all. (Applause.)

END 8:30 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Ridgewood, New Jersey)

For Immediate Release October 22, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT VINELAND WELCOME RALLY

Downtown Vineland
Vineland, New Jersey

12:16 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Frank. First of all, let me just thank Vineland. I have never seen such a wonderful rally. And it's great for the morale. (Applause.)

As Frank says, it's a great day for Vineland. I'll say it's a great day for George Bush. And this will go all across the country. (Applause.)

Everyplace I go, I see signs -- because people are sick and tired of the Congress, the way it's been for the last 38 years, controlled by the liberal Democrats. Everyplace I go, I see signs saying, "Clean House." One way to clean it is to send Frank Lo Biondo down to the United States Congress. (Applause.)

I want to thank State Senator Bill Gormley, who came to meet us. I want to thank Governor Kean, my great leader here and a great Governor. If you had him, people would be a lot more happy in New Jersey. (Applause.)

And, of course, Mayor Joe Romano, who's standing here with me. Give him great credit for all this. (Applause.) And Lou de Marco and so many others, I am so very pleased to be here.

In 12 days, we get right down to the log. We get right down to the vote. In 12 days, the American people are going to have to decide who has the character, who do you trust to be President? And I ask for your vote on that basis. (Applause.)

We are caught up in a global recession. The United States economy is doing better than most of the economies. But we're not doing well enough. And the last thing we need is to put another liberal Democrat in there who wants to raise taxes and raise spending. (Applause.)

We have a plan, the Agenda for America's Renewal, to get us out of this economic rut. And I see the deep-six -- the luxury tax -- we don't need a luxury tax, we need less tax. (Applause.)

I hate to ruin this beautiful rally, but we've got to put things in perspective, because Governor Clinton keeps talking about -- in the debate, he said something scary. He said, "I want to do for America what I've done for Arkansas." No way. No way.

AUDIENCE: Booo!

THE PRESIDENT: In his 10 years in Arkansas, jobs, wage, income growth have lagged the nation -- every single category. He talks about reforming health care -- after 10 years with Bill Clinton, almost half of Arkansas's workers don't have employer-paid health insurance. They are 49th in the entire nation. Don't let him do that to the United States. (Applause.)

Arkansas ranks 50th in the nation in the percentage of adults with high school diplomas -- 50th. Three out of four Arkansas

students after they graduate from high school, go to college, and then they need remedial education, relearning what they're supposed to learn in high school. They are good people down there. They deserve better leadership.

And the nonpartisan Corporation for Enterprise Development gave Arkansas failing grades for economic development, an "F" for employment, an "F" for high technology, an "F" for economic development. We cannot let him do that to the rest of the country. (Applause.)

And now he's campaigning across the country saying he's the candidate for change. Yes, he wants to raise taxes by $150 billion. He wants to raise spending by $220 billion. You listen to that kind of change, and that's all you'll have left in your pocket -- change. We don't need it. (Applause.)

The guy's all over the field. Yesterday he was out there in the west someplace saying it would be hypothetical to discuss what programs he would cut to pay for all these promises. Well, someone's going to have to pay the bill, and it won't be a hypothetical taxpayer. You cannot get all the money he wants to spend from the rich and from the middle class. He's going right after your wallet, man. If you hold a job on Main Street here, he's going after you. So button it up and vote for me. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Bush! Bush! Bush! Bush!

THE PRESIDENT: You saw it. I'm not just making this up. You saw it when Governor Florio came in here, working with that legislature.

AUDIENCE: Booo --

THE PRESIDENT: You saw what happened. Don't do it to the country. Do not do it to the country.

The last time that Governor Clinton is talking about -- well, we really need change. He wants to put the White House in the same hands of the big spenders in Congress. The last time we had this, do you remember what the Misery Index was? They invented it -- 20 percent; it's now 10 percent. Do you remember what the interest rates were? Twenty-one and a half percent, with Carter in the White House and the libs controlling the Congress. We cannot go back. We have got to go forward by getting government spending down and our taxes down. (Applause.)

I think New Jersey, because I think of you all as a great export state. You're broadminded. You look around and send a lot of New Jersey products all around the world. We must open more markets abroad so the productive workers in New Jersey can sell your products all around the world. Do not turn in, turn out. We are the leaders in the world. (Applause.)

There's 72,000 jobs in New Jersey tied to exports, 225,000 jobs to foreign investment of one kind or another. And Bill Clinton waffles on free trade -- tax foreign investment, threatening 4.5 million U.S. jobs by socking it to them. And you've got to open markets. You've got to encourage investments. And I want to open these new markets and encourage our workers. We can outcompete anyone, anywhere in the world. I have confidence in America. (Applause.)

You look around this town and you'll see that it is small business that employs people. Not the big ones -- they do their part -- but it's the small ones that create new jobs and new opportunity. So what I propose for small business is to give them relief from excessive taxation, relief from regulation, and relief from these crazy lawsuits that get inflicted on the people. (Applause.)

It's a sad thing in this country when doctors are afraid to deliver babies in case some of these crazy lawsuits going to come in and sue them; or somebody doesn't want to coach Little League for afraid they're going to get sued; or when somebody's riding along the highway and sees an accident, they don't want to stop and help the person that's hurt because they're afraid some crazy trial lawyer's going to come along and sue. We've got to sue each other less and care for each other more. (Applause.)

I am very proud of Governor Tom Kean's record when he was Governor on education. He was forward-looking. And now he's part of the leadership on a program called America 2000. It puts the power in the hands of the teachers and the local communities. It bypasses the power union that thinks it's speaking for the teachers. It puts the hands in -- the power in the hands of the people.

And we are literally going to revolutionize education. And one way we're going to do it is this: We're going to do it like the G.I. Bill worked. And I have a G.I. bill for kids. And we're going to say to parents: The power should be in your hands. We are going to help you financially to choose the school of your choice -- public, private or religious. (Applause.)

We've got a good program on health care. Give me a couple of more congressmen like Frank here and we'll get that job done. (Applause.) What it says is, don't throw the baby out with the bathwater, keep insurance going for everybody. Help the poorest of the poor; tax breaks for the middle class; create insurance pools; and leave the government out of the insurance business; and get the private citizens involved so everyone has insurance for health care. (Applause.)

I've got a real big difference -- I've got a tremendous difference with Governor Clinton on law enforcement. I see these police officers out here, and I think we ought to support them more, and a little less concern for the criminals. The other day -- one of the great visits I've had as President -- when people come to the Oval Office -- this was about six or eight guys came up to see me. They were all members of the Fraternal Order of Police. They endorsed me, and they were from Little Rock, Arkansas. (Applause.)

Eight-five percent of the criminals that are sentenced under federal law fulfill their full term; and in Arkansas, 20% do. The rest of them get going out of there, and they shouldn't do that. We've got to be tougher on the criminal. And don't listen to the liberals who want to tell it the other way around. (Applause.)

Governor Clinton talks about taxing more and spending more. Let me tell you what I want to do. Here's a four-point program for you: Give a me a balanced budget amendment and make us get that deficit down. (Applause.) Give the taxpayers that are concerned about the deficit a 10 percent -- check on a box -- 10 percent of your income. And if you want to apply that to the deficit, then that law will compel the Congress to cut spending by that amount. And we can get the deficit down by letting the people do the job that Congress has been unwilling to do. (Applause.)

And the last thing we got to do -- and one of the others -- is to give us a line-item veto. Let the President cut through this pork. (Applause.)

And the fourth point -- and I like this one -- is, you know, presidents serve limited terms. And one way to give the Congress back to the people is to have term limits for this Congress. (Applause.)

But I think the reason I'll win this election is going to boil down in the last two weeks, as all elections do, to character and to trust. You know, Justice Hugo Black -- I mentioned this -- did any of you see that debate out there in -- all right. I mentioned this, I believe that great nations like great men should keep their word. And my argument with Governor Clinton is he tries

to be all things to all people. In the Oval Office you cannot do that. But you have to make the tough decision. If you make a mistake, you say, listen, I made a mistake, let's go forward. But you cannot lie, and you can't be all things to all people.

And over and over again, Governor Clinton is trying to be all things to all people. On free trade, first he was for it, then he hadn't made up his mind, now he's for it - maybe. On the Persian Gulf, here's what he said, he said, "I agree with the arguments of the minority but then again I," -- "I guess I would have voted for the majority. If we'd have listened to that kind of waffle, Saddam Hussein would control the world's oil and have a nuclear bomb. We kicked him out. (Applause.)

These decisions are not easy, but you cannot be waffling on one house -- we cannot let him make the White House into the waffle house. I went down there and had a little breakfast there at the waffle house in North Carolina to get the point across. You cannot be all things to all people.

And he said in the debate, you've got to separate the character of the -- he says it this way -- he says "it's not the character of the President, it is the character of the presidency." That is not true; they're interlocked. Countries look to us to see whether the President will keep his word and make the tough decisions. And on the basis of character and trust, I ask for your support as President of the United States. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: You know, if I'd have stood here in Vineland -- if I'd have stood here in Vineland four years ago and said that Soviet communism would be dead; and said that Eastern Europe would be democratic; and said that ancient enemies were talking peace around the world; and said to these kids four years ago, we are going to reduce, if not all but eliminate the threat of nuclear war, you would have said not only is he smoking, but he's inhaling. (Applause.) And all that has happened. All that has happened.

But there are still -- the Soviet bear may be gone. And, yes, we've changed the world dramatically and made it better. But there are still some threats out there. And so I want to keep this country strong and now I want to use that leadership that has literally changed the world; lift up the American worker; guarantee these kids that they are going to have a better future. And it can't be done by waffling, it's got to be done through leadership. (Applause.)

I'm very sorry that Barbara Bush isn't here because I think we've got a great First Lady and I want to see her stay there. (Applause.) But she and I have tried very hard to keep the public trust -- to take the trust you placed in us and live with dignity and honor in that White House. And now that -- some say to me well, why do you want to be President? It's not a question of wanting to be President, it's a question of finishing the job for the young people here today. (Applause.) And I am going to win this election. Don't listen to these nutty pollsters trying to tell you how to think. (Applause.)

I wonder how many people out here have ever been called by a pollster. Well not very many show a hand -- one guy. We got about 10,000, 15,000 people here. I don't know who they talk to, but they're inhaling, and we're going to win this election. (Applause.)

Thank you. Thank you, and may God bless the United States of America.

END 12:37 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Ridgewood, New Jersey)

For Immediate Release October 22, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT RIDGEWOOD WELCOME

Veterans Memorial Park
Ridgewood, New Jersey

3:35 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. It's great to be here. Thank you. What a beautiful day in New Jersey. And let me tell you something: This marvelous crowd convinces me that I will reelected for four more years in 12 days from now. (Applause.)

I want to thank Bob Grant. I want to thank Bob Grant. He always brings people he's for some good luck. And I want to thank your Congressman Marge Roukema. You've got a great Congressman in Washington, D.C. (Applause.)

Everywhere I go, people yell, "Clean House." If we had more like Marge, you wouldn't be doing that. But we need a new Congress to work with her to change America. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: This guy's fired up, up here. (Applause.)

Let me also say that I still wish that Governor Tom Kean were Governor of the state of New Jersey, I'll tell you. (Applause.)

May I thank Mayor Pat Mancuso. And may I say a belated congratulations to the Ridgewood Maroons, the All-Champions, the State Champions, football champions. (Applause.)

And so, I come into this state feeling good. Something's happening out across this country. (Applause.) Something is happening. We're moving up on this guy. And, remember, the vote is not over until November -- when people vote on November 3rd. And we are going to win the election because we are right for the American people. (Applause.)

Here's what's going to decide it -- here's what's going to decide it: When people go into that booth, they're going to have to ask themselves, who do you trust to lead America out of a global recession? Who do you trust to create new jobs? Who has the experience and the ideas to lead the United States of America? (Applause.)

For a long time -- for a long time, Governor Clinton and a handful of others running for President -- for about a year -- have been misrepresenting our record. And so today, I want to run the risk of ruining what is a lovely recession -- a lovely reception -- (laughter) -- wait'll you hear this, you'll know what I'm talking about. I've got to give you just a little bit on the Arkansas record. We've got to get in perspective. Watch out, here it is.

The 50th -- Arkansas is the 50th in the quality of environmental initiatives. They are the 50th in the percentage of adults with a college degree. They are 50th in the per capita spending on criminal justice. They are 49th in per capita spending on police protection. When a high school kid gets out of -- when a kid gets out of high school, 75 per cent of them in college need

remedial learning. They are 48th in adult -- in adults with a high school diploma; 48th on support for corrections; 46th on teachers salaries; 45th on the overall well-being of children. And the other night Governor Clinton says, "I want to do for America what I've done for Arkansas." No way.

AUDIENCE: Booo --

THE PRESIDENT: No way. No way. It's like taking a guy in the Little League, taking a manager of the Little League team that finished last, and say he ought to be managing the Braves. There's a big difference between failing in Arkansas and leading the United States of America. (Applause.)

I'll give you a little -- I'll give you a little idea of what he has already said he wants: $150 billion in new taxes; $220 billion in new spending. He talks about trickle down -- that is "trickle-down government." Government's not yet to create a job that means anything -- small business does that. Let's help small business, not big government. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: It's easy when the times are tough. And yes, we've got a tough economy. We happen to have one of the best in the world. It's not as good as I want it, but we're in a global slowdown -- a global recession. And we've got to change things. But what we don't need to do is go back what it was like when the Democrats controlled the White House and the Congress, which they've controlled for 38 years.

I want to remind you what it was like. Interest rates -- some here are too young to remember -- 21.5 percent. We don't want that for the United States. Inflation was 15 percent. The misery index was going through the ozone hole, that Gore talks about all the time. And we cannot go back to the failed policies of the past. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: Our idea is the government under control and get government spending and the taxation bill down. I saw a horrible sign here -- it says Clinton equals Florio. No, we cannot do that to the United States. There it is. The guy's got it right there.

In early October, the number of Americans filing new claims for jobless benefits to a two-year low. We just got this announcement today. It's a good sign. And I can't wait to turn on the evening TV tonight and hear good news for America. I'm sure they'll report it -- so far I haven't heard too much about that. We've had unemployment down for the last three months. I haven't heard too much about that. And my favorite bumper sticker -- Tom, you got it? Here's my favorite bumper sticker of all -- "Annoy the Media, Reelect Bush." (Applause.) What is it about these guys? (Applause.)

Let me tell you what we've got to do -- and New Jersey knows this -- we've got to open up markets abroad. New Jersey can outproduce, outhustle -- our workers can outproduce, outhustle any, anywhere in the world. But we've got to open up these markets. We've got to outcompete the rest of the world. We don't turn inward, we turn outward and sell New Jersey products in markets all around the world, and that's what I stand for. (Applause.)

A lot of you people here today are small business people. And that means they employ two-thirds of the people in this country -- two-thirds. And they're not taxed too little. They're not regulated too little. They're taxed too much and regulated too much and they're sued too much. Let's change all three. (Applause.)

I'm not -- hey, look -- I'm not against lawyers. What I'm against is malpractice lawsuits that keep doctors from practicing. I'm against lawsuits, so a person goes by and sees a person lying on the side of the road in a car accident and then they're afraid to pick them up and help them because somebody is going to sue them; or a Little League coach who's afraid to coach because some nutty trial lawyer is going to come in and sue the opposition. I'm sorry, we are suing each other too much in this country and caring for each other too little. And we've got to change it. (Applause.)

And Governor Clinton owes his election to the trial lawyers in the past. And we've got to stand up against those people and put some caps on these ridiculous lawsuits that are costing health care alone 50 -- $25 to $50 billion. Do something about it. Change it. That's the kind of change we need. (Applause.)

We've got a good health care program that's going to get insurance available to the poorest of the poor; tax credit to the overworked middle class; get the insurance portable so it goes with you from job to job; change malpractice. But do not let the government run the health care program. (Applause.) And don't let the Congress do it. Congress can't run a two-bit bank or a two-bit post office. (Applause.) Don't let them do anything except change -- change them out. (Applause.) Give Marge some company up there that's sensible like she is.

We've got a good education program -- reform education, America 2000. Tom has been in the lead of it. Taking our case for new American schools all across the country. Saying to the parents, you ought to be able to choose, you ought to choose whether you want your kid to go to a public, private or religious school. It worked for the G.I. Bill, it will work for the public education, too. (Applause.)

Everyplace I go we are so well supported by the law enforcement community. And very candidly, we have been fighting hard to get decent, strong support for our law enforcement community in the Congress. And it's been frustrating. But my idea is we ought to have more support for the police and less support for the criminals. (Applause.) We need people in Congress that will stand up and support us. (Applause.)

The other day -- the other day we had -- I think it was eight people came up to see me. And they were the salt of the Earth -- strong family people, dedicated to the values of this country. And they are supporting me for President. And they are the Fraternal Order of Police from Little Rock, Arkansas. (Applause.)

And speaking of support from labor, I'm glad to see the guys from 472 here. Heads are on right -- strong workers -- the best, the best. (Applause.)

Now here's -- let me, let me -- I get wound up -- too wound up here, but I want to tell you another approach. I'm concerned about the deficit. Marge is concerned about the deficit. Parents are concerned about the deficit because they don't want their kids having their future mortgaged anymore. So I'll give you four ideas: one of them -- give me a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution and make us, make the Congress and the Executive do something about it. (Applause.)

I like the idea also of giving the taxpayer a check-off on his income tax at the end of the year. And he or she can check a box, pay the tax -- 10 percent of it would then go -- and have to go -- to reducing the federal deficit. And that would force the Congress to offset with spending cuts. We need to give the people the power to get this down. (Applause.)

I think we ought to give the power of the Congress back to the people. The President's terms are limited. I favor term limits for the Congress. (Applause.)

And lastly -- lastly, they send me bill after bill. And it's got three good things in it and 25 bad things -- or it will have 20 good things and four bad things. And I want that -- you've got it -- I want that line-item veto that 43 governors have. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: I'll tell you why I really believe I'm going to win this election. I'll tell you why: I don't believe that the country is going to turn to a man who said in this debate, it isn't the character of the President, it is the character of the presidency. They are interlocked. You cannot separate the leadership of the President from the character of the Presidency. (Applause.)

And you cannot be all things to all people. You've got to say, here's what I believe. And if you make a mistake, you do what you all do -- you say I was wrong about that, now I'm going to get on about the nation's business. You can't be on all sides of all question. Whether it's term limits -- where he is one day, someplace else the next. CAFE standards -- one day he wants 45 miles per gallon -- drive every auto worker out of business -- the next day, oh, he's going to study it a little more. A furry owl out on the West Coast -- oh, he's all for the owl, but then he sees the timber workers -- oh, well, I'll study that one a little more.

You can't do that as President of the United States. I had to make a tough decision -- some of you may have agreed with it, some of you didn't -- but when Saddam Hussein took over Kuwait, I determined that we were going to kick him out of Kuwait, and we did. (Applause.)

And where was Bill? He said -- here's exactly what he said -- he said, I agreed with the minority, but I guess I would have voted with the majority. What kind of leadership is that? Flip-flop, flip-flop, everything to all people. You can't do it. Look the American people in the eye and say this is what I'm for. I'll call them as I see them. I'll be right, I'll be wrong, but I'm going to tell you the truth. I'm not going to be all things to all people. You can't do it. (Applause.)

And so I think character is important. And I think trust is important. And Barbara and I have tried very hard as a family to uphold the public trust. The honor of living in this, the most fantastic "people's house" in entire world. We have changed the world. These kids go to bed at night without the same fear of nuclear war that their mothers and dads had. And that is significant -- challenge and significant change. (Applause.)

And now what we've got to do is take that same leadership, and working with the new Congress -- and there will be one; there will be over 100 new members of the United States Congress -- say, I want to sit down with you the minute this election is over and do the people's business. Get on with the business of lifting up every family in this country and telling them -- not like Clinton does, that we're a nation in decline -- but we are the best, the fairest, most decent country in the entire world. And now let's make life better for every single American. (Applause.)

Thank you all, thank you very, very much and may God bless the United States of America. May God bless our great country. Thank you. (Applause.)

END 3:51 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(North Carolina)

For Immediate Release October 21, 1992

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT KANNAPOLIS WELCOME

Kannapolis, North Carolina

12:45 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Lynn, thank you, and thank all of Kannapolis and all of North Carolina for this wonderful welcome. I'm delighted to be with you on this beautiful North Carolina day. (Applause.)

Again, my thanks to Lynn Safrit, and thank you for the introduction; thank all of you for the welcome. And let me say at the beginning here, I am so proud to have the leadership and the support of your great Governor Jim Martin. What a job he's done for this state. (Applause.) And I salute the three members of the United States Congress that are with me, standing here -- Cass Ballenger and Alex McMillan, and Strom Thurmond -- the indefatigable Strom Thurmond from next door here. (Applause.)

If we had more senators like Strom and Jesse Helms, we'd be in great shape in that Senate. (Applause.) And that's why I'm for Lauch Faircloth for the Senate -- I hope you'll send him up there and clean Senate as well as cleaning House. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Clean the House!

THE PRESIDENT: And the man says, "Clean the House," and he's right. Well, let's start by sending Coy Privette up to the Congress. (Applause.) And I also -- I served in the Congress years ago with Jim Gardner -- I want to see him elected to the governorship to continue the work Jim Martin has done. (Applause.)

And also may I salute another American great. I think you've heard from him; I hope you have. You know him, you respect him as I do -- and I'm talking about Darryl Waltrip here. What a great American, great fellow. (Applause.) We're so proud of his record and what he stands for.

It's great to be here today. I've got to ask this question: Did any of you all see that debate two nights ago or three nights ago -- whatever it was? (Applause.) Well, let me tell you something. I hope what you saw was a vast difference in philosophy, approach to this great country of ours, and I hope you saw a difference in character, because that's what's going to decide this election. (Applause.)

You know, Governor Clinton talked about his record in Arkansas, and I don't want to ruin a beautiful gathering like this, but let me just --

AUDIENCE: Please don't. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: I've got to do it. I've got to put it in perspective. Let me -- listen to this now -- facts. Arkansas rates 50th in the quality of environmental initiative; 50th in the percentage of adults with college degrees; 50th in percentage -- per capita spending on criminal justice; 49th in

per capita spending on police protection; 48th in percentage of adults with a high school diploma; 48th in spending on corrections; 46th on teachers' salaries; 45th on the overall well-being of children. And Governor Clinton said the other night "I want to do for the country what I've done for Arkansas." We cannot let him do that. (Applause.) You cannot do that.

It's like sending some little league guy to coach the Braves. The Braves are going to win -- (applause) -- you've got the chop going. Governor Clinton's like the guy that says, well, I might be for Toronto, but on the other hand, I'm for the Braves. You've got to make a commitment. I am for the Braves. Let's be clear on that one. (Applause.)

You know, all we hear about from that Clinton-Gore outfit is change, change, change -- and that's all you'll have left in your pocket if they go in and start raising your taxes and increasing spending. (Applause.) He got a little mad at me when I pointed out what he said he wanted. He said he wants $150 billion in new taxes, $220 billion in new spending. And I call that trickle-down government. Big government trickling its way down to the people. Let's make it the other way -- have the people telling the government what to do. (Applause.)

I remember the last time we had the kind of change he wants to bring to Washington. I hate to bring this one up -- but how many remember the Misery Index that was invented not by us, but by the liberal Democrats -- unemployment and inflation added together. It was 21 percent. Now it's 10. How many remember what interest rates were back then when the Democrats controlled the White House and the Congress? Twenty-one percent. We cannot have that kind of change for the American people. (Applause.)

No, that's change all right. And, as I say, we can't have change for the sake of change; we've got to keep this country moving. And I want -- I've got a proposal -- it's called the Agenda for America's Renewal -- that will cut this spending down. And I'll tell you how I'm going to do it. I'm going to get this new Congress working with these congressmen here who are good and solid to give me a line-item veto to cut out some of the pork out of the budget. (Applause.)

We're going to insist to do what the people want -- give the federal government a balanced budget amendment and take the burden off the backs of these young people. (Applause.) And you want to get the deficit down? Give the taxpayer a check-off. Let the taxpayer say, okay, I'm checking this box on my income tax. Ten percent of my tax must go for reducing the deficit by reducing spending. And if they can't do it, make it mandatory. Make it obligatory. (Applause.)

A couple of other ideas. I don't believe that the answer is to pull inward; I believe we ought to open markets abroad for agriculture, for our textile products, for whatever it is. We've got the most productive workers in the world; now let's hammer out new markets, so North Carolina will continue to do what it's doing -- growing and prospering. (Applause.)

Another thing is small business. We've got some big ones right around the corner here, but small business is what drives this country. And we need less regulation, we need tax breaks, investment tax allowance. We need a capital gains incentive so small business can prosper. We do not need more Clinton-Gore big government. (Applause.)

I think every American worries about health care. And I believe our proposal to provide insurance to the poorest of the poor, to provide tax credit to the overworked and overtaxed middle class is the way to go. Because it provides the quality of our health care, keeps that; and yet, makes insurance available to all. And when you leave one job, the insurance goes

with you -- that's a very important part of it. Keep the quality of the health care, but do not let the government get in and tell us how to run health care. (Applause.)

On education -- I am proud of our record. We have 1,700 communities across the land, North Carolina in the lead and many of its communities, literally reinventing our education. And let me be clear on the big difference with Governor Clinton. I believe that the parents should be able to choose. Just as parents choose day care now because of us, let them choose the school of their choice -- public, private, or religion -- and help them get that. Help them do it. Let's try it. And that will make the public schools better. And it worked in the G.I. Bill after the war. State schools prospered. And it will work for public schools to prosper if we try something different. School choice. Let the family stay together and have a say in all of this. (Applause.)

You know, coming along this trip on the train, I was talking to the Governor and these congressmen about it. It makes me give thanks and count my blessings for those who serve in law enforcement. And I've tried to back them. Strom Thurmond here, your neighbor, has been a leader for tougher laws to go after these criminals. And we've been blocked by a soft-thinking United States Congress.

But when I see those police officers and sheriffs, people and whatever it is, I count my blessings for what they do in our neighborhood. And the other day, we had a visit from six or eight people from -- came to see me -- they were from Arkansas. And they came to give me their endorsement: The Fraternal Order of Police in Little Rock, Arkansas are backing me for President of the United States. So let's support them. Let's support our law enforcement community.

You know, the last point I want to make relates to character. I don't quite understand it when Governor Clinton said in Richmond, Virginia -- he put it this way: It's the character of the presidency, not the character of the President. I don't believe that. I believe it's both. I believe that the President influences the presidency. And I have tried to keep the public trust, and I believe Barbara has kept the public trust. (Applause.) And I don't think you can be on all sides of every issue and keep the public trust. (Applause.)

Some of these guys were talking about Desert Storm. It was a proud moment in our history, and no state did more than North Carolina when their sons and daughters went there. (Applause.) None. And let me remind you where Governor Clinton is when I had to say a prayer up at that little chapel in Camp David a couple of days before we had to commit your sons and your daughters to war. Governor Clinton was saying this as soon as that tough vote was taken a couple of weeks before that moment. He said, well, I was with -- this is a paraphrase -- I probably -- I could support the minority view, but I guess I would have voted for the majority.

If we'd have listened to that view, Saddam Hussein would be in Saudi Arabia today, controlling three-fifths of the world oil and he'd have a nuclear weapon. And because we made a tough decision that didn't play both sides of the aisle, the fourth largest army in the world was defeated by your sons and your daughters. And it's a proud moment, and don't let them try to convert it into something bad. (Applause.)

On every issue, whether it's the right to work -- one day he's on one side of it, another day when he's talking to the labor bosses he's on the other side of it. On term limits, I'm for it -- one day he says he's for it and the next day he's against it. On the free trade -- whatever it is -- he's on one side and then another.

There's a pattern here of deception. And you cannot have a President who's going to try to be all things. You've got to make the tough decision, and when you're right get a little credit if you can. But when you're wrong admit your mistakes and go on trying to lead this great country. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Let's keep him in Arkansas --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let's do that, and let's also not turn the White House into the waffle house. We can't have that. (Applause.) We had breakfast at the Waffle House today -- a little symbolism. Very good breakfast, I might add, but there was a message in that. I don't think the American people want a President who's going to try to be all things to all people.

You know, let me put it this way. Sometimes as President you're faced with pretty tough decisions. Sometimes the phone rings at night and you've got to make a call, or in the day you've got groups coming to compete for your interest and your activities and whatever it is -- your vote. But it's a wonderful thing, the presidency of this country. I want to be elected not to keep a job, but I want to continue to try to help the young people.

Today the young people go to bed at night without the same fear of nuclear war that they had four years ago, and we helped accomplish that for the whole world. (Applause.) Today democracy is on the move to the south and across the world. And, yes, we're caught up in an international economic slowdown, and some places, a recession. But our economy -- you'd never get it from this media -- our economy is doing better than Canada and Germany and England and Japan and France. (Applause.)

And now my goal -- my goal is to make it even better still. We've got to help the people of this country. And it's the United States that's going to lead our way to economic recovery at home and to global economic recovery so we can sell more products from this state all around the world. (Applause.)

So the job is not yet finished. And, yes, we have changed the world. And, yes, I'm proud that interest rates are far less than they were when we came in and inflation under control so every senior citizen is not threatened by being wiped out by this cruelest tax of all. But we've got much to do.

So I came here today to say we are not a nation in decline. Do not listen to the pessimists -- these liberal Democrats posing as a friend of America. We are the number one nation in the world. Now help me make it even better. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: The American Dream is still alive. And let me say in conclusion the longer I am in this White House the more I understand what it means to say we are one nation under God. (Applause.) Don't you ever forget it. (Applause.)

And so with faith -- with faith and with your support, we are going to show the pundits are wrong. We are going to do what Truman did and show these pollsters don't know what they're talking about. The American people will give us this victory. Thank you -- and be sure to go to the polls. (Applause.) And may God bless -- may God bless the United States of America. Thank you very, very much. Thank you all. (Applause.)

END 1:04 P.M. EDT