

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Julie A. Mixell (MIXELL_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:26-JAN-1995 10:20:23.68

SUBJECT: Meeting?

TO: Jennifer N. Palmieri (PALMIERI_J) (OMB)

READ:26-JAN-1995 11:41:42.73

TEXT:

Judge Mikva, George S., Joel Klein and Cliff Sloan need to meet
with Mr. Panetta for apprx. 10 minutes either today or tomorrow
re: Cammermeyer case (Gays in the Military). Does anything look
possible? Thanks
Julie 6-6611

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1995 13:48:51.77

SUBJECT: 1995-02-02 Interview of the President by Religious Press

TO: Julia R. Green (GREEN_J) (WHO)
READ: 3-FEB-1995 15:20:51.76

TO: Dawn A. Alexander (ALEXANDER_DA) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 13:49:31.64

TO: Gabrielle M. Bushman (BUSHMAN_G) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 15:22:59.82

TO: Steven A. Cohen (COHEN_SA) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 13:49:10.28

TO: Manager Infomgt (INFOMGT) (SYS)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Arthur L. Jones (JONES_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David M. Kusnet (KUSNET_D) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David Leavy (LEAVY_D) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Cynthia J. Lizik (LIZIK_C) (OA)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 13:49:43.48

TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez (RIVASVAZQU_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Richard L. Siewert (SIEWERT_R) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 14:08:59.61

TO: Wendy L. Smith (SMITH_WL) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 13:49:23.21

TO: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 13:49:02.78

TO: Virginia M. Terzano (TERZANO_V) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nancy L. Ward (WARD_N) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK_N) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 14:34:25.81

TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 14:01:27.42

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 15:59:40.98

TO: David Dreyer (DREYER_D) (WHO)
READ: 3-FEB-1995 08:41:07.70

TO: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 14:06:14.69

TO: Lorraine McHugh (MCHUGH_L) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 14:04:56.99

TO: Rica F. Rodman (RODMAN_R) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 14:31:06.95

TO: Lawrence J. Sampas (SAMPAS_L) (WHO)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Jess Sarmiento (SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 14:00:36.79

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (SCHWARTZ_L) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 15:30:47.49

TO: Joshua Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 13:49:39.27

TO: Richard Strauss (STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Lori E. Abrams (ABRAMS_L) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 18:14:28.44

TO: Walker, Angelina (Angelina Walker@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Karen L. Barbuschak (BARBUSCHAK_K) (OA)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 13:53:53.72

TO: Heather Beckel (BECKEL_H) (WHO)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Robert O. Boorstin (BOORSTIN_R) (WHO)
READ: 7-FEB-1995 20:20:07.89

TO: Elizabeth C. Bowyer (BOWYER_E) (WHO)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Lisa M. Caputo (CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Helen H. Dickey (DICKY_H) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 14:40:05.52

TO: Rahm Emanuel (EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen E. Finney (FINNEY_K) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jason S. Goldberg (GOLDBERG_JS) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS (HAAS_L) (OMB)
READ: 4-FEB-1995 12:25:45.59

TO: Alexis M. Herman (HERMAN_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Wayne C. Johnson (JOHNSON_WC) (OA)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 14:15:12.12

TO: James Kohlenberger (Jim Kohlenberger@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: G. N. Lattimore (LATTIMORE_G) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mike Lux (LUX_M) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Doris O. Matsui (MATSUI_D) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 13:49:23.50

TO: Paul Meyer (MEYER_P) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (MILLS_C) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 16:42:53.18

TO: Elizabeth A. Montoya (MONTOYA_E) (WHO)
READ:10-FEB-1995 17:02:44.67

TO: Douglas S. Sheorn (SHEORN_D) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 16:13:34.01

TO: Susan P. Shepard (SHEPARD_S) (OA)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 13:55:14.76

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 13:49:00.43

TO: Jodie R. Torkelson (TORKELSON_J) (WHO)
READ: 2-FEB-1995 14:02:42.50

TO: Michael Waldman (WALDMAN_M) (OPD)
READ: NOT READ

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER
TOP ALL
- \p -

BOTTOM ALL
MORE

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Internal Transcript February 2, 1995

INTERVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT
BY RELIGIOUS PRESS

The Oval Office

11:46 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I'm glad too see you all and welcome you here, for many of you, for the first time. As you know, when I was in -- in the State of the Union address, I issued a challenge and as part of my explanation of the New Covenant in challenging citizens to be more responsible to people of faith and to religious leaders, specifically, to help us to deal with those problems that we have to deal with person by person and from the inside out; to help us to deal with the problems of teen pregnancy and out-of-wedlock birth; to help us to deal with the challenges of excessive violence; to help us to deal with the things that have to be organized and dealt with literally one by one at the grassroots level. And while I think we have to be more tolerant of all people, no matter what their differences are, we need to be less tolerant of conditions that are within our power to change.

And as you know now, for two years, ever since I took this job, I've been trying to find ways to galvanize the energies of people of faith to work together on a common agenda that nearly all Americans would agree on; and at the same time, to try to respect the differences of opinion and views. Our administration strongly supported the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, and we've worked very hard to implement it in a good faith way. And I think an awful lot of people from right across the spectrum of religious affiliations in our country would agree that we have done that.

Anyway, if you have any questions, I'd be glad to

answer. But the other thing I was going to say today -- what I said today was that the problems our country faces today are quite profound -- you know, the fact that a rising tide is not lifting all boats; that a lot of people, in spite of this remarkable recovery, have not gotten a raise and they're more vulnerable with their health care, their pensions; and the fact that a lot of people find their values violated and their security violated by crime and violence and the breakdowns of the social order. It would be very hard to assert that there are more profound difficult than the problems of previous days, than the problems that George Washington or Abraham Lincoln or Franklin Roosevelt confronted.

The difference is that in the Information Age, which gives us these vast new opportunities because of the creation of wealth is based on knowledge, and that these people have access to more knowledge than ever before. It's also a great burden because words have greater power today than ever before not only to build up, but also to tear down, to divide, to destroy, to distract. And therefore, in a very profound sense in the modern world, it is more important that people be striving for the kind of spiritual presence of mind and peace of mind that will lead you to use words to build up and to unify, instead of to divide and tear down. And I really do believe that. I think that it's clearly different from any previous time.

Words have always been able to wound in letters or speeches or whatever. But the omnipresence of information today and the fact that we're buried in it, it seems to me, imposes an even greater responsibility on people in positions of respect and trust and power to use those words more carefully.

Q An awkward question, sir. The moral crusade elements of the State of the Union address -- teenage pregnancy, as an example -- sits well, except that there are investigations into your own conduct which some people say leaves an impression. Is this interfering with your ability to lead that type of crusade?

THE PRESIDENT: Not in my own mind. That's up for other people to determine. But the one thing that I would say today -- we live in an age where anybody can say anything; and unlike in previous times, it gets into print. And even if they admit they took money to say it -- which is what happened in my case a couple of times -- it still gets wide currency. So there's not much I can do about that.

I can tell you this -- the work I've tried to do to reduce teen pregnancy and out-of-wedlock births generally is something I've been involved in for many years. And I think it's a very serious matter. The life of these young people was very, very different than my life was when I was their age. Their temptations, their travails, -- it's very, very different and much more difficult for them. And I think we've got to try to find a way to help them walk back from what is now happening.

Interestingly enough -- this is a statistical comment I'm making now -- there is some evidence that the efforts may be beginning to have some impact. The actual numbers of out-of-wedlock births have stabilized in the last two or three years. The rate of illegitimacy is going up because the rate of childbearing by couples who are young and successful is going down, which is another problem for another discussion. But, anyway, I don't see that we have any choice as a people to deal with it, and it's -- and, you know, if folks want to use that as another excuse to attack me, that's their problem, not mine.

Q Related to that, some people suggest that both your welfare reform proposals and the Contract With America's welfare reform proposal takes such Draconian measures against these unwed teen mothers in terms of limits to -- that what it's likely to do is to drive up the abortion rate, not stop the unwanted pregnancy rate, but drive up the abortion rate. Do you see that happening?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I don't agree with that in my proposal, and, obviously, I don't know what would happen in the others, but let's look at that.

The abortion rate has been going down in America. And I think it's been going down for -- maybe because of all the protest against abortion. But I also think that most Americans have deeply ambivalent feelings. That is, I believe that a majority of Americans are pro-choice and anti-abortion. That is, they don't believe that the decision should be criminalized because there are too many different circumstances where most of us feel that decisions should be left to the people who are involved rather than having a totally legal prohibition.

On the other hand, most people think in most circumstances that abortion is wrong and that it shouldn't be done. So the abortion rate is going down in America. It's still very much too high, and we've tried to do some things to make adoption more attractive, and there was a law signed last year that's gotten almost no notice because it was part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to try to remove the prohibitions or the discriminations in courts across the country in cross-racial

adoptions to try to do whatever we could to just encourage more adoptions.

But let me back up to your question and to explain, if I might, why I don't agree that our position would cause more abortions. There are basically three different approaches, with a zillion different limitations, but three different approaches in this welfare debate. There is the Contract approach which is deny benefits, to -- the second welfare child born out-of-wedlock, and then this extreme version is deny benefits to any teenager who has a child out of wedlock and to that child for up to 18 years. That's what -- then there's the people who say, turn it over to the states and let them do whatever they want, which could include that.

Our position is give the states a lot more flexibility, but don't punish the children, take care of their basic needs. And we say don't cut the parents off of public assistance unless, number one, they're bad parents; or number two, they do things which will undermine their ability to either be successful workers or successful parents.

So, for example, the way our plan works is if you're a teenager and you have a baby, in order to draw the public assistance in a normal way, you'd have to stay in school, you'd have to live at home with your parents, and if you lived in a bad home you'd have to live in some other supervised setting. You'd have to cooperate and help identify the father so we could attempt to get the father to pay child support and support the child. If, at the end of your education period and training, if two years have elapsed and you haven't gone to work, then you would have to go to work if there were a job available. And if you turned down a job, you could lose your benefits.

Under their proposal, the second problem is, you'd be cut off after two years whether there's a job there or not. So the two differences are, I say, cut people off after a limited amount of time if there's a job there. They say, cut them off altogether. I say only take benefits away from people if they misbehave as parents or in their own responsibilities. They say, if you have a child out of wedlock and you're a teenager, you should never get benefits and neither should your child.

I'll leave it to you to conclude what impact that might have on the abortion rate -- I don't know. But I don't believe ours would. I think ours is responsible. You have to have more requirements on people, you can't just continue to perpetuate the present system. But I don't think you should punish the children or punish people for their past mistakes; you should deal with their present conduct.

Q What about the suggestion that, particularly of Speaker Gingrich, that the churches and the charities should be able to take over much of the responsibility, including the financial responsibility that the government now has for foster children and various other tough social situations? Is that an appropriate way for these problems to be taken care of, for these people to be cared for? And if so, how should the money get there?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think the churches could well be involved in more activities. For example, I think that you might -- and one of the things that I want to do is to give more flexibility in how to implement welfare reform to state and local government. If they want to involve the church, particularly, for example, in developing supervised settings for young girls and their children who can't -- and shouldn't -- be living in their homes because of the problems in their homes, that's the sort of partnership that I would certainly not oppose.

But I don't think you can say from that that there's no national interest which should command some taxpayer support to make sure that these children have minimal levels of nutrition and medical care and just the basic things that it seems to me we've got an interest in doing, because we don't want to lose any more of these kids than we have to.

The welfare benefits themselves, by the way, are not a problem. The real welfare benefits are about 40 percent lower than they were 20 years ago. So nobody goes on welfare for the check; it's the child care, it's the food stamps, it's the medical care for your children. Therefore, nearly anybody who can will get off and go to work if they can take care of their children and their children won't lose their health care.

But do I think the churches should do more? I do. And one of the things that we want to do is to give them more operational control of this program to the states and let them use churches or community organizations or others to do whatever they can to repair the families.

Q Much of what the churches already do -- for instance, Catholic Charities, their money comes from contracts through federal agencies. In essence, what some of the Republican proposals are asking them to do is to continue doing the sort of work but without those contracts, without the money.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it will just be harder for them, won't it? I mean, I think -- I mean, Fred is a good example. The government does not -- we are not a particularly generous country in terms of social welfare. The thing -- I don't think the American people object to spending tax money on poor people. I think what they object to is spending tax money on a system that perpetuates destructive conduct and irresponsible conduct.

I think that the issue is -- for example, I don't think most Americans really think that it would be a great idea to cut out all spending on poor children in order to afford a capital gains tax cut. I don't think that's where they would come down. On the other hand, would they rather have a tax cut or just waste money on any program, including a program that perpetuated dependency? I think they would -- or reduce the deficit, or whatever. So I think the -- what my goal is, is to say there's a national interest in the health and welfare of our children. I think it requires some investment of taxpayer money in the areas of particularly basic health care and nutrition and immunization of children against serious diseases. But the systems are dysfunctional. So I think we ought to try to fix them.

Q In a meeting of Baptist leaders back in October you were asked a question about some of your critics who were attacking you with unsubstantiated charges. I'm thinking specifically of

Reverend Falwell pushing a video on his TV program. And your response to the question was that you were busy running the country and didn't want to respond to your critics, but you were surprised that the Christian community wasn't taking these men on.

Since that time, I know American Baptist Tony Campollo was asked for equal time on his show to try to defend you. But do you know of any other attempts like that, or anything since that time to try to answer some --

THE PRESIDENT: There have been an awful lot of attempts -- I think there have been a lot of press stories refuting some of the specific allegations. But I would just say again, in the world we're living in -- I'll say what I said at the prayer breakfast today -- there is an inordinate premium put on the use of words to destroy or to distract people. And it takes away from my ability to be

President; to do the job with a clear head and a clear heart, and to focus on the American people, if I have to spend all my time trying to answer charges about what people say that I did years ago. And I just can't do it -- I just can't do it.

I do the very best I can. Sometimes you can actually disprove something someone says about you. A lot of times, some people could lie about you in ways that you can't disprove. You can't always disprove every assertion, so insofar as whatever happened, I can't change yesterday, I can only change today and tomorrow. So I've just got to keep going. I think it is -- I think I have -- if I'd done anything, even though I've tried not to deal with it at all, I think whatever time I've spent kind of trying to absorb those blows since I've been President has been time and effort and energy -- emotional, as well as intellectual energy -- has taken away from the American people. And I'm not going to cheat them anymore. I'm just not going to do it. I'm tired of letting other people say things that require me to deprive the American people of the best effort I can make. They'll have to make whatever evaluation of this they want to.

There is a difference between reputation and character, and I have increasingly less control over my reputation, but still full control over my character. That's between me and God, and I've just got to try to be purified by this.

I also noticed -- Winston Churchill said -- I ran across this the other day -- that just because someone strays from the truth in criticizing you doesn't mean you can't learn something from their criticism. So I've decided that I'll try -- need to learn a little something from my critics, even if what they say is not so. None of us are perfect, and I'm certainly not. But I just can't -- I really think I made the right decision to try to just tune it out and go forward.

Q Is there a place in the Scriptures where you find a source for the kind of faith you talked about earlier in stillness,

in facing these things -- a story or a parable, or a reading that you've turned to?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it's interesting, I just finished reading the entire Psalms. I also read -- this is ironic, Lloyd Ogleby's book on the Psalms that I didn't -- I read it before he was selected to be Chaplain of the Senate. And there are a lot of the Psalms where David is sort of praying for the strength to be sort of purified in the face of adversity, and in the face of his own failures.

There are a lot of the Proverbs which talk about the importance of keeping a quiet tongue, and at least not getting in your own way, which I've done a lot in my life, and which I've tried, even still, to grow out of. And I've spent a lot of time dealing with that over the last two years, as you would imagine I would have to.

I think the important thing -- and I find this in the Scriptures over and over again -- the important thing that I have to keep focusing on is what am I going to do today, what am I going to do tomorrow, how can I be free to call on the power of God to make the most of this job that I have for a little bit of time in the grand sweep of things. And that's just what I keep focusing on every day.

But I think -- you'd be amazed how many people write me little fax notes, from friends of mine on a daily basis, saying look at this Scripture, look at that Scripture, look at the other Scripture. During this difficult period, a lot of people were giving me different Psalms to read. It was amazing, and so I did.

Q Sir, when you talk about destructive language, if you -- you refer to personal attacks on yourself. But what about some of the uncivil language which has been so much in the news over the past months that has been in Congress. Are you including that in --

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, sure. I said today at the prayer breakfast, I don't think anybody in public life, including me, is blameless. I think it's there are general -- excuse me, genuine differences that people have on issues, and they ought to express them. But our public life means more of the spirit of reconciliation, it needs more civility, it needs more humility. Sometimes we think we know things we don't

And I think on debates over public issues that is true as well. The American people very much want us to -- they respond to these negative things, but they don't like it. The reason it keeps happening is because they respond to it. The politicians read polls, you know -- and they know very often that the negative campaigns work and elect people. And they know that if you just constantly demean and run down people like, after a while it sticks. They know that, so they keep on doing it. And the people respond to it, but they

hate it. It's almost saying, I wish you'd lock this liquor store up so I couldn't drink anymore.

And so somehow we have to crawl back off of this wedge because it has -- as I said, it's -- today people get more information that is sort of argumentative and editorial and often less accurate and then get in a more negative context than ever before. And it is a function of the information explosion. And so I do believe that I and others have a heavier responsibility than the -- even than we might have had in a former time, when in order to just get people's attention, you might use a little -- take a little license with your language, you know.

Q -- proven through the words and your actions that you are a genuinely religious person -- since you were very young, and your wife as well. And a lot of religious people I talk to don't seem to accept that, who don't seem to feel it's genuine -- feel that you're using it in the course of making politics. And I'm wondering why, if you believe that, too, and if you -- any analysis as to why that is and what it might say about the role of religion in politics -- whether they really ought to be bound together --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I don't think they should be bound together. I mean, I think the First Amendment is a good thing for our country, that we protect the right of everybody to be faithful to whatever they believe by not uniting church and state. But don't think you can change people or who they are. They have the convictions they have. They have the beliefs they have.

And what I've tried to do is to draw the proper balance by encouraging people of all faiths, including people who disagree with me, to be activist citizens. I think the -- the book that Stephen Carter wrote on that -- he makes a better statement about that than I can make -- in terms of why they don't accept that about me. I think it's hard to make a case that I've -- have tried to use this. I've never tried to say that -- for example, I never tried to say that there was a Christian coalition behind anything I did, you know, that God had ordained us to do these following things, and I knew it and anybody that didn't was seized by the devil. I never said that.

I've said that like every other person, I consider myself a center because I believe I consider myself forgiven; I consider -- you know, I need the power of God. This is a -- a humble thing for me. But it's an important part of my life and has been for

a long time, but especially again in recent years and before I became President. And the same thing is true for Hillary. I think the truth is that there are people who don't believe it's genuine because they disagree with me politically. They don't believe that you could be a committed Christian and not want to criminalize all abortions. I just don't believe you can be. That's what they think. They don't believe that you could be a committed Christian and believe that -- take the position that I took on gays in the military. They thought

-- think the Bible dictated the previous policy on gays in the military, even though we fought two world wars, Korea and Vietnam, with a different policy. And so -- but they don't believe that. That's their conviction.

So then I think there are people, once they disagree with you so much who will believe -- who will believe in perpetuating anything anybody says about you. And so, they think that's evidence of that.

But, you know, the Bible is full of reputations(?) of the latter point. All they had to do was read the Scripture to know better than to make that argument. But I can't worry about them; that's their problem. Let them think what they want.

I literally -- you know, the one thing I realize is, is I wasted too much time when I got here, and it caused me to be a less effective President, either being heard by or paying a great deal of attention to what people said about me in the past. And I've just got to try to keep going and fight against it, because the people that wanted to really blow that up either wanted to do it for their own purposes, or wanted to do it literally without regard to whether the government of the United States functions, or the public interest is furthered; it's just a crazy way to behave, you can't do it.

It never happened before in our history to this extent, and it shouldn't be happening now, and if it is happening, I can't control it. So what I should do is just do my job and shut it out; that's what I have to do.

Q Sir, do you think that religious groups such as the Christian Coalition risk their credibility by wholesale endorsement of the Contract with America?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think that's for others to judge, I think, but I would say this: You know, I think that they will come to be seen more and more like a political party with an agenda, rather than people who are driven into politics based on one or two issues that they believe the Bible dictates a position different from the present policy of the United States.

And there are a lot of European political parties with the name "Christian" in them; the Christian Democratic Party in Germany -- Helmut Kohl's party. Nobody considers him to be, how should I say, sacrilegious because he's part of a party called "the Christian Democratic Party" that has religious roots, but no one anymore seriously believes that every position they take is rooted in their reading of the Scripture. And I think that the Christian Coalition is long since at that point.

Now, the thing I do think they have to be careful about with their credibility is the very, very hard-hit stay put on office holders who don't do as they believe. I remember one of the members of Congress who lost in the last election told me that -- of an

encounter with a Christian Coalition minister who said -- this member, well, you want to see what we're going to put out in our churches on Sunday -- tomorrow? And she said, yes, I'd like to see it. And she went to these ten items, she said -- but, these two things aren't true. He said, so. It's generally true. So what?

So I think that that could hurt their credibility more than anything else -- the idea that they're using the emotions of people of faith who are deeply disturbed for good reasons with what's going on in our country today, and channeling those emotions into convictions about people in public life that aren't true; now, that could hurt their credibility.

But I think just taking positions on these other things, I think everybody knows that they basically are unarmed, the Republican Party, and that they're going to take all these positions. I don't see that there's anything wrong with them doing it. And I agree with some of them, too. You know, I don't disagree with everything in that Contract; I agree with some of it.

Did everybody get a question? I'm glad to see you.

Q It's good to see you.

THE PRESIDENT: Thanks. Do you ever wish you were back in Conway?

Q Almost every day when I'm driving out to Fairfax County for that hour and a half. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: It's pretty out there. I had a woman today from Loan Oak come sing at the prayer breakfast. It made me so homesick I could hardly stand it.

THE PRESS: Thank you.
END12:15 P.M. EST

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-MAR-1995 13:40:55.42

SUBJECT: 1995-03/13 MCCURRY BRIEFING #30

TO: Remote Addressee (edowd@esusda.gov@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (ttate@esusda.gov@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-
822MWOLFE(A)MH1.JS.MIL@MRX@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dawn A. Alexander (ALEXANDER_DA) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 17:19:48.52

TO: Steven A. Cohen (COHEN_SA) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 13:48:01.40

TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 13:48:26.33

TO: Jeremy M. Gaines (GAINES_J) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mary Ellen Glynn (GLYNN_M) (WHO)
READ:14-MAR-1995 09:32:10.84

TO: Julia R. Green (GREEN_J) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 14:55:34.99

TO: Arthur L. Jones (JONES_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Joshua A. King (KING_J) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman (LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 17:29:50.08

TO: Marlene A. MacDonald (MACDONALD_M) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 14:32:37.48

TO: Kathy McKiernan (MCKIERNAN_K) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 14:02:57.57

TO: APRIL K. MELLODY (MELLODY_A) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 14:28:00.72

TO: Jonathan M. Prince (PRINCE_J) (WHO)
READ:14-MAR-1995 15:40:29.26

TO: Meeghan E. Prunty (PRUNTY_M) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 14:49:41.57

TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez (RIVASVAZQU_A) (WHO)
READ:16-MAR-1995 09:31:22.55

TO: Virginia M. Terzano (TERZANO_V) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lorraine A. Voles (VOLES_L) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Lorraine A.
Voles@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK_N) (WHO)
READ:14-MAR-1995 16:12:03.33

TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 14:42:38.18

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ:16-MAR-1995 15:56:03.09

TO: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 15:32:55.69

TO: Lorraine McHugh (MCHUGH_L) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 14:59:42.74

TO: Daniel G. Rauh (RAUH_D) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Rica F. Rodman (RODMAN_R) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 17:48:58.88

TO: Jess Sarmiento (SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 16:18:49.12

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (SCHWARTZ_L) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 14:37:03.78

TO: Joshua Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 15:06:14.15

TO: Richard Strauss (STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (wh-outbox-distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-
822JFREITAS(A)PAGATE.PA.OSD.MIL@MRX@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lori E. Abrams (ABRAMS_L) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 14:16:41.66

TO: Walker, Angelina (Angelina Walker@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen L. Barbuschak (BARBUSCHAK_K) (OA)
READ:13-MAR-1995 13:43:28.01

TO: Heather Beckel (BECKEL_H) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 13:50:22.51

TO: Robert O. Boorstin (BOORSTIN_R) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elizabeth C. Bowyer (BOWYER_E) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lisa M. Caputo (CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Joseph W. Cerrell (CERREL_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Joseph W.
Cerrell@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX (VPO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Helen H. Dickey (DICKEY_H) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 14:41:19.83

TO: Rahm Emanuel (EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen E. Finney (FINNEY_K) (WHO)
READ:17-MAR-1995 10:22:04.88

TO: Jason S. Goldberg (GOLDBERG_JS) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS (HAAS_L) (OMB)
READ:14-MAR-1995 17:29:05.60

TO: Alexis M. Herman (HERMAN_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Heidi Kukis (Heidi Kukis@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Wayne C. Johnson (JOHNSON_WC) (OA)
READ:15-MAR-1995 11:04:24.63

TO: James Kohlenberger (Jim Kohlenberger@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: G. N. Lattimore (LATTIMORE_G) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Cynthia J. Lizik (LIZIK_C) (OA)
READ:14-MAR-1995 14:43:55.79

TO: Mike Lux (LUX_M) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 15:09:16.52

TO: Doris O. Matsui (MATSUI_D) (WHO)
READ:20-MAR-1995 08:24:06.89

TO: Paul Meyer (MEYER_P) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (MILLS_C) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 13:55:01.49

TO: Elizabeth A. Montoya (MONTOYA_E) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Douglas S. Sheorn (SHEORN_D) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 13:50:10.31

TO: Susan P. Shepard (SHEPARD_S) (OA)
READ:13-MAR-1995 13:57:21.24

TO: Richard L. Siewert (SIEWERT_R) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 17:17:48.48

TO: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 14:56:39.90

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 13:43:17.82

TO: Jodie R. Torkelson (TORKELSON_J) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 14:21:22.36

TO: Michael Waldman (WALDMAN_M) (OPD)
READ:13-MAR-1995 14:04:11.01

TO: Donald A. Baer (BAER_D) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Gabrielle M. Bushman (BUSHMAN_G) (WHO)
READ:13-MAR-1995 14:28:53.03

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Alan J. Stone (STONE_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-
822USIA01(A)ACCESS.DIGEX.COM@MRX@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (73030.21@compuserve.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Manager Infomgt (INFOMGT) (SYS)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (usnwire@access.digex.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN
UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: FAX (9-862-0340,William Safire) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:9-862-0340\C:William SafireREAD:NOT READ

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER
TOP ALL
- \p -

BOTTOM ALL
MORE #30-03/13

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 13, 1995

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

12:35 P.M. EST

MR. MCCURRY: Okay. Happy Monday to you all, and welcome to the White House daily briefing.

Your first question, please, whoever would like to pose one.

Q Salinas. Where is he?

MR. MCCURRY: Where is Salinas. To quote the President, he's probably hanging out with Carmen San Diego at the moment. (Laughter.) The answer is, we don't know. President Salinas has traveled since he's been President of Mexico to the United States on three separate occasions. He has a valid general visitor's visa, which would allow him to travel as a private citizen. We don't have any record yet of him having entered the country. We have not had a report back to us from INS that he's been processed at any port of entry. Obviously, we're inquiring as to his whereabouts. To our knowledge, he has not contacted us regarding any intentions that he might have to remain in the United States, so we'll have to establish some contact with him, or at least INS will, to determine what his intentions are beyond the six-month period that he would be allowed to stay on the visa that he's currently traveling on.

Q Does his entire family --

Q Does the administration have an opinion if former President Salinas should choose to live in the United States for a period of time?

MR. MCCURRY: We'd have to have a discussion with him, as we normally would with any individual who would like to stay beyond the period in which he's allowed to stay on under the terms of the visa that he's traveling on.

Q Do his wife and children have valid visas for six months?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't have any information on family members that may or may not be with him.

Q Has the White House contacted the Mexican governments for some clarification on this report that Zedillo and Salinas reached this agreement?

MR. MCCURRY: We have had some contact with the embassy here, and as we learn more details, I'll try to pass them on. But I don't have any readout.

Q If he does get in, is there any thought that he

might be the new Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors?
(Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: I believe his interest is in pursuing an academic career. I'm not sure --

Q Isn't that job traditionally reserved for an academic?

MR. MCCURRY: It is, indeed. I'll determine whether his economic background might put him in the pool of candidates available. I doubt it. We do cast, as you know, though, consistent with our views on diversity, a very wide net.

Q Can I follow up? You said there has been contact between the U.S. and the Mexican government. What did they tell you?

MR. MCCURRY: I frankly, interrupted a call that an NSC staffer was just having with the embassy, so I don't have a full readout on that yet. But if we have any more details -- these are the details that I've got at this point. If we get anything more, we'll pass it on.

Q Mike, can we get an update in progress here?

Q Has he definitely left Mexico?

MR. MCCURRY: Calvin Mitchell just indicated that he's more than happy to continue to pursue this matter while we are on brief.

Q If the former president is in this country -- haven't been told about it, how would that be?

MR. MCCURRY: As a private citizen, he's entitled to travel here on the visa that he has. He has a multiple entry visa. And as I say, he's been here three times that we're aware of since he served as President of Mexico. So that's -- the fact that he would be in the United States is not unusual and is -- wouldn't be inconsistent with the type of visa he has.

Q But you have no record of him.

MR. MCCURRY: We don't have a record. He has not -- the INS has not reported back to us yet, based on our inquiries, any indication of what his port of entry was or where he might be at this moment.

Q Mike, today is the deadline for the Justice Department to say whether they're going to appoint an independent counsel for Henry Cisneros. Have you received any word on that?

MR. MCCURRY: That's at 12:30 p.m. now.

Q And has the President decided whether or not he believes that Cisneros should stay on if the counsel --

MR. MCCURRY: As the Chief of Staff got that same question yesterday, I'll give the same answer the Chief of Staff did. We don't want to comment on this while it's under review by the Attorney General. That would be, in some sense, prejudicial.

Q We ran out of time, so I wasn't able to ask a follow-up. But it seems pretty straightforward. It's not the kind of thing that you have to wait and see whether there's a referral.

You have in your mind -- you know one way or the other what your decision will be.

MR. MCCURRY: I don't think that's an accurate characterization. It depends on what manner is referred and what, if in fact, something is referred. We'll just have to wait and see what the Attorney General recommends.

Q Mike, the British government says that John Major has written a letter to President Clinton asking that he twist Gerry Adams's arm on the issue of decommissioning IRA weapons. Has the President received such a letter? What can you tell us about it?

MR. MCCURRY: The President has received a letter from the Prime Minister dated March 10th. We will be developing a response to the Prime Minister. The tone of the letter is fully consistent with our sense that there exists between the United States and the U.K. a warm and special relationship. It does refer to the issue of Gerry Adams's visit to the United States and it does reflect our determination, as well as the U.K.'s determination that there be forward movement in the peace process and that the issue of discussing decommissioning actually be translated into real actions and words. That would represent a step for in the peace process.

Q The United states favors, or wants to see the IRA take that step?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we are, as you know, we were satisfied that raising the issue of decommissioning within the talks was a step forward. And of course, we do want -- our concerns about disarmament are well known. That could contribute to deepening a furtherance of the peace process.

Q So Major is preaching to the choir in asking that the President twist Adams's arm on --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, there are -- I don't want to confirm -- it really would not be up to us to confirm the substance or tone of the letter beyond what I just described. I think I would leave that to the British.

Q Well that was the purpose of the letter, was it

not?

MR. MCCURRY: The purpose of the letter, generally, I'd describe just reviewing the peace process and where things stand and how we can further and deepen the peace process that the United States clearly supports.

Q Who is Adams going to see when he comes here? Is he -- you said that, or we've been told that there's -- he's not going to have substantive meetings with President Clinton, that's it's basically a handshake. But who will he have meetings with in the administration?

MR. MCCURRY: I'll check on that. I'm not entirely certain that there have been any scheduled. He's been invited to be a guest at the reception for Prime Minister John Bruton. In that sense, he'll be a social guest of the President at the St. Patrick's Day reception Friday. Beyond that, I'm not aware at the moment of any planned meetings, but he has had contact in the past, I believe with the National Security Advisor, as well as other NSC staff members, and I'll see whether they plan any type of contact of that nature.

Q Mike, is the President happy with the way the Pentagon's gays in the military policy has been implemented over the past year?

MR. MCCURRY: He is. He knows that the Department of Defense believes the policy is working well. The Department has no intent of changing it. Both Secretary of Defense Perry and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Shalikashvili report that military commanders in the field are satisfied with it, and the number of expulsions clearly is declining. So, based on that report from the Pentagon, we're satisfied that the policy is working well and we ought to proceed with it.

Q Does the President think that more military personnel should be punished for violating the ban, as there is clear evidence --

MR. MCCURRY: We believe that the Pentagon should effectively implement the policy as it was designed, and they are clearly doing so.

Q Has the President telephoned, or tried to telephone John Major today or over the weekend?

MR. MCCURRY: I'll have to check and see. I know that beyond the letter that I've just described, there have been some attempts to have contact at the highest level, but I'll have to check and see if there was any effort over the weekend to have contact.

Q Mike, what's the latest on Dr. Foster's nomination?

You had a meeting today with how Patsy Fleming, the AIDS Czar, with various groups in the Roosevelt Room to talk about Foster, but what's -- do you have any idea when he's going to actually get his hearings, and can you give us a status report?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't believe that there have been any hearings scheduled yet by the Senate, but we certainly hope that they will be scheduled as soon as possible. And Dr. Foster continues to meet with various groups that are supportive of his nomination. We continue to make the case for his nomination on the Hill, and it is a strong and persuasive one, and we're satisfied that as the Senate exercises its advice and consent role, they'll see the merit of the appointment, see his extraordinary record in its full context, and they will proceed to confirmation.

Q The reaction to Phil Gramm saying that he will do his most, including filibuster, to kill this nomination?

MR. MCCURRY: His remarks are unfortunate, because they indicate that, based at least on the issue of choice, he is willing to use that rather extreme view as a way of blocking a nomination that could do so much to end teenage pregnancy, a subject to which Dr. Foster has devoted most of his professional career. So it would be unfortunate if extremists in the Senate took a view on choice, made it a litmus test and prevented the nomination from going forward on that basis.

Q Senator Gramm said that his opposition was based on the issue of Dr. Foster's credibility, not choice.

MR. MCCURRY: I've read the transcript very carefully, what he said, and his opposition was based in part on the fact, simply that Dr. Foster had performed abortions, and I suggest you check the transcript.

Q Mike, The Post yesterday had a major story of possible connections between high government officials in Mexico and drug-trafficking, and that the U.S. has told the Mexican government. Can you confirm that?

MR. MCCURRY: I'll have to check into that. I saw the story, and I think there have been some contacts related to former President Salinas, but I'll have to check and see what contacts we've had on that subject.

Q It wasn't clear to me this morning whether Mr. Deutch will have to go through any kind of additional vetting process, or does his nomination get sent up right away?

MR. MCCURRY: We are checking on that now. He's been through a confirmation process twice during the course of the current administration, most recently when he was confirmed as Deputy Secretary of Defense last year, so most of the material and

background work on him is relatively current, and was in the hands of the Senate fairly recently. But whatever additional information is necessary, we will gather prior to sending the nomination to the Hill, but we believe we can do that rather quickly.

Q Why did the President decide to make the CIA Director Cabinet level?

MR. MCCURRY: The President believes that elevating the position of Director of Central Intelligence to Cabinet rank will help bring the intelligence-gathering function to the table as foreign policy is discussed within the White House and within the administration broadly. It is a reflection of the President's view that in the new world that we live in, the information that we need to make the right decisions become very, very important. And Dr. Deutch, as someone who will be the chief analyst of that intelligence information, will be able to contribute that perspective to the discussions underway. Even though he will not play a policy-making role as a member of the national security team, he will be at the table as someone who has got the best available facts and the best available analysis, which will be critical as the administration addresses the challenges America faces in this new world.

Q Who convinced the President of this, and when did he change his mind?

MR. MCCURRY: The President -- the question of what role information-gathering can play in foreign policy discussions has been a subject of not only debate in foreign policy circles, but has certainly been a point of discussion within the administration. And the President does feel that the Cabinet rank can attach significance to the intelligence function within foreign policy deliberations. The exact point at which I believe the President indicated his willingness to elevate the DCI to Cabinet rank was Saturday as the announcement was made.

Q As a condition of Deutch taking the job?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not aware -- I'm not 100 percent confident that this question actually arose in the President's conversation with Dr. Deutch. I think it was raised during the day on Saturday.

Q Does this change his salary in any way by being a Cabinet rank office?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know the answer to that. I'll have to check on that.

Q The President has been criticized for not seeing the CIA Director in the morning, regularly, on any basis during the week and so forth. He has no regular meetings with him.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the President gets a daily briefing from his National Security Advisor, which is consistent with pass practices here at the White House. I suspect, given the President's relationship with Dr. Deutch, that he will see the Director of Central Intelligence, once confirmed, on a fairly regular basis.

Q It wasn't clear from what you said about efforts to reach John Major. Are you trying to reach him by phone or have you been unable to, or is he not taking the call?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I'll check on that. As I say, we've had correspondence with him, and I'm not certain whether or not they've had trouble connecting. I do know that the President looks forward to the Prime Minister's upcoming visit. We expect him here in early April for what will be good discussions on a range of matters.

Q What was the reason Mr. Deutch gave in the first place for turning down the job?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't want to get into that. If he feels like he would like to address it, it would be appropriate to address that question to him.

Q Mr. Mitchell has returned. Did he bring Mr. Salinas with him?

MR. MCCURRY: What news, Calvin?

Q The President's plane --

Q The baseball strike is over.

MR. MCCURRY: Struck out, huh?

Q April fools.

MR. MCCURRY: -- 0 for 3 -- says we're -- mostly we'll have to get more information as we come along. We don't have any readout on the conversations we've had so far.

Q Is there any concern that he could be missing; that his plane went down somewhere? I mean, what's -- (laughter) --

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't heard any concerns of that nature expressed.

Q Then somebody --

Q Is it realistic to assume, though, that the former President of Mexico would come to the United States without informing anyone in the United States government of his travel plans?

MR. MCCURRY: I think that is realistic to assume,

because I believe that happened at least on one occasion prior.

Q Depends on the level of haste, you think?
(Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: I don't want to speculate.

Q Time is -- since time was of the essence here?

MR. MCCURRY: I've --

Q Is he wanted in Mexico?

MR. MCCURRY: Not that I'm aware of, no.

Q Is he wanted here?

MR. MCCURRY: Not that I'm aware of.

Any other questions? We're sort of petering out.

Q What's the significance of that green M&M on the edge of the podium?

MR. MCCURRY: The significance -- it's the one little bit of bait that's put out there to see if I will tempt myself with a chocolate.

Q What was the prior occasion?

MR. MCCURRY: Prior occasions that he's been here? I'd have to check. He gave a lecture in Texas at one point. I'm doing that from memory, Gene, but I'd have to go and check the other times he's been here.

Q He has a general visitor's visa. And we were unaware of his presence here?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes. At least that one other occasion.

All right, thank you everybody.

THE PRESS: Thank you.
END 12:50 P.M. EST
#30-03/13

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Daniel G. Rauh (RAUH_D) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 14-MAR-1995 08:02:16.91

SUBJECT: tv

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER

WHITE HOUSE TV NEWS ANALYSIS

Monday, March 13, 1995

Produced by the Office of News Analysis, OEOB 161 (ext. 6-

5694)

ABC WORLD NEWS TONIGHT

1. Detective Fuhrman cross-examined in O.J. Simpson trial.
2. Death toll at 12 after five days of California flooding.
3. National Weather Service says a dozen states are flood risks.
4. Former Mexican President Salinas reportedly in the U.S.
5. Postcard rate will increase to twenty-one cents.
6. Dow Jones down 10pts., closes at 4025; NASDAQ no change.
7. Tampa hospital mistakes and damage cap legislation.
8. Legislation introduced to use vouchers for education.
9. Muslim moderates riot against Turkish fundamental officials.
10. U.N. Security Council continues Iraqi sanctions until May.
11. Russian military pilot misses nuclear plant with missile.
12. Fidel Castro visits French President Francois Mitterand.
13. Your Money: Republicans protecting their pork too.

CBS EVENING NEWS

1. Defense grills LAPD detective in Simpson case.
2. Storms continue to batter northern California.
3. Draft NASA report recommends private sector Space Shuttle.
4. First American on board Russian rocket to lift off tonight.
5. Janet Reno undecided about independent counsel for Cisneros.
6. U.N. votes to continue sanctions against Iraq.
7. Dow Jones closed down 10.38 to close at 4025.
8. "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy taken to court.
9. Islamic moderates riot in Istanbul.
10. Secretary of State Christopher meets with Syria's Assad.
11. Cuban president Fidel Castro visits Paris.
12. Eye on America: Doctor's treatment not Govt. sanctioned.

NBC NIGHTLY NEWS

1. Detective Fuhrman is cross-examined by Simpson defense team.
2. Flood warning remain in effect in Northern California.
3. New York federal court to rule on gays in the military.
4. Gov. Wilson of California overturns homosexual adoption law.
5. Senate Republicans unveil plan to cut federal budget.
6. President and Speaker Gingrich argue over welfare reform.
7. Wisconsin experiments with programs for welfare reform.
8. Independent council decision delayed in case of Cisneros.
9. Michael Jordan practices with the Chicago Bulls.

10. Dow Jones down 10.38 points to close at 4025.
11. Limited withdrawal of U.N. forces to take place in Croatia.
12. Former Mexican Pres. Salinas in New York on academic agenda.
13. Homocysteine could be new risk factor for heart failure.
14. Study shows low college enrollment for minorities.
15. Bootleg American products still plentiful in China.

ABC:

Bill Blankman reported on legislation to provide school vouchers for low income children. He said Secretary of Education Richard Riley opposes the plan. [Clip of Secretary Riley at a Committee meeting. He later told Blankman the plan will be a "gigantic drain on public education" and said parents "should have choices within the public school system...like pilot schools."]

In a story about Fidel Castro's state visit to France, his first to a western democracy, Peter Jennings said French President Francois Mitterand called the U.S. embargo against Cuba "stupid."

CBS:

Anchor Dan Rather reported Attorney General Janet Reno "has yet to decide whether to launch an independent counsel investigation of...Housing Secretary Henry Cisneros." Correspondent Rita Braver reported the issue clouding Cisneros is "an allegation that he lied to the FBI during a background check about thousands of dollars he had paid to his former mistress." Braver said the White House refused "to speculate on whether Cisneros will step down if an independent counsel is named." She continued by highlighting other troubled or ended nominations.

Braver reported retired General Michael Cams withdrew his nomination to become the next CIA chief over discrepancies regarding a domestic worker.

Braver reported Dr. Henry Foster's nomination remains unclear due to "misstatements" Foster made about the number of abortions he performed. She reported Senator Phil Gramm has threatened a filibuster in the Senate to block Foster's confirmation. She went on to highlight the problems faced by Commerce Secretary Ron Brown and former Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy. "Some Republicans charge that the Clinton administration has done a poor job of choosing political appointees," said Braver. [Clip of Leon Panetta on Face the Nation: "It is unfortunate that we're living in a kind of tabloid atmosphere these days and the unfortunate thing is this kind of thing can really hurt people in the nomination process."] Braver closed by stating that "some Democrats are having regrets over giving some Republican appointees difficult confirmation hearings."

Rather reported that the "don't ask, don't tell" policy regarding gays in the military is being challenged in court. Correspondent David Martin continued with the story saying "the always controversial issue of gays in the military, which both the Pentagon and the White House wish would just go away, resurfaced today in a federal court..." Martin said the argument against the policy is that it discriminates against gays and therefore is unconstitutional. He also reported this is the first challenge of the policy, which "is supposed to be more lenient than the old

ban on homosexuals but the Pentagon acknowledges gays are being kicked out at the same rate as before." Assistant Secretary of Defense Fred Pang said, "basically, we are separating at the same rates we have in the past." Martin said this issue "will continue to dog President Clinton. He touched off the controversy by trying to totally lift the ban on gays over the objections of the Joint Chiefs." Martin ended by speculating the case will probably reach the Supreme Court at the same time as the '96 presidential campaign gets under way.

Rather reported Secretary of State Warren Christopher met with Syria's President Hafez El-Assad for five hours. "Christopher is trying to broker a peace agreement between Israel and Syria..."

Rather added President Clinton has offered the use of U.S. military personnel as peacekeepers in the Golan Heights.

NBC:

Anchor Tom Browkaw reported "the Pentagon's don't ask, don't tell policy" regarding gays in the military is on trial today in New York federal court. Ed Rable, reporting from the Pentagon, said that four Army reservists and two Navy enlisted men are suing the federal government over the current policy. The plaintiffs, reported Rable, claim the policy discriminates because it "demands that they hide their homosexuality." He added that the Pentagon "threw out 500 people they said violated this policy."

Experts testified that gay and lesbian soldiers that were evaluated did not threaten morale or reduce fighting spirit, continued Rable. Rable closed with "the Pentagon is standing by its current policy." [Clip of Secretary of Defense William Perry: "We are satisfied with the regulation that we are now following."]

Brokaw reported that today President Clinton and Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich traded "political punches" over welfare reform. Speaking before the National League of Cities Conference, the President said that Republicans are "pandering to those who want to get rid of government at the expense of the poor" reported Brokaw. He added that Gingrich claimed the White House is running a "disinformation campaign" on welfare.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Daniel G. Rauh (RAUH_D) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-MAR-1995 08:00:40.54

SUBJECT: Newsrep.314

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER

TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 1995

GAYS IN THE MILITARY -- CBS's David Martin reported the "don't ask, don't tell" policy is "...supposed to be more lenient than the old ban on homosexuals, but the Pentagon acknowledges gays are being kicked out at the same rate as before." Martin reported this issue "will continue to dog President Clinton...the case will probably reach the Supreme Court just as the '96 presidential campaign gets under way."

NBC's Ed Rable reported that the Pentagon is supporting the policy [Clip of Secretary of Defense William Perry: "We are satisfied with the regulation that we are now following."]

The New York Times Wire Service reported, "...government lawyers said the new regulations, often described as 'don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue,' were necessary to preserve order and discipline in the ranks."

The Washington Post's Malcolm Gladwell reported the plaintiffs argue that the policy "...moved from saying that homosexuality in and of itself was unacceptable to saying that what was unacceptable was the negative reactions that the straight service members would have if they learned a colleague was gay."

Gladwell reported that since the new policy was put in place, the Pentagon "has discharged over 500 people for disclosing their homosexuality." (WP)

TERM LIMITS --

The Los Angeles Times' Ronald Brownstein reported "...when it comes to welfare reform, House Republicans are willing to roll the dice in the name of reform. When it comes to their own future, the legislators are much more cautious."

"The term limits debate now due to begin later this month, in fact, offers a revealing parallel to the Republican efforts to eliminate the federal entitlement to welfare." (LAT)

A New York Times Editorial stated, "It is amusing to see the Republicans trying to hold onto their jobs by resorting to the same kind of hair-splitting perfected by Democrats."

"But no voter should mind if they do nothing. This is case where political duplicity serves a worthy purpose." (NYT)

INDEPENDENT COUNSEL/SECRETARY CISNEROS -- CBS Correspondent Rita Braver reported the issue "clouding" Cisneros is "an allegation that he lied to the FBI during a background check about thousands

of dollars he had paid to his former mistress." Braver said the White House refused "to speculate on whether Cisneros will step down if an independent counsel is named."

The New York Times David Johnston reported Attorney General Reno, "In sealed legal papers...advised a special judicial panel on whether an independent prosecutor should investigate Housing Secretary Henry Cisneros..."

"Lawyers following the case...said Reno leaned strongly in favor of an appointment of an outside prosecutor after hours of agonizing deliberations." (NYT)

David Jackson of the Dallas Morning News reported, "Justice Department officials refused to say Monday whether a special prosecutor had been requested to review Housing and Urban Development Secretary Henry Cisneros' payments to his former mistress."

WELFARE REFORM -- NBC's Tom Brokaw reported President Clinton and Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich traded "political punches" over welfare reform today. The President said that Republicans are "pandering to those who want to get rid of government at the expense of the poor," reported Brokaw. Brokaw added that Gingrich claimed the White House is running a "disinformation campaign" on welfare.

The New York Times' Robert Pear reported that growth in the welfare and food stamp rolls "have finally leveled off..."

"The figures may slightly reduce political pressure for wholesale changes in the welfare system." (NYT)

The Boston Globe's Bob Hohler reported that "...the president assailed the Republicans' so-called 'Contract with America' as promoting 'the new rage of no government.' Moments earlier, Gingrich accused Clinton of failing to lead the nation."

The Chicago Tribune's Carol Jouzaitis reported that Rep. Henry Hyde's (R-IL) and Rep. Lynn Woolsey's (D-CA) child support amendment to the GOP welfare reform bill has "...83 House sponsors for the amendment, mostly Democrats."

DEUTCH/CABINET --

A New York Times editorial stated that "while there is no evidence that Mr. Deutch is likely to lead the C.I.A. back into illegal covert operations, there are other important reasons not to mix intelligence and policy making."

A Washington Post editorial stated, "this is far too consequential a step to take, and an ill-advised one at that, merely to meet the crisis of the day and the demands of a prospective appointee."

FOSTER NOMINATION -- CBS's Rita Braver reported Dr. Foster's nomination remains unclear due to "misstatements" Foster made about the number of abortions he performed. She reported Senator Gramm has threatened a filibuster in the Senate to block Foster's confirmation.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Karen L. Anderson (ANDERSON_KL) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-MAR-1995 16:35:43.81

SUBJECT: Governor's Report

TO: Karen L. Hancox (HANCOX_K) (WHO)

READ:16-MAR-1995 16:40:15.89

CC: Karen L. Anderson (ANDERSON_KL) (WHO)

READ:16-MAR-1995 16:54:45.08

TEXT:

I've never sent a document by e-mail before, so I hope this works.
Please let me know if you want me to bring over the changes Doug
made to the initial document. We're still waiting for Mack
McLarty's input.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:16-MAR-1995 16:34:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Karen L. Anderson

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

March 16, 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

From: Doug Sosnik

Re: 1995 Gubernatorial Races in MS, KY and LA

OVERVIEW

Of the three gubernatorial seats up in 1995, two (Kentucky and Louisiana) are held by Democrats. Throughout the 1995 election cycle, we will have the difficult, but not impossible, task of holding onto these seats. Mississippi is held by a strong Republican Governor seeking re-election to a second term.

In Mississippi, incumbent Republican Governor Kirk Fordice is considered the favorite in his re-election bid, although Secretary of State and gubernatorial nominee Dick Molpus has the potential to be the "long shot" win of the 1995 races. Molpus will benefit from an uncontested primary battle, his strong personal profile and his ability to raise funds nationwide for his bid. The key will be for Molpus to go after Fordice early and hard.

The field of Democratic candidates in the Kentucky race is weak and uninspiring. While this race should not be written off, the

Democratic nominee will face the challenge of motivating Democratic forces in the state for a general election win against de-facto GOP nominee Larry Forgy.

In the Louisiana race, the hotly contested primary will largely decide the outcome of the election. Buddy Roemer enjoys the status of frontrunner in the Republican field, while Democrats continue to battle for the second slot in the general election race. Given the demographics of Louisiana, this is our greatest opportunity in the 1995 races to elect a Democrat.

In each of the races, the Democratic nominee will face a formidable challenge in the general election. The loss of all three races would be a devastating blow to the Democratic Party entering the 1996 election cycle and the Administration must determine the most useful and affective way to benefit each campaign.

MISSISSIPPI

Primary Election: August 8

Runoff Election: August 29

General Election: November 7

The '95 general election has boiled down to a clean match-up between incumbent Governor Kirk Fordice (R) and Secretary of State Dick Molpus (D). The only primary opposition to Fordice and Molpus will come from little-known perennial candidates Shawn and Richard O'Hara.

Molpus has focused his general election strategy on fundraising, with almost \$1 million raised in 1994 and early 1995 for the race. He has hired former Gore '88 southeast director John Jameson to manage his campaign, and has contracted Geoff Garin for polling and Strubel-Totten for media. A couple of key issues already surfacing in the race include gaming and middle class tax relief. Molpus has pledged not to accept any gaming money for his campaign, while a large chunk of Fordice's contributions come from gaming interests. In addition, Molpus has begun attacks against Fordice's newly proposed "middle class tax break" which, when broken down, is easily discerned as a tax break for big business and upper class families.

Molpus is set to begin a national fundraising campaign, which is expected to include activities with Mississippi author John Grisham. Grisham, a strong Democrat, is talking with the Molpus campaign about incorporating a fundraising effort into an upcoming book tour through California and New York. Molpus has also talked with the DNC about developing a strategy for soliciting support from the Democratic Jewish community, which should be successful given Fordice's history of making anti-semitic statements to the public and press. The National Education Association (NEA) may also give up to \$100,000 to the Mississippi Coordinated Campaign.

Given the demographics of Mississippi, this will be a difficult race for the Democrats to win. However, the lack of a Democratic primary challenge will allow state Democrats to rally support behind Molpus and to expand their grassroots organization throughout the state. The

Molpus campaign is in the process of completing their benchmark poll, which they expect will show their candidate trailing Fordice by approximately 20 percentage points. Overall, the Mississippi gubernatorial race is viewed by the DNC as a "long shot with low expectations."

KENTUCKY

Primary Election: May 23
Runoff Election June 27
General Election: November 7

While Kentucky has traditionally been a strong Democratic state, the Republican Party made significant inroads in the 1994 election. Statewide, the Democrats captured only 41 percent of the vote in the 1994 congressional elections. Issues such as gun control, gays in the military and tobacco taxes have all been factors in Kentucky's GOP growth.

Newly implemented election laws will lend a new dynamic to the 1995 race. First and foremost, the new laws allow for public financing and require the nominees for Governor and Lt. Governor to run together as ticket. In order to qualify for public financing in the primary, at least two candidates must qualify for public financing (a two to one match) by raising a minimum of \$600,000 in the primary cycle. The new laws also provide for a primary runoff election if no single candidate receives more than 40 percent of the primary vote, and will allow the Governor elected in 1995 to seek re-election in 1999. (Kentucky has previously been a one-term state).

The candidates are as follows:

- Secretary of State Bob Babbage (D) and his running-mate, former Homebuilders Association President Tommy Thompson;
- Lt. Governor Paul Patton (D) and his running-mate, Louisville city councilmember Steve Henry;
- State Senate President Eck Rose (D) and his running-mate, Jefferson County Property Administrator Denise Harper Angel;
- Former gubernatorial nominee Larry Forgy (R) and his running-mate, Laureo County Attorney Tom Handy; and
- Former state GOP Chair Bob Gable, who filed without a running-mate as part of his challenge to the new election laws.

The sentiment among Kentucky politicians is that there is little to no excitement about the 1995 race. The early polls, conducted in December, 1994 and January, 1995 showed Patton taking a significant lead among Kentucky's Democratic voters. However, Rose's late entry into the race will likely lead to a tighter race closer to the primary. In a key victory, Patton won the early endorsements of the Kentucky Education Association and the United Auto Workers in the primary and general elections. The state AFL-CIO will make its endorsement during their March 27-28 convention.

The conventional wisdom in Kentucky is that Patton will either win outright in the primary, or head into a runoff with Rose or Babbage.

While Patton has been laying the groundwork for his gubernatorial bid over the last four to five years, his campaign has yet to take off, despite the fact that he was the top vote-getter in the state during his election as State Auditor (1987) and Secretary of State (1991). In the GOP primary, neither Forgy nor Gable is eligible for public financing, due to Gable's failure to raise the necessary \$600,000 for matching funds. Forgy is considered the strong Republican frontrunner and should win his party's nomination with little difficulty.

While the gubernatorial race should be highly competitive, the lack of enthusiasm among Democratic voters could give the Republicans a strong advantage in the general election. Early reports of voter registration numbers, since the implementation of Motor Voter in January, show Democrats attracting about 37 percent of the 15,000 new voters. Approximately 30 percent of new voters have aligned themselves with the GOP, while 33 percent registered as independents. The relatively high number of new independent voters illustrates the lack of enthusiasm in the partisan match-ups. In addition to low morale, a divisive primary battle among the Democrats, coupled with a runoff primary challenge, would give added momentum to the Republican's campaign efforts.

LOUISIANA

Filing Period: September 5-7
Primary Date: October 21
Runoff Date: NA
General Election: November 18

With the filing deadline still six months away, the open primary race is shaping into a potential 14-way match-up. Unless one candidate receives more than 50 percent of the vote, the top two vote-getters in the October 21st primary will proceed to the general election, regardless of party affiliation.

Key announced Democrats in the primary race include: U.S. Representative Cleo Fields; state Treasurer Mary Landrieu; U.S. Representative William Jefferson; Lt. Governor Melinda Schwegmann; attorney Phil Pries; and state Senator Mike Foster. Leading Republican contenders include: former Governor Buddy Roemer; former Governor David Treen; pro-life activist Cary Kimbrell; and state Representative Quentin Dastugue. Other possible candidates in the '95 race are: U.S. Senator Bennett Johnston (D) and former state Representative David Duke.

The general consensus among political analysts and party leaders in the state is that Roemer will make it into the runoff with "someone else." A recent Mason-Dixon poll showed Roemer leading Johnston 21 percent to 16 percent, with Landrieu receiving 11 percent and Schwegmann nine percent of the vote. Fields followed with five percent of the vote, while Jefferson received only three percent. Mason-Dixon also polled for the race without Johnston as a candidate. The poll showed Roemer leading with 24 percent of the vote, followed

by Landrieu and Schwegmann each with 12 percent, Fields with seven percent of the vote and Jefferson with four percent. In general election match-ups, the poll showed Roemer defeating Johnston 45 percent to 37 percent, Schwegmann 51 percent to 34 percent, and Landrieu 50 percent to 31 percent. Political insiders have suggested that Johnston wants to run, but is "testing the waters" to determine his electoral strength before making a decision. Among Democrats, the entry of both Fields and Jefferson in the race will likely lead to a split among African American vote, and result in a match-up between two white candidates in the general election. And the presence of both Landrieu and Schwegmann in the race will significantly split the female vote; Landrieu recently received the endorsement of the Women's Campaign Fund.

Though Roemer leads in the polls, he may ultimately be significantly outspent by a Democratic challenger, making this a toss-up race. In fundraising, Landrieu has outraised Roemer by a 3 to 1 margin with \$1.3 raised, while Johnston enjoys a campaign war chest of approximately \$2 million -- which could be converted to his gubernatorial campaign should he decide to run. Louisiana is a traditionally Democratic state which went for Clinton/Gore in 1992 with 46.6 percent of the vote. Democrats received 49.9 percent of the vote statewide in the 1994 congressional races.

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Kyle M. Baker (BAKER_K) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-MAR-1995 12:28:20.42

SUBJECT: DOLE: Takes a right and then a sharp right.

TO: Remote Addressee (Smotus@aol.com@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

DOLE: TAKES A RIGHT AND THEN A SHARP RIGHT

Bob Dole is "mounting a surprise effort to repeal last year's ban on the possession and sale of semiautomatic assault weapons, indicating that he now believes he has the votes to overturn the most sweeping gun-control law ever enacted." In a 3/10 letter to the NRA, Dole said he would make repeal of the "ill-conceived gun ban" a priority -- a "turnaround" from his statement two months ago that a repeal of the assault-weapons ban would not pass in the Senate. Dole, in the letter: "The Senate will debate this issue in the near future and I hope to have a bill on President Clinton's desk by this summer." Gun-control activists "promptly rallied" in support of the legislation. Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-CA), who wrote the legislation, pledged to "launch the mother of all filibusters" if Dole goes forward with the repeal. Dole's office gave a "lukewarm" response to Feinstein's threat, "saying it came as no surprise." A Senate Dem aide: "This is a stunning turnaround. ... His presidential ambition is dictating his politics and policy as the Senate leader." But others suggested that Speaker Newt Gingrich "could be forcing Dole's hand and that the weapons ban likely would land in the Senate this year whether or not Dole brings it there" (Fiore, L.A. TIMES, 3/19). The fact that Dole has made it an issue "indicates that he believes he controls the votes to undo parts or all of the crime bill, including the gun ban. To lose on such a public fight would cause major damage to Mr. Dole's political standing and his Presidential campaign." Handgun Control's Robert Walker said there's enough support for repeal of the ban in the House but in the Senate, "it's not clear today which way the tally would go." However, just "pushing the gun control issue may help" Dole in some "important Republican primaries, especially in New Hampshire where gun owners are a powerful bloc. But it is a divisive issue that could hurt his chances to attract moderate voters in and outside the party should he win the nomination" (Gray, N.Y. TIMES, 3/18). L.A. TIMES editorial: "The task now for Bob Dole is to explain to the American people how repealing the assault weapons ban could possibly be in the country's best interests. Indeed, his impossible task is to explain how it would be in anyone's interest -- except, of course, his own" (3/20). Wm Raspberry asks is Dole's effort to repeal the ban "based on his reading of the Constitution or of public necessity -- or only on the thought

of enhancing his chances of gaining the White House?" (3/20).

WAS IT A FLIP? Dole pledged to introduce legislation that would bar any preferential treatment to any group (see HOTLINE 3/16). Responding to criticism that he flip-flopped, Dole said his comments "did not mean his position was shifting." Dole: "I am proud of my civil rights record and I have never shied away from it. ... However, my past record on civil rights, does not, and should not, disqualify me from raising legitimate questions about the continuing effectiveness of affirmative action -- particularly when the affirmative-action label is used to describe quotas, set-asides and other preferences" (Lelyveld, AP/PHILA. INQUIRER, 3/18). TIME's Karen Tumulty: "His main desire now seems to be not to allow Phil Gramm to get on his right, and if Pete Wilson gets into the race ... that makes it all the more necessary for Senator Dole to be as far out on the issue as he can" ("IP," CNN, 3/17). Paul Gigot: "The point that Senator Dole is trying to make is that 'Just because I voted for the Civil Rights Act in 1964 doesn't mean I am for racial preferences now'" ("M/L," PBS, 3/17).

TO BOB, LOVE GARRY TRUDEAU: "Doonesbury" features Dole on TV introducing his "old war wound" to America. "Dole": "I myself have always tried to bear my injury with dignity. But George Bush changed things forever when he ordered up a war-hero video during the 1988 campaign. Today war wound gives you a critical edge. ... A World War II injury is a cherished personal symbol, a badge of honor and sacrifice. Does my wound stand in vivid contrast to the smooth, untouched skin of a Bill Clinton or Phil Gramm, say? You be the judge. Ladies and gentlemen, please give a warm welcome to my old war wound." "Wound": Thank you, Bob. Thank you. I'm proud to be a political asset" (Universal Press Syndicate, 3/20).

GAYS IN THE MILITARY: Dole has "stirred the anger of pro-family and Christian groups" with his comments in the 3/5 N.Y. TIMES MAGAZINE profile that he is "undecided" on gays in the military. Dole, in the article: "I haven't made a judgment on that. The big mistake there, whatever the answer is, was that Clinton brought it up so early." That comment "shocked" some conservative groups. Family Research Council spokesperson Kristi Hamrick: "We are underwhelmed by those particular comments but hopeful the senator can re-examine them. ... it's very important for the senator to reaffirm his support for the traditional family and that he will fight for the traditional family." Christian Coalition spokesperson Mike Russell: "We are obviously surprised. ... We look forward to any future statement from Senator Dole clarifying where he stands on the issue." Dole dep. campaign chair Bill Lacy "did not dispute" the remarks, but said Dole "does oppose allowing open homosexuals to serve": "He's been very consistent. He opposed it. He led the fight against it" (Scarborough, W. TIMES, 3/20).

STRATEGY: W. POST's Balz write Dole is running a "classic front-runner's campaign." Dole '96 is modeled on Bush '88: 1) Dole is "using his lead in the polls to attract endorsements and talent, all designed to create an aura of inevitability about his candidacy in a party that has been friendly to front-

runners." 2) He is "building firewalls" in "key" primary states like NY, OH and SC "to protect against an unexpected stumble" in IA or NH. 3) He is using the already established political networks of GOP govts. and is "far ahead" of his rivals in getting their support. 4) He is "counting on a less-than-unified" conservative wing of the party and is "trying to prevent" conservative Republicans from "coalescing" around Phil Gramm. In addition, Dole is "aggressively positioning himself on the right on issues such as affirm. action, guns and shrinking the federal government to prevent rivals from gaining the upper hand on hot-button issues to GOP primary voters." However, one weakness is message. But Dole's advisers Dole will address that issue when he formally announces 4/10 (3/19). David Broder: "The next six months are going to be very, very tough for Bob Dole as all of this stuff moves over from the House to the Senate, and he's going to have to figure out what to do with it" ("Meet the Press," NBC, 3/19).

THEY JUST KEEP ON JOINING: Paul Young, ex-NH GOP exec. dir and ex-pres. of the Conservative Political Victory Fund, endorsed Dole and signed on as a senior adviser. Young currently serves as NH Gov. Steve Merrill's (R) campaign finance chair and treas. of the NH GOP (Manchester UNION LEADER, 3/18). CHICAGO TRIBUNE's Hardy writes that IL Gov. Jim Edgar (R) "appears ready to climb aboard" the Dole "bandwagon." Edgar sources said he will "probably" endorse Dole in the spring (3/19).

(c) The American Political Network, Inc.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Jeffrey S. Shulman (SHULMAN_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-MAR-1995 17:31:36.71

SUBJECT: REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT COLLEGE PRESS FORUM

TO: Remote Addressee (jenb@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (dickson@strauss.udel.edu@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (JACOBSM@guvax.acc.georgetown.edu@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (JKOPF01@UKCC.uky.edu@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (Gary_Pickett@baylor.edu@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (phcomp@acpub.duke.edu@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (elizabeth_macdonald@saturn.rti.org@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (rlg@med.unc.edu@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (sil@acpub.duke.edu@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (HN3067@HANDSNET.ORG@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (JENNIFER_PECK@ED.GOV@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (cda@netcom.com@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 23, 1995

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT COLLEGE PRESS FORUM

The East Room

1:05 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you and welcome to the White House. This is, as I'm sure you agree, a fascinating time to be in our Nation's Capital. We are now having a great debate about how we can best assure the American Dream for your generation and for your children well into the next century. The choices we make here will have a profound effect on all of your lives.

This is an historic era -- we have the end of the Cold War, the dawn of the Information Age, a globalized economy, an explosion of entrepreneurialism; an enormous amount of opportunity. At the same time, we have profound challenges. We have almost 20 years of stagnant incomes in the United States. We have growing inequality of incomes based primarily on educational differentials. We have deep strains within our society and still profound problems related to the breakdown of family and community, and the rise of crime and violence. We have challenges abroad in terrorism, environmental destruction, population explosion, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The issue we are most debating around here now in many different ways is what is the proper role of the national government in working with the American people to meet our challenges. The old view is that government is inherently a positive force and that there is a one-size-fits-all, big government solution for every big problem. The new view that's all the rage around here is that the federal government is the cause of every problem and if we just didn't have one we might not have any problems.

My view is different from both of these. I ran for president to advance that view, and I still believe it is the proper one. I believe government does have a role to play as a partner in meeting the challenges of the future with all of the American people.

I believe the role of government is to increase opportunity as we shrink bureaucracy, to empower people to make the most of their own lives, and to enhance our security at home and abroad.

We have to work economically to expand the middle class and to shrink the underclass. We have to work to promote mainstream values of work and family and future. We have to do it with a government that is smaller and less bureaucratic, but still effective. The key to our future is our ability to create more opportunity and, at the same time, the willingness of our citizens to assume more responsibility. That's what I have called The New Covenant.

I agree that we have to cut outmoded government, and our administration has lead the way. There are already more than 100,000

fewer people working here for the national government than there were on the day I became President. We're on our way to the smallest federal establishment since President Kennedy worked here.

But I also believe that this government should invest in your future and in your capacity to contribute and to live up to the fullest of your abilities. Therefore, I support more investments in education and technology and training, and empowering people to make the most of their own lives.

I also believe that if you look at the end of two years, the evidence is pretty good that our approach is right. We have reduced the deficit three years in a row for the first time since Mr. Truman was here. We have 6.1 million new jobs, the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 25 years, the first time in 20 years the African American unemployment rate has been under 10 percent. We have in 1993 the largest number of new businesses incorporated in any given year in American history. Finally, in 1994, we began to make some progress on the wage issue when we had more high-wage jobs coming into the economy than in the previous five years combined.

Notwithstanding that, the American people said they wanted a different sort of debate here in Washington last November, and so we are having it. Now, I believe that nothing will more clearly define the contours of this debate than what we decide to do in the area of education and training.

In the global economy into which we are moving, we can see what is happening to American jobs and incomes. Those who are able to grasp the high-wage jobs of the future are doing very well, indeed. We're going to have record numbers of millionaires created in this four-year period.

But we also see more and more and more Americans in the grip of insecurity as they work harder than they were working 20 years ago for wages that are the same or lower. And, overwhelmingly, it is because technology and global economic competition have depressed wages in areas that are not high skilled, with the capacity to grow and learn for a lifetime.

Therefore, I do not agree that we should cut our investments in education and training, starting with the advances we made in Head Start, going through the school lunch program, all the way to the apprenticeship programs for young people who don't go to college, to college loans, to the subsidies for college loans for working young people -- right the way through. I don't believe we should cut them, certainly not to pay for tax cuts and not even to reduce the deficit. We do not have to cut education to reduce the deficit.

The leaders of Congress have targeted two areas that I would like to mention -- three, if I might, although only one reduces the deficit -- or two. The first is, the student loan program. We have, through our direct loan program, offered the opportunity for millions of young people

to borrow money at lower costs on better repayment terms in a way that is less hassle for colleges and universities, less paperwork, and actually saves the government money because we take out the middle man. We don't have guarantees to banks, we just make the loans directly. That has actually reduced the deficit and reduced the costs of college loans.

At the same time, we have gotten tougher on collecting delinquent loans, reducing the costs to the taxpayers of delinquent loans from \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion. So, more loans, lower costs to the students, lower costs to the taxpayers, less hassle to the schools. It's a win-win deal.

The Republicans in the Congress want to change all of that. They, first of all, want to put a lid on the number of students who can participate in the direct loan program, which will add to the deficit. And then, they want to eliminate the student loan subsidy for four million college students and charge people interest on their loans while they're in college, even if they come from very modest backgrounds.

Interestingly enough, this cut in education will only replace the money that they want to keep giving middlemen in the old student loan program so we could have the same reduction in the deficit by leaving the interest subsidy in place and making the direct loan program available to all the students in America. I think it's clear that our decision is a better one than theirs, and I hope that we will prevail. We are doing some things together, you know. We signed the unfunded mandates bill yesterday, we're about to get a bipartisan consensus for a line-item veto, which I have worked very hard for. So I hope that my view can prevail here, because it's very important to you.

The other thing that has happened in the House is that the Republicans have voted to cut the National Service Program, AmeriCorps, to the bone. I think that is a mistake. The AmeriCorps program is giving thousands of young Americans a chance to serve their communities, serve their country, and earn money for higher education.

I don't believe we need to trade in our future for what is a pitting amount on the deficit, but will have an enormous negative symbolic and substantive impact on what we're trying to do in this country.

There is an article in The Washington Post this morning by Mary McGrory, whom I see sitting in the back who quotes a Georgetown student who happens to be a Republican who says, "I understand that taxpayers are heavily burdened, but if we give up what's best about America, what kind of legacy will we leave?"

So I will close with that. I urge you to think about this question. Yes, we have to continue to reduce the deficit, and we will. Yes, we have to move ourselves into the future economically. How can we do both? What are our other challenges?

One of the things we know is that the countries that do the best

job of developing the full capacities of every one of their citizens will be the most successful in the 21 century. That's in all your interests, and that's what we should be debating here.

Thank you very much. I'd like to now call on as many of you as we possibly can. I'd like to ask you when I recognize you, please, to say what your name is and what your school is. And we'll start here.

Q Jeff Glasser, from Yale. How do you plan to stop Congress from capping direct loans, or cutting Pell grants, or paying the interest on loans taken out during college? Are you willing to veto legislation if it comes across your desk?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, of course, I am in the areas of education, which are so important to me. But let me say again what my first choice has been all along -- is to try to prevail in the debate in the Congress. We are making progress. As I said, we -- I signed a bill yesterday that I strongly believe in -- the unfunded mandates bill --which limits the ability of Congress to pass laws that require state and local governments to raise taxes or otherwise pay for things that we require. We're going to get the line-item veto I hope and believe, which is a good way to cut out unnecessary spending. So maybe we can make some progress here.

I don't think there's as much enthusiasm in the Senate among Republicans, and I know the Democrats will oppose eliminating the subsidies, cutting the Pell grants, eliminating the direct loan program. So I hope we can prevail in the Congress. But the veto pen is always there.

And this is a -- look, I wouldn't be standing here today, no way in the world would I be standing here today if it hadn't been for the opportunities America gave me through education. When I was born in my state in 1946, the per capita income of my state was barely over half the national average. And my whole generation owes everything we have to the educational opportunities our country gave to us. And now education is even more important to the general welfare of America than it was when I was your age.

I cannot sit by and watch it go backward. We need to bear down and do more, not ease up and go back.

Yes.

Q Francine Friedman, from Georgetown. As a fellow Hoya about to graduate and start paying back my loans, I was wondering if you could share with us how you financed your Georgetown education.

THE PRESIDENT: I had a \$500 -- as I remember, it was a \$500-a-year scholarship and a job. I worked in the Congress for two years. And when I went to Yale to law school I had a grant, a loan, a tuition postponement option, which works like the direct loan does now -- that is, I paid it back as a percentage of my income. I had a national defense loan and six jobs. But never more than three at once.

(Laughter.)

Q Kristal Adams, from the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. On a lighter note, I was wondering who do you have picked for the Arkansas-Memphis game, and do you think Arkansas will make it all the way to the championship game this year?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I feel somehow, after the last two games, there is some divine providence that keeps us going. (Laughter.) So I'm more hopeful now than I was when they started the tournament. Thank you.

Q Yes. My name is Peter McKay. I'm a sophomore at Florida A&M University. And my question deals with the White House review of affirmative action that's been going on for several weeks now. What is the status of the review, and what conclusions have you reached about affirmative action?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first, the status is ongoing. I'll talk a little about where we are now, but I want to emphasize that the review is still underway.

And let me urge you -- I know there must be a lot of discussion about this on college campuses as it affects admissions policies. But I want to emphasize to begin you, if you spark a debate about this it's important to know what people are talking about when they're talking about affirmative action. There are policies of the government and policies in the private sector that affect admissions to colleges, availability of financial aid to schools, admissions to workplaces and promotional policies within the workplace, and access to contracts in the public sector; and, sometimes, in the private sector as well, like big companies contracting with smaller ones. So you're basically talking about a range of programs.

When there is evidence of past discrimination, as found in a court, then there can be more strenuous rules and regulations. Otherwise, there are actually a lot of strictures on how far affirmative action can go in giving preferences to people based on race or gender.

But let me back up a little bit and again talk about a little history. When I was your age and I began to work in political campaigns, which I know was a long time ago -- almost 30 years ago now, but it's not so long in the life of the country -- there were still courthouses on squares in county seats in my state that had segregated restrooms -- in my lifetime, when I was your age, in the mid-'60s, there were still older African Americans in my state who did not know that they could vote without buying a poll tax, because it had only been abolished by the Supreme Court a couple of years before. I can remember when there were no women in any number of jobs now where we take it for granted that women will be.

The point I want to make to you is that we have made a lot of progress in this country. It has been inexact, it has been imperfect, there are still problems. We have made a lot of progress because we

tried to take action to open up more opportunities to people without regard to their race or gender. And all of us, including white males, are better off because of that.

If you look at the countries around the world today that are being absolutely ripped apart because of violence based on ethnic or religious or racial disputes, and sometimes also related to the role of women, if you look at the countries that are struggling to become modern today where there's still regularly violence against women -- the general point I want to make to you is that it is in everyone's interest to see that everybody gets the best chance to live up to the fullest of their abilities.

On the other hand, it is in no one's interest to see that people get positions if they're completely unqualified to hold them. So the question is: How do we now go forward? And let me tell you the

questions I've asked my folks to answer. I've said, first of all, how do these programs work, and do they have a positive effect? Okay, that's the first question. Secondly, even if they work, are they sometimes, at least, unfair to others? Could you argue that in some cases there is reverse discrimination, and if so, how? Thirdly, are there now others in need who are not covered by affirmative action programs?

Keep in mind that's really what's fueling this whole thing. You've got 20 years in this country where most hourly wage-earners have not kept up with inflation. Most Americans are working harder for lower wages than they were making 20 years ago. If so, how are we going to deal with them?

And, finally, let's look at what clearly works, and I'll give you three examples. I don't think anybody in America would like us to suspend what we are doing in the military -- the system that produced not only General Powell, but countless other generals and colonels who are not only African Americans and Hispanics and Asian Americans, but also women, doing things that never were available before. How does that system work? Why does nobody reject it? Because nobody thinks anyone unqualified gets promoted.

What do they do? They work as hard as they can to develop the capacities of everybody who signs up, they do their very best to see that each level in the promotional pool, there is a mix of people that reflect the population in the rank just below, and then nobody -- nobody gets promoted who is not qualified. But they really work hard to give everybody a chance and develop everybody's capacities.

A second example -- this is self-serving, but I'll give it to you, anyway. I have appointed at this point in my tenure to this point in the two years, more judges to the federal bench who were women or members of racial minorities than my three predecessors combined, I believe. But my judges have the highest ratings, on average, from the American Bar Associations of any of the last four presidents. So no one suggests that I am not promoting quality in the federal bench.

Fourth example: My Deputy Chief of Staff, Erskine Bowles was, before he came to the White House, the head of the Small Business Administration. And he spent 20 years helping people finance small business. And I said, we've got to bring enterprise into the depressed areas of this country, we have got to do it. So in one year, there was a huge increase in the volume of loans given to African Americans, Hispanics and women under the Small Business Administration without, in any way, discriminating against qualified white males, and every one of the loans was to a qualified person. Now, I don't believe any American would object to those three things.

The last thing I want to say is, I have also asked where does discrimination still exist among people who are not poor, or not economically distressed, in the traditional definition, based on race or gender. We just had the Glass Ceiling Report issued this last week, which was originally initiated, I believe, by Senator Dole, which said that there is still evidence of discrimination in promotional practices in large enterprises.

So I want to review all this, I want to make the best decision I can, and I've given you the questions.

I want to close with just two points. I'm against discrimination, I'm against giving people opportunities who are unqualified. But we all have an interest, including white males, in developing the capacities of all of us to relate to one another --because our economy will grow quicker, it'll be stronger, and in a global society, our diversity is our greatest asset. We must not let this debate be another cheap political wedge issue to divide the American electorate. We can use this to come together, and that's what we ought to do.

Tell me your name and where you're from.

Q My name is Lori Wiechman. I go to the University of Georgia. And in your first remarks, you had mentioned that you're really concerned about the future of us as college students and as -- our children. And I was just wondering, looking back on your experience in politics, which areas would you suggest for the college students who attend all of the universities here who are wanting to go into politics to pursue before they begin their career?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, I do not believe that there is a specific academic discipline that is necessarily better than another one to pursue a political career. If you are pursuing a degree in science or mathematics, or economics, let's say, I would recommend that at least you take whatever electives you can in history and in the social sciences, like political science, and in psychology. (Laughter.) And then -- but I think the most important thing is to develop your mind, is to learn to think.

And then the second thing I would say is, it's very important to spend your free time deciding whether you're interested in people as individuals and interested in public problems. Not everybody is, you

know. And it's a good thing -- I mean, a lot of wonderful work has been done in the world by people who didn't want to spend hours a day talking to people who were different from them.

But if you really want to make a positive difference, in my judgment, you have to be able to imagine what life is like for people who are very different from you, and you have to be willing to invest

some time in listening to those people.

If you think about what's happening, even in -- I read stories on college campuses, that kids are sort of separating by race, at least younger people and -- I'll give you something positive -- one of the best things that's happened is a lot of older people are now coming back to schools, especially to community colleges, but also to four-year colleges.

If you want to be effective in public life, you have to understand how other people view the world, and you have to be able to imagine yourself in their position. And then, the third thing I would say is, you should get some experience in campaigns and in other public endeavors to find out both how hard and how exhilarating it is to get people together and try to work to change something. Those are the three pieces of advice. But there is no single academic discipline that's the best.

Q My name is Shafeeq Qaasim. I'm from Los Angeles Trade Technical College. As opposed to the budget that everybody's concerned about, and we have all of these illegal aliens that mostly -- that affect all of us, including the taxpayers -- I would like to know, considering we passed a proposal of Proposition #187 in California, and it's now somewhere in the federal court system, what's being done, and how can it get back into the state where the voters have already voted?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the voters voted for it, and then like any law, it's subject to court challenge, and it's being challenged in the courts. Let me tell you what we've tried to do in the meanwhile. First of all, after I became President, I increased spending by 30 percent on programs designed to reduce the problem of illegal aliens. We have increased the number of border guards on the southern borders, assuming my next budget is adopted on this -- I think it will be -- by about 60 percent in three years, we are turning more people back.

We are also sending more people back home more quickly who come in contact with the criminal justice system. We are working to increase our ability to check workplaces for illegal immigrants, and we're trying to standardize identification so people can't give phony papers and stay in jobs. And we are trying to alleviate some of the costs that states face. We've given California, for example, more money to deal with their costs of imprisonment and health care and other things. And I asked the Congress to do even more than they voted to do, but I think that we should, as a matter of principle, no illegal immigrant is entitled to the expenditure of American people's tax dollars.

I did not support 187 for a very different reason. I don't think it's in the interest of the American people to have kids here and have them not in school. I don't think it's in the interest of the

American people who have families here and not be able to get into a health clinic and maybe have them get seriously ill and spread whatever illness they have to the population at large. So my problem with 187 was in the details.

We do not give welfare benefits, for example, to illegal immigrants, and we should not be spending our money there, except where it is in the interest of our larger sense of self-interest. And I think schools and health care are. But we've got to do a lot more to crack down on the borders, and we have to do a lot more to go into these workplaces and send people away. And I would hope again -- this was a great wedge issue in the last election, but I'd like to remind you of where this issue came from, in part.

A lot of the very same people that were out there for 187, just a few years ago when the California economy was booming, weakened the anti-immigration -- anti-illegal immigration legislation pending in Congress, so they could get more illegal immigrations into workplaces in California who would work for lower wages -- for their supporters. Now, that's the truth.

And what we need to do is crack down in the workplace, crack down at the borders, crack down in the criminal justice system, and not spend any money that we don't have to spend. And that's our policy and the one we're going to pursue.

Q I'm from Ohio University -- we're represented by a freshman Republican in Congress -- to be a freshman Democrat -- he says he opposes cuts in student aid, yet he says we need to look at your direct funding program -- because it builds a billion-dollar bureaucracy here in Washington. Could you respond to that?

THE PRESIDENT: It's just a -- it's a myth. It's a myth. The direct lending program -- the Secretary of Education is here with me -- the direct lending program will save the taxpayers \$12 billion over six years, the same amount of money they propose to save by eliminating the interest subsidy on student loan. Why is that?

You know how the student loan program works now under the old system? It's a 90-percent guarantee. So you go to the bank and you borrow the money -- right? And the government guarantees 90 percent of it. And the bank gets payment in the middle. And then if somebody defaults on the loan, unless it's a huge amount of money, it's not worth it to the bank to go try to sue somebody and get the money back. Why? Because they're going to get 90 percent of it anyway. And they'll spend 10 percent or more on lawyer fees.

So what have we done? We have reduced the number of defaults. We have been tough on this -- over and above the previous

administrations who were here before me -- we have reduced the loan defaults from a cost a year of \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion. This direct lending program is far less expensive to run than the alternative. It is pure ideology to say it costs a little money to run the direct loan program and we don't want to hire one government employee; we'd rather pay billions and billions and billions of dollars to banks that could be going for lower cost college loans to more students.

This program is working. It saves money for everybody, and we shouldn't limit its reach. I think it is a real error.

Yes. Go ahead.

Q Margretta Sundelin, from Brigham Young University. It seems the United States is a nation founded on -- and prided upon its diversity. However, in the course of the last few years, it seems its diversity is dividing us. What I want to know is, in your presidency, what have you done to bring cohesion back to the nation and to settle the unrest?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I've tried to do many things, but let me emphasize two or three. The first thing I've tried to do is to focus on initiatives that would provide opportunities to all Americans; that would unite us in getting more opportunities by, first of all in economic terms, but bringing down the deficit and expanding trade opportunities for American products, by working to create more jobs for the American people. Secondly, in education, by increasing everything from Head Start programs to college loans. I have tried to offer broad-based opportunity.

The second thing I've tried to do is to demonstrate to the American people that you could have diversity and excellence at the same time. That's what I just mentioned -- if you look at the people I've appointed to high public office, the people I've appointed to the federal judgeships, and the things that I have tried to do that I think are important.

The third thing I have tried to do is to emphasize the importance of uniting the American people around shared values. That's what welfare reform is all about. That's what the attempts of the crime bill to clean up our streets from violence are all about. We should all be able to agree that we are going to pursue policies that promote family, that promote work, that strengthen communities, that look to the future. These are the things that I have tried to do.

And I believe that the American people would think more in these terms -- I know that a lot of people are so bewildered by the changes and they feel so threatened by the changes going on today, that it's

easy to lash out at someone who is different from us. But if we would focus on those three things I think we'd come together more.

Q I'm Jamie Sivlerstein, from Northwestern University. With the knowledge of computers and other types of technology becoming

more crucial in order to succeed in the workplace, what steps is your administration taking to promote this type of education?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we are doing a number of things. First of all, I think you saw the White House on the Internet today, didn't you? We're trying to set a good example. But we're also promoting the availability of more computers and the use of more responsible computer education in our schools, starting in the earliest grades. It was a big part of the education reform legislation that Secretary Riley and I and the administration pushed last year.

One thing I note -- Mr. Gingrich said the other day something that I really agreed with, and then he said maybe it was an unrealistic thing. But I don't think it is. He said it would really help to cure poverty if every poor child in America had a little laptop computer. And then I think he backed off of it. I don't think that's a bad idea at all. I think that if we had enough resources to teach every poor child in this country how to interact with the whole world of information that's available, if you can work that it would be a very good thing.

So I believe we should continue to press technology. It is not an excuse, it's not a substitute for learning to read, for learning to write, for learning to express yourself clearly, for learning to reason and argue and think. But it is enormous leverage to us. And I think we should do more.

Q My name is Carrie Budoff. I'm from Rutgers University. Many colleges have policies of nondiscrimination. And your "don't ask, don't tell" policy for ROTC programs -- it applies to ROTC programs. And it's an obvious conflict with universities' policy. The ROTC program in the case of Rutgers may lose funding because of this, because they are not abiding by the nondiscrimination policy. How can these programs -- how can the ROTC program on college campuses deal with this if they have a nondiscrimination policy?

THE PRESIDENT: Explain what you mean. I'm sorry I don't understand it. Go ahead.

Q Okay. The ROTC program at Rutgers University may lose scholarship funding because they are on the campus. And the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, which extends --

THE PRESIDENT: Conflicts with Rutgers' nondiscrimination policy.

Q Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it's an act of Congress, so Rutgers will have to decide what to do about it. I mean, there isn't -- I'll say this. If the policy were implemented in spirit and in letter the way it was really written -- if you read the whole policy -- I don't think it would be in conflict. But if you read the whole policy -- I would urge you to go back and read the whole policy and see what it really says. I

don't think it would be in conflict. But if Rutgers deems it's in conflict, then Rutgers will have to do whatever it decides to do, because that policy was written into law as an act of Congress and so it is not subject to change unless Congress changes it.

Q Christan Hanna, Western Michigan University. On our campus we had a nonviolent protest because a faculty member told a student that she asked "stupid -- blank -- questions." And instead of dealing with the problem of racism and talking about it on campus, the university's reaction has been to try to quell all of the surrounding problems instead of dealing with the issue -- the main issues, which is the racism and problems that people have with that. What do you think the university's role in educating beyond your study, your area of study is?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think it's a very important role. I mean, if you have the luxury of going to college, and you stay there for four years -- or in the case of a community college, two years -- it's maybe different if you've got a family to raise and a full-time job and all. But if basically you're a full-time student and you're in your formative years, some of the most important things that happen to you happen to you outside the classroom and involve things you don't get a grade on.

And I think one of the things -- I've been really quite concerned about the challenges that both students and faculty members face in this so-called political correctness atmosphere. I think we need to encourage people to say what they really think, but to do it in an atmosphere that is more tolerant. And I think universities ought to be laboratories all across this country for people airing their real feelings and convictions, but doing it in a way that other people can hear them, and really being honest and forthright about it. Because otherwise, then the universities can just become one more island of isolation for the American people. We don't need that. We don't need more islands of isolation. We need instruments to open us up to one another.

Q Jim Buchanan, St. Louis Community College. Mr. President, I congratulate your efforts to try to bring about health care

reform. And I wonder if you're going to try that again. And do you think a single-payer system might make it?

THE PRESIDENT: The answer is, I am going to try to health care reform again this year. Obviously, the American people made a judgment, or at least the Congress did, and I think the American people did -- that this was such a big issue, they didn't want me or anybody else to try to put together a program that purported to solve it all at one time. So I think we'll have to go back and take it a piece at a time.

My own view is -- this is something you need to know about this, by the way -- the entire problem with the federal deficit in 1995, 1994, 1993, now since our budget has come in, is interest on the debt and health care costs. Everything else is going down. Last year we reduced spending on both defense and domestic spending overall for the first time

in 25 years. The deficit's going up because of interest on the debt and health care costs. So we have an interest in doing that.

The second thing you need to know is that your country is the only advanced country in the world where there are a smaller percentage of working families with health insurance today than had it 10 years ago. That is not true in any other advanced country in the world. So we have to do it. We have to -- we should do it by reforming the insurance system, helping people when they're unemployed not to lose their insurance, giving incentives to cover children, and helping families with disabled kids or with parents who want care other than nursing homes, and where that would be a cheaper, more affordable thing to do.

Let me give a little -- go ahead in the back there. I'll take a couple more. Go ahead. Yes, go ahead. (Laughter.) You know, when they're here, they all stand up if I point in the general direction. (Laughter.)

Q My name is Evan Koblentz from Kean College of New Jersey. Much progress has been made in your administration for financially-strapped or opportunity-privileged students to get grants and loans. What are you doing with the Republican Congress to get more grants available for merit-based and academic-based scholarships?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me say, first of all, I'm not -- I don't believe that that should primarily be the subject for the federal government. Historically, it hasn't been. And I'll come back to that in a moment. Secondly, let me emphasize that the direct loan program is not very much income limited. It's really available to quite a broad range of young people to participate in. And since there are at least four different options for repayment, the idea is that you don't lose the right to get a loan even if you're a middle-class student. And if you decide to take a job that doesn't pay a high wage, you can afford to

pay it back if you want to be someone who's more interested in public service early on than higher incomes.

Now, on the merit-based scholarships, let me just say what I meant by that. There are many states -- Georgia is one -- I know we have some journalists here from Georgia -- Georgia has now passed a law that says that if you have a B average in Georgia and you go to school there, you get a tuition scholarship. And I think you get some money for books as well. When I was the governor of my state, I instituted a governor's scholarship program that was similar to that. These programs are sweeping the country, but they are basically the province of state government.

Let me further state that this is the second year in a row when the economy of all 50 states has grown. So they're in a --if they don't do it, they're in a better position to do it than they were a couple years ago. And that's one I would direct you to the state legislatures for.

Q Yes, all day we've been hearing -- I'm sorry, Kelly McEvers, from the University of Illinois. All day we've been hearing

about the growing disparity between those in the upper echelon of income and those in the lower -- those at the low poverty level. However, especially after the election in November, the rhetoric that seemed to be coming through, at least in the mainstream media, was solely toward the middle class. I guess one example is the Middle Class Bill of Rights. It seems to me that there's an attitude that we're becoming a classless society when, in fact, we're moving in opposite directions --

THE PRESIDENT: We are --

Q Is that because that's the class that goes to the polls?

THE PRESIDENT: No. It's because -- let me just say this. The argument of the Republicans in last November's election was the middle class should vote for us because all the Democrats do is take your taxes and spend it on poor people -- right? -- or minorities or illegal immigrants or criminals or whatever. That was the basic argument -- right? Government's bad, vote for us, we'll give you less government, lower taxes, and we'll be harder on all those groups.

And the voters bought it -- wrongly, I think -- at least those who voted, because we had done more for the middle class. But you have to understand what middle class is. Middle class is more than an economic designation in America. It's a statement about values. When we say middle class in America what we really mean is, everybody ought to have the chance to be rewarded for their work. If you work hard, raise your kids, obey the law, you ought to have a chance to do better.

And what is happening is we are becoming more stratified by economic class, but it's different than before. In other words -- and I guess -- I'm really glad you asked this, because I'll try to clarify the point I was trying to make before. We do have poor people in America. Mostly they're young women and their little children, but there are also a lot of working people who are poor who are making the minimum wage or right near it, which is why I'm for raising the minimum wage. And then we have a lot of wealthy people in America, and our economy is producing more wealthy people, and that is good. Entrepreneurs -- more entrepreneurs are becoming millionaires today than ever before who started with nothing -- not inherited wealth, but are making money. That is a good thing, not a bad thing.

But what is happening is that the middle class itself is splitting apart. That's the point I'm trying to make. The great American middle class, which basically rose more or less evenly with the poor and the rich in income from the end of World War II to the late '70s -- everybody rose together about the same amount. The American middle class itself is now splitting apart, based largely on education, age and job description. And if you don't have the skills and you're not in the place -- in the workplace, where you can hook into one of these groups that is growing, then you tend to work harder every year for lower wages. That's what I'm pointing out.

So what do we try to do? In the economic plan in '93, we had one

big tax cut. We cut taxes for working families with children to make sure nobody who was working 40 hours a week with children would be below the poverty line. That's what the earned income tax credit was about. On average this year it's worth about \$1,000 in lower taxes to families of four with income of under \$26,000. Why do we do that? To reward work and family and lift people, keep trying to push people toward the middle class.

So this whole education thing -- we know if our government here can continue to follow responsible economic policies, we can create jobs, we can have growth. But we still -- that will not raise incomes. And it won't overcome this inequality, this splitting apart of the middle class.

So that's what I'm saying. The middle class mentality, which has been -- what made America great, requires us to follow policies that lift everybody's income.

I will close with just one thing. I had an interview with Money Magazine the other day. Do you all know Money Magazine? It's a -- and they did a readers' survey, they told me. And they said -- I guess I'm jumping my interview. They'll probably be made at me, but --(laughter). They said -- they said that their readers said that they

recognize that we have lowered the deficit, created jobs, sparked an economic recovery, and two-thirds of them were still worried about their future. Right? Yes, you lowered the deficit, created jobs, there's an economic recovery. Am I worried? You bet I am. Why? Because of all this churning instability in the global economy.

That is our challenge. We've got to find a way to keep the entrepreneurship, keep the growth going, but lift the middle-class folks that are good people that have been left behind.

That's why I'm glad to see some of the nontraditional students in the community college. That's means that they're going to make the transfer from the middle class that might be left behind to the middle class that's surging ahead. And we need more of that, which is why we don't need to be in a position of reducing our commitment to education at the end of this century when the next century will trigger opportunity to education more than ever before.

Thank you very much. I have to go. Thank you. (Applause.)
END1:49 P.M. EST

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Marlene A. MacDonald (MACDONALD_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-MAR-1995 18:24:42.50

SUBJECT: TRANSCRIPT OF COLLEGE FORUM WITH PRESIDENT CLINTON

TO: FAX (94010596,Kerry Morgan) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:94010596\C:Kerry MorganREAD:NOT READ

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

23

-Mar

-1995 02:36pm

TO: (See Below)

FROM: Margaret M. Suntum
Office of the Press Secretary

SUBJECT: 1995

-3

-23 College Press Forum remarks

HORIZONTAL_PITCH 12

PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER

TOP ALL

- \p -

BOTTOM ALL

MORE

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 23, 1995

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT COLLEGE PRESS FORUM

The East Room

1:05 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you and welcome to the White House. This is, as I'm sure you agree, a fascinating time to be in our Nation's Capital. We are now having a great debate about how we can best assure the American Dream for your generation and for your children well into the next century. The choices we make here will have a profound effect on all of your lives.

This is an historic era -- we have the end of the Cold War, the dawn of the Information Age, a globalized economy, an explosion of entrepreneurialism; an enormous amount of opportunity. At the same time, we have profound challenges. We have almost 20 years of stagnant incomes in the United States. We have growing inequality of incomes based primarily on educational differentials. We have deep strains within our society and still profound problems related to the breakdown of family and community, and the rise of crime and violence. We have challenges abroad in terrorism, environmental destruction, population explosion, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The issue we are most debating around here now in many different ways is what is the proper role of the national government in working with the American people to meet our challenges. The old view is that government is inherently a positive force and that there is a one-size-fits-all, big government solution for every big problem. The new view that's all the rage around here is that the federal government is the cause of every problem and if we just didn't have one we might not have any problems.

My view is different from both of these. I ran for president to advance that view, and I still believe it is the proper one. I believe government does have a role to play as a partner in meeting the challenges of the future with all of the American people. I believe the role of government is to increase opportunity as we shrink bureaucracy, to empower people to make the most of their own lives, and to enhance our security at home and abroad.

We have to work economically to expand the middle class and to shrink the underclass. We have to work to promote mainstream values of work and family and future. We have to do it with a government that is smaller and less bureaucratic, but still effective. The key to our future is our ability to create more opportunity and, at the same time, the willingness of our citizens to assume more responsibility. That's what I have called The New Covenant.

I agree that we have to cut outmoded government, and our administration has lead the way. There are already more than 100,000 fewer people working here for the national government than there were on the day I became President. We're on our way to the smallest federal establishment since President Kennedy worked here.

But I also believe that this government should invest in

your future and in your capacity to contribute and to live up to the fullest of your abilities. Therefore, I support more investments in education and technology and training, and empowering people to make the most of their own lives.

I also believe that if you look at the end of two years, the evidence is pretty good that our approach is right. We have reduced the deficit three years in a row for the first time since Mr. Truman was here. We have 6.1 million new jobs, the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 25 years, the first time in 20 years the African American unemployment rate has been under 10 percent. We have in 1993 the largest number of new businesses incorporated in any given year in American history. Finally, in 1994, we began to make some progress on the wage issue when we had more high-wage jobs coming into the economy than in the previous five years combined.

Notwithstanding that, the American people said they wanted a different sort of debate here in Washington last November, and so we are having it. Now, I believe that nothing will more clearly define the contours of this debate than what we decide to do in the area of education and training.

In the global economy into which we are moving, we can see what is happening to American jobs and incomes. Those who are able to grasp the high-wage jobs of the future are doing very well, indeed. We're going to have record numbers of millionaires created in this four-year period.

But we also see more and more and more Americans in the grip of insecurity as they work harder than they were working 20 years ago for wages that are the same or lower. And, overwhelmingly, it is because technology and global economic competition have depressed wages in areas that are not high skilled, with the capacity to grow and learn for a lifetime.

Therefore, I do not agree that we should cut our investments in education and training, starting with the advances we made in Head Start, going through the school lunch program, all the way to the apprenticeship programs for young people who don't go to college, to college loans, to the subsidies for college loans for working young people -- right the way through. I don't believe we should cut them, certainly not to pay for tax cuts and not even to reduce the deficit. We do not have to cut education to reduce the deficit.

The leaders of Congress have targeted two areas that I would like to mention -- three, if I might, although only one reduces the deficit -- or two. The first is, the student loan program. We have, through our direct loan program, offered the opportunity for millions of young people to borrow money at lower costs on better repayment terms in a way that is less hassle for colleges and universities, less paperwork, and actually saves the government money because we take out the middle man. We don't have guarantees to

banks, we just make the loans directly. That has actually reduced the deficit and reduced the costs of college loans.

At the same time, we have gotten tougher on collecting delinquent loans, reducing the costs to the taxpayers of delinquent loans from \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion. So, more loans, lower costs to the students, lower costs to the taxpayers, less hassle to the schools. It's a win-win deal.

The Republicans in the Congress want to change all of that. They, first of all, want to put a lid on the number of students who can participate in the direct loan program, which will add to the deficit. And then, they want to eliminate the student

loan subsidy for four million college students and charge people interest on their loans while they're in college, even if they come from very modest backgrounds.

Interestingly enough, this cut in education will only replace the money that they want to keep giving middlemen in the old student loan program so we could have the same reduction in the deficit by leaving the interest subsidy in place and making the direct loan program available to all the students in America. I think it's clear that our decision is a better one than theirs, and I hope that we will prevail. We are doing some things together, you know. We signed the unfunded mandates bill yesterday, we're about to get a bipartisan consensus for a line-item veto, which I have worked very hard for. So I hope that my view can prevail here, because it's very important to you.

The other thing that has happened in the House is that the Republicans have voted to cut the National Service Program, AmeriCorps, to the bone. I think that is a mistake. The AmeriCorps program is giving thousands of young Americans a chance to serve their communities, serve their country, and earn money for higher education.

I don't believe we need to trade in our future for what is a pittance on the deficit, but will have an enormous negative symbolic and substantive impact on what we're trying to do in this country.

There is an article in The Washington Post this morning by Mary McGrory, whom I see sitting in the back who quotes a Georgetown student who happens to be a Republican who says, "I understand that taxpayers are heavily burdened, but if we give up what's best about America, what kind of legacy will we leave?"

So I will close with that. I urge you to think about this question. Yes, we have to continue to reduce the deficit, and we will. Yes, we have to move ourselves into the future economically. How can we do both? What are our other challenges?

One of the things we know is that the countries that do the best job of developing the full capacities of every one of their

citizens will be the most successful in the 21 century. That's in all your interests, and that's what we should be debating here.

Thank you very much. I'd like to now call on as many of you as we possibly can. I'd like to ask you when I recognize you, please, to say what your name is and what your school is. And we'll start here.

Q Jeff Glasser, from Yale. How do you plan to stop Congress from capping direct loans, or cutting Pell grants, or paying the interest on loans taken out during college? Are you willing to veto legislation if it comes across your desk?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, of course, I am in the areas of education, which are so important to me. But let me say again what my first choice has been all along -- is to try to prevail in the debate in the Congress. We are making progress. As I said, we -- I signed a bill yesterday that I strongly believe in -- the unfunded mandates bill -- which limits the ability of Congress to pass laws that require state and local governments to raise taxes or otherwise pay for things that we require. We're going to get the line-item veto I hope and believe, which is a good way to cut out unnecessary spending. So maybe we can make some progress here.

I don't think there's as much enthusiasm in the Senate among Republicans, and I know the Democrats will oppose eliminating the subsidies, cutting the Pell grants, eliminating the direct loan program. So I hope we can prevail in the Congress. But the veto pen is always there.

And this is a -- look, I wouldn't be standing here today, no way in the world would I be standing here today if it hadn't been for the opportunities America gave me through education. When I was born in my state in 1946, the per capita income of my state was barely over half the national average. And my whole generation owes everything we have to the educational opportunities our country gave to us. And now education is even more important to the general welfare of America than it was when I was your age.

I cannot sit by and watch it go backward. We need to bear down and do more, not ease up and go back.

Yes.

Q Francine Friedman, from Georgetown. As a fellow Hoya about to graduate and start paying back my loans, I was wondering if you could share with us how you financed your Georgetown education.

THE PRESIDENT: I had a \$500 -- as I remember, it was a \$500-a-year scholarship and a job. I worked in the Congress for two years. And when I went to Yale to law school I had a grant, a loan, a tuition postponement option, which works like the direct loan does now -- that is, I paid it back as a percentage of my income. I had a

national defense loan and six jobs. But never more than three at once. (Laughter.)

Q Kristal Adams, from the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. On a lighter note, I was wondering who do you have picked for the Arkansas-Memphis game, and do you think Arkansas will make it all the way to the championship game this year?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I feel somehow, after the last two games, there is some divine providence that keeps us going. (Laughter.) So I'm more hopeful now than I was when they started the tournament. Thank you.

Q Yes. My name is Peter McKay. I'm a sophomore at Florida A&M University. And my question deals with the White House review of affirmative action that's been going on for several weeks now. What is the status of the review, and what conclusions have you reached about affirmative action?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first, the status is ongoing. I'll talk a little about where we are now, but I want to emphasize that the review is still underway.

And let me urge you -- I know there must be a lot of discussion about this on college campuses as it affects admissions policies. But I want to emphasize to begin you, if you spark a debate about this it's important to know what people are talking about when they're talking about affirmative action. There are policies of the government and policies in the private sector that affect admissions to colleges, availability of financial aid to schools, admissions to workplaces and promotional policies within the workplace, and access to contracts in the public sector; and, sometimes, in the private sector as well, like big companies contracting with smaller ones. So you're basically talking about a range of programs.

When there is evidence of past discrimination, as found in a court, then there can be more strenuous rules and regulations. Otherwise, there are actually a lot of strictures on how far affirmative action can go in giving preferences to people based on race or gender.

But let me back up a little bit and again talk about a little history. When I was your age and I began to work in political campaigns, which I know was a long time ago -- almost 30 years ago now, but it's not so long in the life of the country -- there were still courthouses on squares in county seats in my state that had segregated restrooms -- in my lifetime, when I was your age, in the mid-'60s, there were still older African Americans in my state who did not know that they could vote without buying a poll tax, because it had only been abolished by the Supreme Court a couple of years before. I can remember when there were no women in any number of jobs now where we take it for granted that women will be.

The point I want to make to you is that we have made a lot of progress in this country. It has been inexact, it has been imperfect, there are still problems. We have made a lot of progress because we tried to take action to open up more opportunities to people without regard to their race or gender. And all of us, including white males, are better off because of that.

If you look at the countries around the world today that are being absolutely ripped apart because of violence based on ethnic or religious or racial disputes, and sometimes also related to the role of women, if you look at the countries that are struggling to become modern today where there's still regularly violence against women -- the general point I want to make to you is that it is in everyone's interest to see that everybody gets the best chance to live up to the fullest of their abilities.

On the other hand, it is in no one's interest to see that people get positions if they're completely unqualified to hold them. So the question is: How do we now go forward? And let me tell you the questions I've asked my folks to answer. I've said, first of all, how do these programs work, and do they have a positive effect? Okay, that's the first question. Secondly, even if they work, are they sometimes, at least, unfair to others? Could you argue that in some cases there is reverse discrimination, and if so, how? Thirdly, are there now others in need who are not covered by affirmative action programs?

Keep in mind that's really what's fueling this whole thing. You've got 20 years in this country where most hourly wage-earners have not kept up with inflation. Most Americans are working harder for lower wages than they were making 20 years ago. If so, how are we going to deal with them?

And, finally, let's look at what clearly works, and I'll give you three examples. I don't think anybody in America would like us to suspend what we are doing in the military -- the system that produced not only General Powell, but countless other generals and colonels who are not only African Americans and Hispanics and Asian Americans, but also women, doing things that never were available before. How does that system work? Why does nobody reject it? Because nobody thinks anyone unqualified gets promoted.

What do they do? They work as hard as they can to develop the capacities of everybody who signs up, they do their very best to see that each level in the promotional pool, there is a mix of people that reflect the population in the rank just below, and then nobody -- nobody gets promoted who is not qualified. But they really work hard to give everybody a chance and develop everybody's capacities.

A second example -- this is self-serving, but I'll give it to you, anyway. I have appointed at this point in my tenure to this point in the two years, more judges to the federal bench who were women or members of racial minorities than my three predecessors

combined, I believe. But my judges have the highest ratings, on average, from the American Bar Associations of any of the last four presidents. So no one suggests that I am not promoting quality in the federal bench.

Fourth example: My Deputy Chief of Staff, Erskine Bowles was, before he came to the White House, the head of the Small Business Administration. And he spent 20 years helping people finance small business. And I said, we've got to bring enterprise into the depressed areas of this country, we have got to do it. So in one year, there was a huge increase in the volume of loans given to African Americans, Hispanics and women under the Small Business Administration without, in any way, discriminating against qualified white males, and every one of the loans was to a qualified person. Now, I don't believe any American would object to those three things.

The last thing I want to say is, I have also asked where does discrimination still exist among people who are not poor, or not economically distressed, in the traditional definition, based on race or gender. We just had the Glass Ceiling Report issued this last week, which was originally initiated, I believe, by Senator Dole, which said that there is still evidence of discrimination in promotional practices in large enterprises.

So I want to review all this, I want to make the best decision I can, and I've given you the questions.

I want to close with just two points. I'm against discrimination, I'm against giving people opportunities who are unqualified. But we all have an interest, including white males, in developing the capacities of all of us to relate to one another -- because our economy will grow quicker, it'll be stronger, and in a global society, our diversity is our greatest asset. We must not let this debate be another cheap political wedge issue to divide the American electorate. We can use this to come together, and that's what we ought to do.

Tell me your name and where you're from.

Q My name is Lori Wiechman. I go to the University of Georgia. And in your first remarks, you had mentioned that you're really concerned about the future of us as college students and as -- our children. And I was just wondering, looking back on your experience in politics, which areas would you suggest for the college students who attend all of the universities here who are wanting to go into politics to pursue before they begin their career?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, I do not believe that there is a specific academic discipline that is necessarily better than another one to pursue a political career. If you are pursuing a degree in science or mathematics, or economics, let's say, I would recommend that at least you take whatever electives you can in history and in the social sciences, like political science, and in psychology.

(Laughter.) And then -- but I think the most important thing is to develop your mind, is to learn to think.

And then the second thing I would say is, it's very important to spend your free time deciding whether you're interested in people as individuals and interested in public problems. Not everybody is, you know. And it's a good thing -- I mean, a lot of wonderful work has been done in the world by people who didn't want to spend hours a day talking to people who were different from them.

But if you really want to make a positive difference, in my judgment, you have to be able to imagine what life is like for people who are very different from you, and you have to be willing to invest some time in listening to those people.

If you think about what's happening, even in -- I read stories on college campuses, that kids are sort of separating by race, at least younger people and -- I'll give you something positive -- one of the best things that's happened is a lot of older people are now coming back to schools, especially to community colleges, but also to four-year colleges.

If you want to be effective in public life, you have to understand how other people view the world, and you have to be able to imagine yourself in their position. And then, the third thing I would say is, you should get some experience in campaigns and in other public endeavors to find out both how hard and how exhilarating it is to get people together and try to work to change something. Those are the three pieces of advice. But there is no single academic discipline that's the best.

Q My name is Shafeeq Qaasim. I'm from Los Angeles Trade Technical College. As opposed to the budget that everybody's concerned about, and we have all of these illegal aliens that mostly - - that affect all of us, including the taxpayers -- I would like to know, considering we passed a proposal of Proposition #187 in California, and it's now somewhere in the federal court system, what's being done, and how can it get back into the state where the voters have already voted?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the voters voted for it, and then like any law, it's subject to court challenge, and it's being challenged in the courts. Let me tell you what we've tried to do in the meanwhile. First of all, after I became President, I increased spending by 30 percent on programs designed to reduce the problem of illegal aliens. We have increased the number of border guards on the southern borders, assuming my next budget is adopted on this -- I think it will be -- by about 60 percent in three years, we are turning more people back.

We are also sending more people back home more quickly who come in contact with the criminal justice system. We are working to increase our ability to check workplaces for illegal immigrants,

and we're trying to standardize identification so people can't give phony papers and stay in jobs. And we are trying to alleviate some of the costs that states face. We've given California, for example, more money to deal with their costs of imprisonment and health care and other things. And I asked the Congress to do even more than they voted to do, but I think that we should, as a matter of principle, no illegal immigrant is entitled to the expenditure of American people's tax dollars.

I did not support 187 for a very different reason. I don't think it's in the interest of the American people to have kids here and have them not in school. I don't think it's in the interest of the American people who have families here and not be able to get into a health clinic and maybe have them get seriously ill and spread whatever illness they have to the population at large. So my problem with 187 was in the details.

We do not give welfare benefits, for example, to illegal immigrants, and we should not be spending our money there, except where it is in the interest of our larger sense of self-interest. And I think schools and health care are. But we've got to do a lot more to crack down on the borders, and we have to do a lot more to go into these workplaces and send people away. And I would hope again -- this was a great wedge issue in the last election, but I'd like to remind you of where this issue came from, in part.

A lot of the very same people that were out there for 187, just a few years ago when the California economy was booming, weakened the anti-immigration -- anti-illegal immigration legislation pending in Congress, so they could get more illegal immigrations into

workplaces in California who would work for lower wages -- for their supporters. Now, that's the truth.

And what we need to do is crack down in the workplace, crack down at the borders, crack down in the criminal justice system, and not spend any money that we don't have to spend. And that's our policy and the one we're going to pursue.

Q I'm from Ohio University -- we're represented by a freshman Republican in Congress -- to be a freshman Democrat -- he says he opposes cuts in student aid, yet he says we need to look at your direct funding program -- because it builds a billion-dollar bureaucracy here in Washington. Could you respond to that?

THE PRESIDENT: It's just a -- it's a myth. It's a myth. The direct lending program -- the Secretary of Education is here with me -- the direct lending program will save the taxpayers \$12 billion over six years, the same amount of money they propose to save by eliminating the interest subsidy on student loan. Why is that?

You know how the student loan program works now under the old system? It's a 90-percent guarantee. So you go to the bank and you borrow the money -- right? And the government guarantees 90

percent of it. And the bank gets payment in the middle. And then if somebody defaults on the loan, unless it's a huge amount of money, it's not worth it to the bank to go try to sue somebody and get the money back. Why? Because they're going to get 90 percent of it anyway. And they'll spend 10 percent or more on lawyer fees.

So what have we done? We have reduced the number of defaults. We have been tough on this -- over and above the previous administrations who were here before me -- we have reduced the loan defaults from a cost a year of \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion. This direct lending program is far less expensive to run than the alternative. It is pure ideology to say it costs a little money to run the direct loan program and we don't want to hire one government employee; we'd rather pay billions and billions and billions of dollars to banks that could be going for lower cost college loans to more students.

This program is working. It saves money for everybody, and we shouldn't limit its reach. I think it is a real error.

Yes. Go ahead.

Q Margretta Sundelin, from Brigham Young University. It seems the United States is a nation founded on -- and prided upon its diversity. However, in the course of the last few years, it seems its diversity is dividing us. What I want to know is, in your presidency, what have you done to bring cohesion back to the nation and to settle the unrest?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I've tried to do many things, but let me emphasize two or three. The first thing I've tried to do is to focus on initiatives that would provide opportunities to all Americans; that would unite us in getting more opportunities by, first of all in economic terms, but bringing down the deficit and expanding trade opportunities for American products, by working to create more jobs for the American people. Secondly, in education, by increasing everything from Head Start programs to college loans. I have tried to offer broad-based opportunity.

The second thing I've tried to do is to demonstrate to the American people that you could have diversity and excellence at the same time. That's what I just mentioned -- if you look at the people I've appointed to high public office, the people I've

appointed to the federal judgeships, and the things that I have tried to do that I think are important.

The third thing I have tried to do is to emphasize the importance of uniting the American people around shared values. That's what welfare reform is all about. That's what the attempts of the crime bill to clean up our streets from violence are all about. We should all be able to agree that we are going to pursue policies that promote family, that promote work, that strengthen communities, that look to the future. These are the things that I have tried to

do.

And I believe that the American people would think more in these terms -- I know that a lot of people are so bewildered by the changes and they feel so threatened by the changes going on today, that it's easy to lash out at someone who is different from us. But if we would focus on those three things I think we'd come together more.

Q I'm Jamie Sivlerstein, from Northwestern University. With the knowledge of computers and other types of technology becoming more crucial in order to succeed in the workplace, what steps is your administration taking to promote this type of education?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we are doing a number of things. First of all, I think you saw the White House on the Internet today, didn't you? We're trying to set a good example. But we're also promoting the availability of more computers and the use of more responsible computer education in our schools, starting in the earliest grades. It was a big part of the education reform legislation that Secretary Riley and I and the administration pushed last year.

One thing I note -- Mr. Gingrich said the other day something that I really agreed with, and then he said maybe it was an unrealistic thing. But I don't think it is. He said it would really help to cure poverty if every poor child in America had a little laptop computer. And then I think he backed off of it. I don't think that's a bad idea at all. I think that if we had enough resources to teach every poor child in this country how to interact with the whole world of information that's available, if you can work that it would be a very good thing.

So I believe we should continue to press technology. It is not an excuse, it's not a substitute for learning to read, for learning to write, for learning to express yourself clearly, for learning to reason and argue and think. But it is enormous leverage to us. And I think we should do more.

Q My name is Carrie Budoff. I'm from Rutgers University. Many colleges have policies of nondiscrimination. And your "don't ask, don't tell" policy for ROTC programs -- it applies to ROTC programs. And it's an obvious conflict with universities' policy. The ROTC program in the case of Rutgers may lose funding because of this, because they are not abiding by the nondiscrimination policy. How can these programs -- how can the ROTC program on college campuses deal with this if they have a nondiscrimination policy?

THE PRESIDENT: Explain what you mean. I'm sorry I don't understand it. Go ahead.

Q Okay. The ROTC program at Rutgers University may lose scholarship funding because they are on the campus. And the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, which extends --

THE PRESIDENT: Conflicts with Rutgers' nondiscrimination policy.

Q Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it's an act of Congress, so Rutgers will have to decide what to do about it. I mean, there isn't -- I'll say this. If the policy were implemented in spirit and in letter the way it was really written -- if you read the whole policy -- I don't think it would be in conflict. But if you read the whole policy -- I would urge you to go back and read the whole policy and see what it really says. I don't think it would be in conflict. But if Rutgers deems it's in conflict, then Rutgers will have to do whatever it decides to do, because that policy was written into law as an act of Congress and so it is not subject to change unless Congress changes it.

Q Christan Hanna, Western Michigan University. On our campus we had a nonviolent protest because a faculty member told a student that she asked "stupid -- blank -- questions." And instead of dealing with the problem of racism and talking about it on campus, the university's reaction has been to try to quell all of the surrounding problems instead of dealing with the issue -- the main issues, which is the racism and problems that people have with that. What do you think the university's role in educating beyond your study, your area of study is?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think it's a very important role. I mean, if you have the luxury of going to college, and you stay there for four years -- or in the case of a community college, two years -- it's maybe different if you've got a family to raise and a full-time job and all. But if basically you're a full-time student and you're in your formative years, some of the most important things that happen to you happen to you outside the classroom and involve things you don't get a grade on.

And I think one of the things -- I've been really quite concerned about the challenges that both students and faculty members face in this so-called political correctness atmosphere. I think we need to encourage people to say what they really think, but to do it in an atmosphere that is more tolerant. And I think universities ought to be laboratories all across this country for people airing their real feelings and convictions, but doing it in a way that other people can hear them, and really being honest and forthright about it. Because otherwise, then the universities can just become one more island of isolation for the American people. We don't need that. We don't need more islands of isolation. We need instruments to open us up to one another.

Q Jim Buchanan, St. Louis Community College. Mr. President, I congratulate your efforts to try to bring about health care reform. And I wonder if you're going to try that again. And do

you think a single-payer system might make it?

THE PRESIDENT: The answer is, I am going to try to health care reform again this year. Obviously, the American people made a judgment, or at least the Congress did, and I think the American people did -- that this was such a big issue, they didn't want me or anybody else to try to put together a program that purported to solve it all at one time. So I think we'll have to go back and take it a piece at a time.

My own view is -- this is something you need to know about this, by the way -- the entire problem with the federal deficit in 1995, 1994, 1993, now since our budget has come in, is interest on the debt and health care costs. Everything else is going down. Last year we reduced spending on both defense and domestic spending overall for the first time in 25 years. The deficit's going up

because of interest on the debt and health care costs. So we have an interest in doing that.

The second thing you need to know is that your country is the only advanced country in the world where there are a smaller percentage of working families with health insurance today than had it 10 years ago. That is not true in any other advanced country in the world. So we have to do it. We have to -- we should do it by reforming the insurance system, helping people when they're unemployed not to lose their insurance, giving incentives to cover children, and helping families with disabled kids or with parents who want care other than nursing homes, and where that would be a cheaper, more affordable thing to do.

Let me give a little -- go ahead in the back there. I'll take a couple more. Go ahead. Yes, go ahead. (Laughter.) You know, when they're here, they all stand up if I point in the general direction. (Laughter.)

Q My name is Evan Koblentz from Kean College of New Jersey. Much progress has been made in your administration for financially-strapped or opportunity-privileged students to get grants and loans. What are you doing with the Republican Congress to get more grants available for merit-based and academic-based scholarships?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me say, first of all, I'm not -
- I don't believe that that should primarily be the subject for the federal government. Historically, it hasn't been. And I'll come back to that in a moment. Secondly, let me emphasize that the direct loan program is not very much income limited. It's really available to quite a broad range of young people to participate in. And since there are at least four different options for repayment, the idea is that you don't lose the right to get a loan even if you're a middle-class student. And if you decide to take a job that doesn't pay a high wage, you can afford to pay it back if you want to be someone who's more interested in public service early on than higher incomes.

Now, on the merit-based scholarships, let me just say

what I meant by that. There are many states -- Georgia is one -- I know we have some journalists here from Georgia -- Georgia has now passed a law that says that if you have a B average in Georgia and you go to school there, you get a tuition scholarship. And I think you get some money for books as well. When I was the governor of my state, I instituted a governor's scholarship program that was similar to that. These programs are sweeping the country, but they are basically the province of state government.

Let me further state that this is the second year in a row when the economy of all 50 states has grown. So they're in a --if they don't do it, they're in a better position to do it than they were a couple years ago. And that's one I would direct you to the state legislatures for.

Q Yes, all day we've been hearing -- I'm sorry, Kelly McEvers, from the University of Illinois. All day we've been hearing about the growing disparity between those in the upper echelon of income and those in the lower -- those at the low poverty level. However, especially after the election in November, the rhetoric that seemed to be coming through, at least in the mainstream media, was solely toward the middle class. I guess one example is the Middle Class Bill of Rights. It seems to me that there's an attitude that we're becoming a classless society when, in fact, we're moving in opposite directions --

THE PRESIDENT: We are --

Q Is that because that's the class that goes to the polls?

THE PRESIDENT: No. It's because -- let me just say this. The argument of the Republicans in last November's election was the middle class should vote for us because all the Democrats do is take your taxes and spend it on poor people -- right? -- or minorities or illegal immigrants or criminals or whatever. That was the basic argument -- right? Government's bad, vote for us, we'll give you less government, lower taxes, and we'll be harder on all those groups.

And the voters bought it -- wrongly, I think -- at least those who voted, because we had done more for the middle class. But you have to understand what middle class is. Middle class is more than an economic designation in America. It's a statement about values. When we say middle class in America what we really mean is, everybody ought to have the chance to be rewarded for their work. If you work hard, raise your kids, obey the law, you ought to have a chance to do better.

And what is happening is we are becoming more stratified by economic class, but it's different than before. In other words -- and I guess -- I'm really glad you asked this, because I'll try to clarify the point I was trying to make before. We do have poor people in America. Mostly they're young women and their little children, but

there are also a lot of working people who are poor who are making the minimum wage or right near it, which is why I'm for raising the minimum wage. And then we have a lot of wealthy people in America, and our economy is producing more wealthy people, and that is good. Entrepreneurs -- more entrepreneurs are becoming millionaires today than ever before who started with nothing -- not inherited wealth, but are making money. That is a good thing, not a bad thing.

But what is happening is that the middle class itself is splitting apart. That's the point I'm trying to make. The great American middle class, which basically rose more or less evenly with the poor and the rich in income from the end of World War II to the late '70s -- everybody rose together about the same amount. The American middle class itself is now splitting apart, based largely on education, age and job description. And if you don't have the skills and you're not in the place -- in the workplace, where you can hook into one of these groups that is growing, then you tend to work harder every year for lower wages. That's what I'm pointing out.

So what do we try to do? In the economic plan in '93, we had one big tax cut. We cut taxes for working families with children to make sure nobody who was working 40 hours a week with children would be below the poverty line. That's what the earned income tax credit was about. On average this year it's worth about \$1,000 in lower taxes to families of four with income of under \$26,000. Why do we do that? To reward work and family and lift people, keep trying to push people toward the middle class.

So this whole education thing -- we know if our government here can continue to follow responsible economic policies, we can create jobs, we can have growth. But we still -- that will not raise incomes. And it won't overcome this inequality, this splitting apart of the middle class.

So that's what I'm saying. The middle class mentality, which has been -- what made America great, requires us to follow policies that lift everybody's income.

I will close with just one thing. I had an interview with Money Magazine the other day. Do you all know Money Magazine? It's a -- and they did a readers' survey, they told me. And they

said -- I guess I'm jumping my interview. They'll probably be made at me, but -- (laughter). They said -- they said that their readers said that they recognize that we have lowered the deficit, created jobs, sparked an economic recovery, and two-thirds of them were still worried about their future. Right? Yes, you lowered the deficit, created jobs, there's an economic recovery. Am I worried? You bet I am. Why? Because of all this churning instability in the global economy.

That is our challenge. We've got to find a way to keep the entrepreneurship, keep the growth going, but lift the middle-class folks that are good people that have been left behind.

That's why I'm glad to see some of the nontraditional students in the community college. That's means that they're going to make the transfer from the middle class that might be left behind to the middle class that's surging ahead. And we need more of that, which is why we don't need to be in a position of reducing our commitment to education at the end of this century when the next century will trigger opportunity to education more than ever before.

Thank you very much. I have to go. Thank you.
(Applause.)
END1:49 P.M. EST

Distribution:

TO: edowd@esusda.gov@INET
TO: ttate@esusda.gov@INET
TO: 1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC

-822\MWOLFE(A)MH1.JS.MIL@MRX@EOPMRX

TO: Dawn A. Alexander
TO: Steven A. Cohen
TO: Anne M. Edwards
TO: Jeremy M. Gaines
TO: Mary Ellen Glynn
TO: Julia R. Green
TO: Joshua A. King
TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman
TO: Marlene A. MacDonald
TO: Kathy McKiernan
TO: APRIL K. MELLODY
TO: Jonathan M. Prince
TO: Meeghan E. Prunty
TO: A. Victoria Rivas

-Vazquez

TO: Margaret M. Suntum
TO: Virginia M. Terzano
TO: Lorraine A. Voles
TO: Natalie S. Wozniak
TO: David B. Anderson
TO: C. Patricia Cogdell
TO: Peggy A. Lewis
TO: Lorraine McHugh
TO: Daniel G. Rauh
TO: Rica F. Rodman
TO: Jess Sarmiento
TO: Laura D. Schwartz
TO: Joshua Silverman
TO: Richard Strauss
TO: wh

-outbox

-distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET

TO: backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET

TO: BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX

TO: MATT GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX

TO: Donald A. Baer

TO: Gabrielle M. Bushman

TO: Carolyn Curiel

TO: Alan J. Stone

TO: Lori E. Abrams

TO: Walker, Angelina

TO: Karen L. Barbuschak

TO: Heather Beckel

TO: Robert O. Boorstin

TO: Elizabeth C. Bowyer

TO: Lisa M. Caputo

TO: Joseph W. Cerrell

TO: Helen H. Dickey

TO: Rahm Emanuel

TO: Barry G. Epstein

TO: Karen E. Finney

TO: Michael A. Gill

TO: Jason S. Goldberg

TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS

TO: Alexis M. Herman

TO: Heidi Kukis

TO: Brian J. Johnson

TO: Wayne C. Johnson

TO: James Kohlenberger

TO: G. N. Lattimore

TO: Cynthia J. Lizik

TO: Mike Lux

TO: Doris O. Matsui

TO: Paul Meyer

TO: Cheryl D. Mills

TO: Elizabeth A. Montoya

TO: Douglas S. Sheorn

TO: Susan P. Shepard

TO: Richard L. Siewert

TO: Barry J. Toiv

TO: Jodie R. Torkelson

TO: Michael Waldman

TO: usia01@access.digex.com@INET

TO: 62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET

TO: 73030.21@compuserve.com@INET

TO: Manager Infomgt

TO: newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET

TO: usnwire@access.digex.com@INET

TO: 1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@EOPMRX

TO: FAX (9

-862

-0340,William Safire)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Mike Lux (LUX_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-MAR-1995 16:13:01.67

SUBJECT: college forum

TO: Jeffrey S. Shulman (SHULMAN_J) (WHO)

READ:23-MAR-1995 16:31:52.63

TEXT:

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:23-MAR-1995 14:35:00.00

ATT CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum

ATT SUBJECT: 1995-3-23 College Press Forum remarks

ATT TO: Remote Addressee (edowd@esusda.gov@INET)

ATT TO: Remote Addressee (ttate@esusda.gov@INET)

ATT TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-
822\MWOLFE(A)MH1.JS.MIL@MRX@EOPMRX)

ATT TO: Dawn A. Alexander (ALEXANDER_DA)

ATT TO: Steven A. Cohen (COHEN_SA)

ATT TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A)

ATT TO: Jeremy M. Gaines (GAINES_J)

ATT TO: Mary Ellen Glynn (GLYNN_M)

ATT TO: Julia R. Green (GREEN_J)

ATT TO: Joshua A. King (KING_J)

ATT TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman (LIEBERMAN_E)

ATT TO: Marlene A. MacDonald (MACDONALD_M)

ATT TO: Kathy McKiernan (MCKIERNAN_K)

ATT TO: APRIL K. MELLODY (MELLODY_A)

ATT TO: Jonathan M. Prince (PRINCE_J)

ATT TO: Meeghan E. Prunty (PRUNTY_M)

ATT TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez (RIVASVAZQU_A)

ATT TO: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M)

ATT TO: Virginia M. Terzano (TERZANO_V)

ATT TO: Lorraine A. Voles (VOLES_L)

ATT TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK_N)

ATT TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D)

ATT TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C)

ATT TO: Peggy A. Lewis (LEWIS_P)

ATT TO: Lorraine McHugh (MCHUGH_L)

ATT TO: Daniel G. Rauh (RAUH_D)

ATT TO: Rica F. Rodman (RODMAN_R)

ATT TO: Jess Sarmiento (SARMIENTO_J)

ATT TO: Laura D. Schwartz (SCHWARTZ_L)

ATT TO: Joshua Silverman (SILVERMAN_J)

ATT TO: Richard Strauss (STRAUSS_R)

ATT TO: Remote Addressee (wh-outbox-distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET)

ATT TO: Remote Addressee (backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET)

ATT TO: Remote Addressee (BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX)

ATT TO: Remote Addressee (MATT
GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX)

ATT TO: Donald A. Baer (BAER_D)

ATT TO: Gabrielle M. Bushman (BUSHMAN_G)

ATT TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C)

ATT TO: Alan J. Stone (STONE_A)

ATT TO: Lori E. Abrams (ABRAMS_L)

ATT TO: Walker, Angelina (Angelina Walker@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)

ATT TO: Karen L. Barbuschak (BARBUSCHAK_K)

ATT TO: Heather Beckel (BECKEL_H)

ATT TO: Robert O. Boorstin	(BOORSTIN_R)
ATT TO: Elizabeth C. Bowyer	(BOWYER_E)
ATT TO: Lisa M. Caputo	(CAPUTO_L)
ATT TO: Joseph W. Cerrell	(CERREL_J)
ATT TO: Helen H. Dickey	(DICKEY_H)
ATT TO: Rahm Emanuel	(EMANUEL_R)
ATT TO: Barry G. Epstein	(EPSTEIN_B)
ATT TO: Karen E. Finney	(FINNEY_K)
ATT TO: Michael A. Gill	(GILL_M)
ATT TO: Jason S. Goldberg	(GOLDBERG_JS)
ATT TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS	(HAAS_L)
ATT TO: Alexis M. Herman	(HERMAN_A)
ATT TO: Heidi Kukis	(Heidi Kukis@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: Brian J. Johnson	(JOHNSON_BJ)
ATT TO: Wayne C. Johnson	(JOHNSON_WC)
ATT TO: James Kohlenberger	(Jim Kohlenberger@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: G. N. Lattimore	(LATTIMORE_G)
ATT TO: Cynthia J. Lizik	(LIZIK_C)
ATT TO: Mike Lux	(LUX_M)
ATT TO: Doris O. Matsui	(MATSUI_D)
ATT TO: Paul Meyer	(MEYER_P)
ATT TO: Cheryl D. Mills	(MILLS_C)
ATT TO: Elizabeth A. Montoya	(MONTOYA_E)
ATT TO: Douglas S. Sheorn	(SHEORN_D)
ATT TO: Susan P. Shepard	(SHEPARD_S)
ATT TO: Richard L. Siewert	(SIEWERT_R)
ATT TO: Barry J. Toiv	(TOIV_B)

ATT TO: Jodie R. Torkelson (TORKELSON_J)
ATT TO: Michael Waldman (WALDMAN_M)
ATT TO: Remote Addressee (usia01@access.digex.com@INET)
ATT TO: Remote Addressee (62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET)
ATT TO: Remote Addressee (73030.21@compuserve.com@INET)
ATT TO: Manager Infomgt (INFOMGT)
ATT TO: Remote Addressee (newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET)
ATT TO: Remote Addressee (usnwire@access.digex.com@INET)
ATT TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN
UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: FAX (9-862-0340,William Safire) (TLXA IMAIL_ \F:9-862-0340\C:William Safire
TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER
TOP ALL
- \p -

BOTTOM ALL
MORE

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release March 23, 1995

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT COLLEGE PRESS FORUM

The East Room

1:05 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you and welcome to the White House. This is, as I'm sure you agree, a fascinating time to be in our Nation's Capital. We are now having a great debate about how we can best assure the American Dream for your generation and for your children well into the next century. The choices we make here will have a profound effect on all of your lives.

This is an historic era -- we have the end of the Cold War, the dawn of the Information Age, a globalized economy, an

explosion of entrepreneurialism; an enormous amount of opportunity. At the same time, we have profound challenges. We have almost 20 years of stagnant incomes in the United States. We have growing inequality of incomes based primarily on educational differentials. We have deep strains within our society and still profound problems related to the breakdown of family and community, and the rise of crime and violence. We have challenges abroad in terrorism, environmental destruction, population explosion, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The issue we are most debating around here now in many different ways is what is the proper role of the national government in working with the American people to meet our challenges. The old view is that government is inherently a positive force and that there is a one-size-fits-all, big government solution for every big problem. The new view that's all the rage around here is that the federal government is the cause of every problem and if we just didn't have one we might not have any problems.

My view is different from both of these. I ran for president to advance that view, and I still believe it is the proper one. I believe government does have a role to play as a partner in meeting the challenges of the future with all of the American people. I believe the role of government is to increase opportunity as we shrink bureaucracy, to empower people to make the most of their own lives, and to enhance our security at home and abroad.

We have to work economically to expand the middle class and to shrink the underclass. We have to work to promote mainstream values of work and family and future. We have to do it with a government that is smaller and less bureaucratic, but still effective. The key to our future is our ability to create more opportunity and, at the same time, the willingness of our citizens to assume more responsibility. That's what I have called The New Covenant.

I agree that we have to cut outmoded government, and our administration has lead the way. There are already more than 100,000 fewer people working here for the national government than there were on the day I became President. We're on our way to the smallest federal establishment since President Kennedy worked here.

But I also believe that this government should invest in your future and in your capacity to contribute and to live up to the fullest of your abilities. Therefore, I support more investments in education and technology and training, and empowering people to make the most of their own lives.

I also believe that if you look at the end of two years, the evidence is pretty good that our approach is right. We have reduced the deficit three years in a row for the first time since Mr. Truman was here. We have 6.1 million new jobs, the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 25 years, the first time in 20

years the African American unemployment rate has been under 10 percent. We have in 1993 the largest number of new businesses incorporated in any given year in American history. Finally, in 1994, we began to make some progress on the wage issue when we had more high-wage jobs coming into the economy than in the previous five years combined.

Notwithstanding that, the American people said they wanted a different sort of debate here in Washington last November, and so we are having it. Now, I believe that nothing will more clearly define the contours of this debate than what we decide to do in the area of education and training.

In the global economy into which we are moving, we can see what is happening to American jobs and incomes. Those who are able to grasp the high-wage jobs of the future are doing very well, indeed. We're going to have record numbers of millionaires created in this four-year period.

But we also see more and more and more Americans in the grip of insecurity as they work harder than they were working 20 years ago for wages that are the same or lower. And, overwhelmingly, it is because technology and global economic competition have depressed wages in areas that are not high skilled, with the capacity to grow and learn for a lifetime.

Therefore, I do not agree that we should cut our investments in education and training, starting with the advances we made in Head Start, going through the school lunch program, all the way to the apprenticeship programs for young people who don't go to college, to college loans, to the subsidies for college loans for working young people -- right the way through. I don't believe we should cut them, certainly not to pay for tax cuts and not even to reduce the deficit. We do not have to cut education to reduce the deficit.

The leaders of Congress have targeted two areas that I would like to mention -- three, if I might, although only one reduces the deficit -- or two. The first is, the student loan program. We have, through our direct loan program, offered the opportunity for millions of young people to borrow money at lower costs on better repayment terms in a way that is less hassle for colleges and universities, less paperwork, and actually saves the government money because we take out the middle man. We don't have guarantees to banks, we just make the loans directly. That has actually reduced the deficit and reduced the costs of college loans.

At the same time, we have gotten tougher on collecting delinquent loans, reducing the costs to the taxpayers of delinquent loans from \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion. So, more loans, lower costs to the students, lower costs to the taxpayers, less hassle to the schools. It's a win-win deal.

The Republicans in the Congress want to change all of

that. They, first of all, want to put a lid on the number of students who can participate in the direct loan program, which will add to the deficit. And then, they want to eliminate the student

loan subsidy for four million college students and charge people interest on their loans while they're in college, even if they come from very modest backgrounds.

Interestingly enough, this cut in education will only replace the money that they want to keep giving middlemen in the old student loan program so we could have the same reduction in the deficit by leaving the interest subsidy in place and making the direct loan program available to all the students in America. I think it's clear that our decision is a better one than theirs, and I hope that we will prevail. We are doing some things together, you know. We signed the unfunded mandates bill yesterday, we're about to get a bipartisan consensus for a line-item veto, which I have worked very hard for. So I hope that my view can prevail here, because it's very important to you.

The other thing that has happened in the House is that the Republicans have voted to cut the National Service Program, AmeriCorps, to the bone. I think that is a mistake. The AmeriCorps program is giving thousands of young Americans a chance to serve their communities, serve their country, and earn money for higher education.

I don't believe we need to trade in our future for what is a pitting amount on the deficit, but will have an enormous negative symbolic and substantive impact on what we're trying to do in this country.

There is an article in The Washington Post this morning by Mary McGrory, whom I see sitting in the back who quotes a Georgetown student who happens to be a Republican who says, "I understand that taxpayers are heavily burdened, but if we give up what's best about America, what kind of legacy will we leave?"

So I will close with that. I urge you to think about this question. Yes, we have to continue to reduce the deficit, and we will. Yes, we have to move ourselves into the future economically. How can we do both? What are our other challenges?

One of the things we know is that the countries that do the best job of developing the full capacities of every one of their citizens will be the most successful in the 21 century. That's in all your interests, and that's what we should be debating here.

Thank you very much. I'd like to now call on as many of you as we possibly can. I'd like to ask you when I recognize you, please, to say what your name is and what your school is. And we'll start here.

Q Jeff Glasser, from Yale. How do you plan to stop

Congress from capping direct loans, or cutting Pell grants, or paying the interest on loans taken out during college? Are you willing to veto legislation if it comes across your desk?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, of course, I am in the areas of education, which are so important to me. But let me say again what my first choice has been all along -- is to try to prevail in the debate in the Congress. We are making progress. As I said, we -- I signed a bill yesterday that I strongly believe in -- the unfunded mandates bill -- which limits the ability of Congress to pass laws that require state and local governments to raise taxes or otherwise pay for things that we require. We're going to get the line-item veto I hope and believe, which is a good way to cut out unnecessary spending. So maybe we can make some progress here.

I don't think there's as much enthusiasm in the Senate among Republicans, and I know the Democrats will oppose eliminating the subsidies, cutting the Pell grants, eliminating the direct loan

program. So I hope we can prevail in the Congress. But the veto pen is always there.

And this is a -- look, I wouldn't be standing here today, no way in the world would I be standing here today if it hadn't been for the opportunities America gave me through education. When I was born in my state in 1946, the per capita income of my state was barely over half the national average. And my whole generation owes everything we have to the educational opportunities our country gave to us. And now education is even more important to the general welfare of America than it was when I was your age.

I cannot sit by and watch it go backward. We need to bear down and do more, not ease up and go back.

Yes.

Q Francine Friedman, from Georgetown. As a fellow Hoya about to graduate and start paying back my loans, I was wondering if you could share with us how you financed your Georgetown education.

THE PRESIDENT: I had a \$500 -- as I remember, it was a \$500-a-year scholarship and a job. I worked in the Congress for two years. And when I went to Yale to law school I had a grant, a loan, a tuition postponement option, which works like the direct loan does now -- that is, I paid it back as a percentage of my income. I had a national defense loan and six jobs. But never more than three at once. (Laughter.)

Q Kristal Adams, from the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. On a lighter note, I was wondering who do you have picked for the Arkansas-Memphis game, and do you think Arkansas will make it all the way to the championship game this year?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I feel somehow, after the last two games, there is some divine providence that keeps us going. (Laughter.) So I'm more hopeful now than I was when they started the tournament. Thank you.

Q Yes. My name is Peter McKay. I'm a sophomore at Florida A&M University. And my question deals with the White House review of affirmative action that's been going on for several weeks now. What is the status of the review, and what conclusions have you reached about affirmative action?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first, the status is ongoing. I'll talk a little about where we are now, but I want to emphasize that the review is still underway.

And let me urge you -- I know there must be a lot of discussion about this on college campuses as it affects admissions policies. But I want to emphasize to begin you, if you spark a debate about this it's important to know what people are talking about when they're talking about affirmative action. There are policies of the government and policies in the private sector that affect admissions to colleges, availability of financial aid to schools, admissions to workplaces and promotional policies within the workplace, and access to contracts in the public sector; and, sometimes, in the private sector as well, like big companies contracting with smaller ones. So you're basically talking about a range of programs.

When there is evidence of past discrimination, as found in a court, then there can be more strenuous rules and regulations. Otherwise, there are actually a lot of strictures on how far affirmative action can go in giving preferences to people based on race or gender.

But let me back up a little bit and again talk about a little history. When I was your age and I began to work in political campaigns, which I know was a long time ago -- almost 30 years ago now, but it's not so long in the life of the country -- there were still courthouses on squares in county seats in my state that had segregated restrooms -- in my lifetime, when I was your age, in the mid-'60s, there were still older African Americans in my state who did not know that they could vote without buying a poll tax, because it had only been abolished by the Supreme Court a couple of years before. I can remember when there were no women in any number of jobs now where we take it for granted that women will be.

The point I want to make to you is that we have made a lot of progress in this country. It has been inexact, it has been imperfect, there are still problems. We have made a lot of progress because we tried to take action to open up more opportunities to people without regard to their race or gender. And all of us, including white males, are better off because of that.

If you look at the countries around the world today that are being absolutely ripped apart because of violence based on ethnic or religious or racial disputes, and sometimes also related to the role of women, if you look at the countries that are struggling to become modern today where there's still regularly violence against women -- the general point I want to make to you is that it is in everyone's interest to see that everybody gets the best chance to live up to the fullest of their abilities.

On the other hand, it is in no one's interest to see that people get positions if they're completely unqualified to hold them. So the question is: How do we now go forward? And let me tell you the questions I've asked my folks to answer. I've said, first of all, how do these programs work, and do they have a positive effect? Okay, that's the first question. Secondly, even if they work, are they sometimes, at least, unfair to others? Could you argue that in some cases there is reverse discrimination, and if so, how? Thirdly, are there now others in need who are not covered by affirmative action programs?

Keep in mind that's really what's fueling this whole thing. You've got 20 years in this country where most hourly wage-earners have not kept up with inflation. Most Americans are working harder for lower wages than they were making 20 years ago. If so, how are we going to deal with them?

And, finally, let's look at what clearly works, and I'll give you three examples. I don't think anybody in America would like us to suspend what we are doing in the military -- the system that produced not only General Powell, but countless other generals and colonels who are not only African Americans and Hispanics and Asian Americans, but also women, doing things that never were available before. How does that system work? Why does nobody reject it? Because nobody thinks anyone unqualified gets promoted.

What do they do? They work as hard as they can to develop the capacities of everybody who signs up, they do their very best to see that each level in the promotional pool, there is a mix of people that reflect the population in the rank just below, and then nobody -- nobody gets promoted who is not qualified. But they really work hard to give everybody a chance and develop everybody's capacities.

A second example -- this is self-serving, but I'll give it to you, anyway. I have appointed at this point in my tenure to this point in the two years, more judges to the federal bench who were women or members of racial minorities than my three predecessors combined, I believe. But my judges have the highest ratings, on

average, from the American Bar Associations of any of the last four presidents. So no one suggests that I am not promoting quality in the federal bench.

Fourth example: My Deputy Chief of Staff, Erskine

Bowles was, before he came to the White House, the head of the Small Business Administration. And he spent 20 years helping people finance small business. And I said, we've got to bring enterprise into the depressed areas of this country, we have got to do it. So in one year, there was a huge increase in the volume of loans given to African Americans, Hispanics and women under the Small Business Administration without, in any way, discriminating against qualified white males, and every one of the loans was to a qualified person. Now, I don't believe any American would object to those three things.

The last thing I want to say is, I have also asked where does discrimination still exist among people who are not poor, or not economically distressed, in the traditional definition, based on race or gender. We just had the Glass Ceiling Report issued this last week, which was originally initiated, I believe, by Senator Dole, which said that there is still evidence of discrimination in promotional practices in large enterprises.

So I want to review all this, I want to make the best decision I can, and I've given you the questions.

I want to close with just two points. I'm against discrimination, I'm against giving people opportunities who are unqualified. But we all have an interest, including white males, in developing the capacities of all of us to relate to one another -- because our economy will grow quicker, it'll be stronger, and in a global society, our diversity is our greatest asset. We must not let this debate be another cheap political wedge issue to divide the American electorate. We can use this to come together, and that's what we ought to do.

Tell me your name and where you're from.

Q My name is Lori Wiechman. I go to the University of Georgia. And in your first remarks, you had mentioned that you're really concerned about the future of us as college students and as -- our children. And I was just wondering, looking back on your experience in politics, which areas would you suggest for the college students who attend all of the universities here who are wanting to go into politics to pursue before they begin their career?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, I do not believe that there is a specific academic discipline that is necessarily better than another one to pursue a political career. If you are pursuing a degree in science or mathematics, or economics, let's say, I would recommend that at least you take whatever electives you can in history and in the social sciences, like political science, and in psychology. (Laughter.) And then -- but I think the most important thing is to develop your mind, is to learn to think.

And then the second thing I would say is, it's very important to spend your free time deciding whether you're interested in people as individuals and interested in public problems. Not everybody is, you know. And it's a good thing -- I mean, a lot of

wonderful work has been done in the world by people who didn't want to spend hours a day talking to people who were different from them.

But if you really want to make a positive difference, in my judgment, you have to be able to imagine what life is like for people who are very different from you, and you have to be willing to invest some time in listening to those people.

If you think about what's happening, even in -- I read stories on college campuses, that kids are sort of separating by race, at least younger people and -- I'll give you something positive -- one of the best things that's happened is a lot of older people are now coming back to schools, especially to community colleges, but also to four-year colleges.

If you want to be effective in public life, you have to understand how other people view the world, and you have to be able to imagine yourself in their position. And then, the third thing I would say is, you should get some experience in campaigns and in other public endeavors to find out both how hard and how exhilarating it is to get people together and try to work to change something. Those are the three pieces of advice. But there is no single academic discipline that's the best.

Q My name is Shafeeq Qaasim. I'm from Los Angeles Trade Technical College. As opposed to the budget that everybody's concerned about, and we have all of these illegal aliens that mostly -- that affect all of us, including the taxpayers -- I would like to know, considering we passed a proposal of Proposition #187 in California, and it's now somewhere in the federal court system, what's being done, and how can it get back into the state where the voters have already voted?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the voters voted for it, and then like any law, it's subject to court challenge, and it's being challenged in the courts. Let me tell you what we've tried to do in the meanwhile. First of all, after I became President, I increased spending by 30 percent on programs designed to reduce the problem of illegal aliens. We have increased the number of border guards on the southern borders, assuming my next budget is adopted on this -- I think it will be -- by about 60 percent in three years, we are turning more people back.

We are also sending more people back home more quickly who come in contact with the criminal justice system. We are working to increase our ability to check workplaces for illegal immigrants, and we're trying to standardize identification so people can't give phony papers and stay in jobs. And we are trying to alleviate some of the costs that states face. We've given California, for example, more money to deal with their costs of imprisonment and health care and other things. And I asked the Congress to do even more than they voted to do, but I think that we should, as a matter of principle, no illegal immigrant is entitled to the expenditure of American people's

tax dollars.

I did not support 187 for a very different reason. I don't think it's in the interest of the American people to have kids here and have them not in school. I don't think it's in the interest of the American people who have families here and not be able to get into a health clinic and maybe have them get seriously ill and spread whatever illness they have to the population at large. So my problem with 187 was in the details.

We do not give welfare benefits, for example, to illegal immigrants, and we should not be spending our money there, except where it is in the interest of our larger sense of self-interest. And I think schools and health care are. But we've got to do a lot more to crack down on the borders, and we have to do a lot more to go into these workplaces and send people away. And I would hope again - - this was a great wedge issue in the last election, but I'd like to remind you of where this issue came from, in part.

A lot of the very same people that were out there for 187, just a few years ago when the California economy was booming, weakened the anti-immigration -- anti-illegal immigration legislation pending in Congress, so they could get more illegal immigrations into

workplaces in California who would work for lower wages -- for their supporters. Now, that's the truth.

And what we need to do is crack down in the workplace, crack down at the borders, crack down in the criminal justice system, and not spend any money that we don't have to spend. And that's our policy and the one we're going to pursue.

Q I'm from Ohio University -- we're represented by a freshman Republican in Congress -- to be a freshman Democrat -- he says he opposes cuts in student aid, yet he says we need to look at your direct funding program -- because it builds a billion-dollar bureaucracy here in Washington. Could you respond to that?

THE PRESIDENT: It's just a -- it's a myth. It's a myth. The direct lending program -- the Secretary of Education is here with me -- the direct lending program will save the taxpayers \$12 billion over six years, the same amount of money they propose to save by eliminating the interest subsidy on student loan. Why is that?

You know how the student loan program works now under the old system? It's a 90-percent guarantee. So you go to the bank and you borrow the money -- right? And the government guarantees 90 percent of it. And the bank gets payment in the middle. And then if somebody defaults on the loan, unless it's a huge amount of money, it's not worth it to the bank to go try to sue somebody and get the money back. Why? Because they're going to get 90 percent of it anyway. And they'll spend 10 percent or more on lawyer fees.

So what have we done? We have reduced the number of defaults. We have been tough on this -- over and above the previous administrations who were here before me -- we have reduced the loan defaults from a cost a year of \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion. This direct lending program is far less expensive to run than the alternative. It is pure ideology to say it costs a little money to run the direct loan program and we don't want to hire one government employee; we'd rather pay billions and billions and billions of dollars to banks that could be going for lower cost college loans to more students.

This program is working. It saves money for everybody, and we shouldn't limit its reach. I think it is a real error.

Yes. Go ahead.

Q Margretta Sundelin, from Brigham Young University. It seems the United States is a nation founded on -- and prided upon its diversity. However, in the course of the last few years, it seems its diversity is dividing us. What I want to know is, in your presidency, what have you done to bring cohesion back to the nation and to settle the unrest?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I've tried to do many things, but let me emphasize two or three. The first thing I've tried to do is to focus on initiatives that would provide opportunities to all Americans; that would unite us in getting more opportunities by, first of all in economic terms, but bringing down the deficit and expanding trade opportunities for American products, by working to create more jobs for the American people. Secondly, in education, by increasing everything from Head Start programs to college loans. I have tried to offer broad-based opportunity.

The second thing I've tried to do is to demonstrate to the American people that you could have diversity and excellence at the same time. That's what I just mentioned -- if you look at the people I've appointed to high public office, the people I've

appointed to the federal judgeships, and the things that I have tried to do that I think are important.

The third thing I have tried to do is to emphasize the importance of uniting the American people around shared values. That's what welfare reform is all about. That's what the attempts of the crime bill to clean up our streets from violence are all about. We should all be able to agree that we are going to pursue policies that promote family, that promote work, that strengthen communities, that look to the future. These are the things that I have tried to do.

And I believe that the American people would think more in these terms -- I know that a lot of people are so bewildered by the changes and they feel so threatened by the changes going on today, that it's easy to lash out at someone who is different from

us. But if we would focus on those three things I think we'd come together more.

Q I'm Jamie Sivlerstein, from Northwestern University. With the knowledge of computers and other types of technology becoming more crucial in order to succeed in the workplace, what steps is your administration taking to promote this type of education?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we are doing a number of things. First of all, I think you saw the White House on the Internet today, didn't you? We're trying to set a good example. But we're also promoting the availability of more computers and the use of more responsible computer education in our schools, starting in the earliest grades. It was a big part of the education reform legislation that Secretary Riley and I and the administration pushed last year.

One thing I note -- Mr. Gingrich said the other day something that I really agreed with, and then he said maybe it was an unrealistic thing. But I don't think it is. He said it would really help to cure poverty if every poor child in America had a little laptop computer. And then I think he backed off of it. I don't think that's a bad idea at all. I think that if we had enough resources to teach every poor child in this country how to interact with the whole world of information that's available, if you can work that it would be a very good thing.

So I believe we should continue to press technology. It is not an excuse, it's not a substitute for learning to read, for learning to write, for learning to express yourself clearly, for learning to reason and argue and think. But it is enormous leverage to us. And I think we should do more.

Q My name is Carrie Budoff. I'm from Rutgers University. Many colleges have policies of nondiscrimination. And your "don't ask, don't tell" policy for ROTC programs -- it applies to ROTC programs. And it's an obvious conflict with universities' policy. The ROTC program in the case of Rutgers may lose funding because of this, because they are not abiding by the nondiscrimination policy. How can these programs -- how can the ROTC program on college campuses deal with this if they have a nondiscrimination policy?

THE PRESIDENT: Explain what you mean. I'm sorry I don't understand it. Go ahead.

Q Okay. The ROTC program at Rutgers University may lose scholarship funding because they are on the campus. And the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, which extends --

THE PRESIDENT: Conflicts with Rutgers' nondiscrimination policy.

Q Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it's an act of Congress, so Rutgers will have to decide what to do about it. I mean, there isn't -- I'll say this. If the policy were implemented in spirit and in letter the way it was really written -- if you read the whole policy -- I don't think it would be in conflict. But if you read the whole policy -- I would urge you to go back and read the whole policy and see what it really says. I don't think it would be in conflict. But if Rutgers deems it's in conflict, then Rutgers will have to do whatever it decides to do, because that policy was written into law as an act of Congress and so it is not subject to change unless Congress changes it.

Q Christan Hanna, Western Michigan University. On our campus we had a nonviolent protest because a faculty member told a student that she asked "stupid -- blank -- questions." And instead of dealing with the problem of racism and talking about it on campus, the university's reaction has been to try to quell all of the surrounding problems instead of dealing with the issue -- the main issues, which is the racism and problems that people have with that. What do you think the university's role in educating beyond your study, your area of study is?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think it's a very important role. I mean, if you have the luxury of going to college, and you stay there for four years -- or in the case of a community college, two years -- it's maybe different if you've got a family to raise and a full-time job and all. But if basically you're a full-time student and you're in your formative years, some of the most important things that happen to you happen to you outside the classroom and involve things you don't get a grade on.

And I think one of the things -- I've been really quite concerned about the challenges that both students and faculty members face in this so-called political correctness atmosphere. I think we need to encourage people to say what they really think, but to do it in an atmosphere that is more tolerant. And I think universities ought to be laboratories all across this country for people airing their real feelings and convictions, but doing it in a way that other people can hear them, and really being honest and forthright about it. Because otherwise, then the universities can just become one more island of isolation for the American people. We don't need that. We don't need more islands of isolation. We need instruments to open us up to one another.

Q Jim Buchanan, St. Louis Community College. Mr. President, I congratulate your efforts to try to bring about health care reform. And I wonder if you're going to try that again. And do you think a single-payer system might make it?

THE PRESIDENT: The answer is, I am going to try to health care reform again this year. Obviously, the American people

made a judgment, or at least the Congress did, and I think the American people did -- that this was such a big issue, they didn't want me or anybody else to try to put together a program that purported to solve it all at one time. So I think we'll have to go back and take it a piece at a time.

My own view is -- this is something you need to know about this, by the way -- the entire problem with the federal deficit in 1995, 1994, 1993, now since our budget has come in, is interest on the debt and health care costs. Everything else is going down. Last year we reduced spending on both defense and domestic spending overall for the first time in 25 years. The deficit's going up

because of interest on the debt and health care costs. So we have an interest in doing that.

The second thing you need to know is that your country is the only advanced country in the world where there are a smaller percentage of working families with health insurance today than had it 10 years ago. That is not true in any other advanced country in the world. So we have to do it. We have to -- we should do it by reforming the insurance system, helping people when they're unemployed not to lose their insurance, giving incentives to cover children, and helping families with disabled kids or with parents who want care other than nursing homes, and where that would be a cheaper, more affordable thing to do.

Let me give a little -- go ahead in the back there. I'll take a couple more. Go ahead. Yes, go ahead. (Laughter.) You know, when they're here, they all stand up if I point in the general direction. (Laughter.)

Q My name is Evan Koblentz from Kean College of New Jersey. Much progress has been made in your administration for financially-strapped or opportunity-privileged students to get grants and loans. What are you doing with the Republican Congress to get more grants available for merit-based and academic-based scholarships?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me say, first of all, I'm not -- I don't believe that that should primarily be the subject for the federal government. Historically, it hasn't been. And I'll come back to that in a moment. Secondly, let me emphasize that the direct loan program is not very much income limited. It's really available to quite a broad range of young people to participate in. And since there are at least four different options for repayment, the idea is that you don't lose the right to get a loan even if you're a middle-class student. And if you decide to take a job that doesn't pay a high wage, you can afford to pay it back if you want to be someone who's more interested in public service early on than higher incomes.

Now, on the merit-based scholarships, let me just say what I meant by that. There are many states -- Georgia is one -- I know we have some journalists here from Georgia -- Georgia has now passed a law that says that if you have a B average in Georgia and

you go to school there, you get a tuition scholarship. And I think you get some money for books as well. When I was the governor of my state, I instituted a governor's scholarship program that was similar to that. These programs are sweeping the country, but they are basically the province of state government.

Let me further state that this is the second year in a row when the economy of all 50 states has grown. So they're in a -- if they don't do it, they're in a better position to do it than they were a couple years ago. And that's one I would direct you to the state legislatures for.

Q Yes, all day we've been hearing -- I'm sorry, Kelly McEvers, from the University of Illinois. All day we've been hearing about the growing disparity between those in the upper echelon of income and those in the lower -- those at the low poverty level. However, especially after the election in November, the rhetoric that seemed to be coming through, at least in the mainstream media, was solely toward the middle class. I guess one example is the Middle Class Bill of Rights. It seems to me that there's an attitude that we're becoming a classless society when, in fact, we're moving in opposite directions --

THE PRESIDENT: We are --

Q Is that because that's the class that goes to the polls?

THE PRESIDENT: No. It's because -- let me just say this. The argument of the Republicans in last November's election was the middle class should vote for us because all the Democrats do is take your taxes and spend it on poor people -- right? -- or minorities or illegal immigrants or criminals or whatever. That was the basic argument -- right? Government's bad, vote for us, we'll give you less government, lower taxes, and we'll be harder on all those groups.

And the voters bought it -- wrongly, I think -- at least those who voted, because we had done more for the middle class. But you have to understand what middle class is. Middle class is more than an economic designation in America. It's a statement about values. When we say middle class in America what we really mean is, everybody ought to have the chance to be rewarded for their work. If you work hard, raise your kids, obey the law, you ought to have a chance to do better.

And what is happening is we are becoming more stratified by economic class, but it's different than before. In other words -- and I guess -- I'm really glad you asked this, because I'll try to clarify the point I was trying to make before. We do have poor people in America. Mostly they're young women and their little children, but there are also a lot of working people who are poor who are making the minimum wage or right near it, which is why I'm for

raising the minimum wage. And then we have a lot of wealthy people in America, and our economy is producing more wealthy people, and that is good. Entrepreneurs -- more entrepreneurs are becoming millionaires today than ever before who started with nothing -- not inherited wealth, but are making money. That is a good thing, not a bad thing.

But what is happening is that the middle class itself is splitting apart. That's the point I'm trying to make. The great American middle class, which basically rose more or less evenly with the poor and the rich in income from the end of World War II to the late '70s -- everybody rose together about the same amount. The American middle class itself is now splitting apart, based largely on education, age and job description. And if you don't have the skills and you're not in the place -- in the workplace, where you can hook into one of these groups that is growing, then you tend to work harder every year for lower wages. That's what I'm pointing out.

So what do we try to do? In the economic plan in '93, we had one big tax cut. We cut taxes for working families with children to make sure nobody who was working 40 hours a week with children would be below the poverty line. That's what the earned income tax credit was about. On average this year it's worth about \$1,000 in lower taxes to families of four with income of under \$26,000. Why do we do that? To reward work and family and lift people, keep trying to push people toward the middle class.

So this whole education thing -- we know if our government here can continue to follow responsible economic policies, we can create jobs, we can have growth. But we still -- that will not raise incomes. And it won't overcome this inequality, this splitting apart of the middle class.

So that's what I'm saying. The middle class mentality, which has been -- what made America great, requires us to follow policies that lift everybody's income.

I will close with just one thing. I had an interview with Money Magazine the other day. Do you all know Money Magazine? It's a -- and they did a readers' survey, they told me. And they

said -- I guess I'm jumping my interview. They'll probably be made at me, but -- (laughter). They said -- they said that their readers said that they recognize that we have lowered the deficit, created jobs, sparked an economic recovery, and two-thirds of them were still worried about their future. Right? Yes, you lowered the deficit, created jobs, there's an economic recovery. Am I worried? You bet I am. Why? Because of all this churning instability in the global economy.

That is our challenge. We've got to find a way to keep the entrepreneurship, keep the growth going, but lift the middle-class folks that are good people that have been left behind.

That's why I'm glad to see some of the nontraditional students in the community college. That's means that they're going to make the transfer from the middle class that might be left behind to the middle class that's surging ahead. And we need more of that, which is why we don't need to be in a position of reducing our commitment to education at the end of this century when the next century will trigger opportunity to education more than ever before.

Thank you very much. I have to go. Thank you.

(Applause.)

END1:49 P.M. EST

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Marlene A. MacDonald (MACDONALD_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-MAR-1995 18:02:04.24

SUBJECT: transcript of college forum

TO: FAX (95140293,Helene Greenfield) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:95140293\C:Helene GreenfieldREAD:NOT READ

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

23

-Mar

-1995 02:36pm

TO: (See Below)

FROM: Margaret M. Suntum
Office of the Press Secretary

SUBJECT: 1995

-3

-23 College Press Forum remarks

HORIZONTAL_PITCH 12

PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER

TOP ALL

- \p -

BOTTOM ALL

MORE

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 23, 1995

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT COLLEGE PRESS FORUM

The East Room

1:05 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you and welcome to the White House. This is, as I'm sure you agree, a fascinating time to be in our Nation's Capital. We are now having a great debate about how we can best assure the American Dream for your generation and for your children well into the next century. The choices we make here will have a profound effect on all of your lives.

This is an historic era -- we have the end of the Cold War, the dawn of the Information Age, a globalized economy, an explosion of entrepreneurialism; an enormous amount of opportunity. At the same time, we have profound challenges. We have almost 20 years of stagnant incomes in the United States. We have growing inequality of incomes based primarily on educational differentials. We have deep strains within our society and still profound problems related to the breakdown of family and community, and the rise of crime and violence. We have challenges abroad in terrorism, environmental destruction, population explosion, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The issue we are most debating around here now in many different ways is what is the proper role of the national government in working with the American people to meet our challenges. The old view is that government is inherently a positive force and that there is a one-size-fits-all, big government solution for every big problem. The new view that's all the rage around here is that the federal government is the cause of every problem and if we just didn't have one we might not have any problems.

My view is different from both of these. I ran for president to advance that view, and I still believe it is the proper one. I believe government does have a role to play as a partner in meeting the challenges of the future with all of the American people. I believe the role of government is to increase opportunity as we shrink bureaucracy, to empower people to make the most of their own lives, and to enhance our security at home and abroad.

We have to work economically to expand the middle class and to shrink the underclass. We have to work to promote mainstream values of work and family and future. We have to do it with a government that is smaller and less bureaucratic, but still effective. The key to our future is our ability to create more opportunity and, at the same time, the willingness of our citizens to assume more responsibility. That's what I have called The New Covenant.

I agree that we have to cut outmoded government, and our administration has lead the way. There are already more than 100,000 fewer people working here for the national government than there were on the day I became President. We're on our way to the smallest federal establishment since President Kennedy worked here.

But I also believe that this government should invest in

your future and in your capacity to contribute and to live up to the fullest of your abilities. Therefore, I support more investments in education and technology and training, and empowering people to make the most of their own lives.

I also believe that if you look at the end of two years, the evidence is pretty good that our approach is right. We have reduced the deficit three years in a row for the first time since Mr. Truman was here. We have 6.1 million new jobs, the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 25 years, the first time in 20 years the African American unemployment rate has been under 10 percent. We have in 1993 the largest number of new businesses incorporated in any given year in American history. Finally, in 1994, we began to make some progress on the wage issue when we had more high-wage jobs coming into the economy than in the previous five years combined.

Notwithstanding that, the American people said they wanted a different sort of debate here in Washington last November, and so we are having it. Now, I believe that nothing will more clearly define the contours of this debate than what we decide to do in the area of education and training.

In the global economy into which we are moving, we can see what is happening to American jobs and incomes. Those who are able to grasp the high-wage jobs of the future are doing very well, indeed. We're going to have record numbers of millionaires created in this four-year period.

But we also see more and more and more Americans in the grip of insecurity as they work harder than they were working 20 years ago for wages that are the same or lower. And, overwhelmingly, it is because technology and global economic competition have depressed wages in areas that are not high skilled, with the capacity to grow and learn for a lifetime.

Therefore, I do not agree that we should cut our investments in education and training, starting with the advances we made in Head Start, going through the school lunch program, all the way to the apprenticeship programs for young people who don't go to college, to college loans, to the subsidies for college loans for working young people -- right the way through. I don't believe we should cut them, certainly not to pay for tax cuts and not even to reduce the deficit. We do not have to cut education to reduce the deficit.

The leaders of Congress have targeted two areas that I would like to mention -- three, if I might, although only one reduces the deficit -- or two. The first is, the student loan program. We have, through our direct loan program, offered the opportunity for millions of young people to borrow money at lower costs on better repayment terms in a way that is less hassle for colleges and universities, less paperwork, and actually saves the government money because we take out the middle man. We don't have guarantees to

banks, we just make the loans directly. That has actually reduced the deficit and reduced the costs of college loans.

At the same time, we have gotten tougher on collecting delinquent loans, reducing the costs to the taxpayers of delinquent loans from \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion. So, more loans, lower costs to the students, lower costs to the taxpayers, less hassle to the schools. It's a win-win deal.

The Republicans in the Congress want to change all of that. They, first of all, want to put a lid on the number of students who can participate in the direct loan program, which will add to the deficit. And then, they want to eliminate the student

loan subsidy for four million college students and charge people interest on their loans while they're in college, even if they come from very modest backgrounds.

Interestingly enough, this cut in education will only replace the money that they want to keep giving middlemen in the old student loan program so we could have the same reduction in the deficit by leaving the interest subsidy in place and making the direct loan program available to all the students in America. I think it's clear that our decision is a better one than theirs, and I hope that we will prevail. We are doing some things together, you know. We signed the unfunded mandates bill yesterday, we're about to get a bipartisan consensus for a line-item veto, which I have worked very hard for. So I hope that my view can prevail here, because it's very important to you.

The other thing that has happened in the House is that the Republicans have voted to cut the National Service Program, AmeriCorps, to the bone. I think that is a mistake. The AmeriCorps program is giving thousands of young Americans a chance to serve their communities, serve their country, and earn money for higher education.

I don't believe we need to trade in our future for what is a pitting amount on the deficit, but will have an enormous negative symbolic and substantive impact on what we're trying to do in this country.

There is an article in The Washington Post this morning by Mary McGrory, whom I see sitting in the back who quotes a Georgetown student who happens to be a Republican who says, "I understand that taxpayers are heavily burdened, but if we give up what's best about America, what kind of legacy will we leave?"

So I will close with that. I urge you to think about this question. Yes, we have to continue to reduce the deficit, and we will. Yes, we have to move ourselves into the future economically. How can we do both? What are our other challenges?

One of the things we know is that the countries that do the best job of developing the full capacities of every one of their

citizens will be the most successful in the 21 century. That's in all your interests, and that's what we should be debating here.

Thank you very much. I'd like to now call on as many of you as we possibly can. I'd like to ask you when I recognize you, please, to say what your name is and what your school is. And we'll start here.

Q Jeff Glasser, from Yale. How do you plan to stop Congress from capping direct loans, or cutting Pell grants, or paying the interest on loans taken out during college? Are you willing to veto legislation if it comes across your desk?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, of course, I am in the areas of education, which are so important to me. But let me say again what my first choice has been all along -- is to try to prevail in the debate in the Congress. We are making progress. As I said, we -- I signed a bill yesterday that I strongly believe in -- the unfunded mandates bill -- which limits the ability of Congress to pass laws that require state and local governments to raise taxes or otherwise pay for things that we require. We're going to get the line-item veto I hope and believe, which is a good way to cut out unnecessary spending. So maybe we can make some progress here.

I don't think there's as much enthusiasm in the Senate among Republicans, and I know the Democrats will oppose eliminating the subsidies, cutting the Pell grants, eliminating the direct loan program. So I hope we can prevail in the Congress. But the veto pen is always there.

And this is a -- look, I wouldn't be standing here today, no way in the world would I be standing here today if it hadn't been for the opportunities America gave me through education. When I was born in my state in 1946, the per capita income of my state was barely over half the national average. And my whole generation owes everything we have to the educational opportunities our country gave to us. And now education is even more important to the general welfare of America than it was when I was your age.

I cannot sit by and watch it go backward. We need to bear down and do more, not ease up and go back.

Yes.

Q Francine Friedman, from Georgetown. As a fellow Hoya about to graduate and start paying back my loans, I was wondering if you could share with us how you financed your Georgetown education.

THE PRESIDENT: I had a \$500 -- as I remember, it was a \$500-a-year scholarship and a job. I worked in the Congress for two years. And when I went to Yale to law school I had a grant, a loan, a tuition postponement option, which works like the direct loan does now -- that is, I paid it back as a percentage of my income. I had a

national defense loan and six jobs. But never more than three at once. (Laughter.)

Q Kristal Adams, from the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. On a lighter note, I was wondering who do you have picked for the Arkansas-Memphis game, and do you think Arkansas will make it all the way to the championship game this year?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I feel somehow, after the last two games, there is some divine providence that keeps us going. (Laughter.) So I'm more hopeful now than I was when they started the tournament. Thank you.

Q Yes. My name is Peter McKay. I'm a sophomore at Florida A&M University. And my question deals with the White House review of affirmative action that's been going on for several weeks now. What is the status of the review, and what conclusions have you reached about affirmative action?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first, the status is ongoing. I'll talk a little about where we are now, but I want to emphasize that the review is still underway.

And let me urge you -- I know there must be a lot of discussion about this on college campuses as it affects admissions policies. But I want to emphasize to begin you, if you spark a debate about this it's important to know what people are talking about when they're talking about affirmative action. There are policies of the government and policies in the private sector that affect admissions to colleges, availability of financial aid to schools, admissions to workplaces and promotional policies within the workplace, and access to contracts in the public sector; and, sometimes, in the private sector as well, like big companies contracting with smaller ones. So you're basically talking about a range of programs.

When there is evidence of past discrimination, as found in a court, then there can be more strenuous rules and regulations. Otherwise, there are actually a lot of strictures on how far affirmative action can go in giving preferences to people based on race or gender.

But let me back up a little bit and again talk about a little history. When I was your age and I began to work in political campaigns, which I know was a long time ago -- almost 30 years ago now, but it's not so long in the life of the country -- there were still courthouses on squares in county seats in my state that had segregated restrooms -- in my lifetime, when I was your age, in the mid-'60s, there were still older African Americans in my state who did not know that they could vote without buying a poll tax, because it had only been abolished by the Supreme Court a couple of years before. I can remember when there were no women in any number of jobs now where we take it for granted that women will be.

The point I want to make to you is that we have made a lot of progress in this country. It has been inexact, it has been imperfect, there are still problems. We have made a lot of progress because we tried to take action to open up more opportunities to people without regard to their race or gender. And all of us, including white males, are better off because of that.

If you look at the countries around the world today that are being absolutely ripped apart because of violence based on ethnic or religious or racial disputes, and sometimes also related to the role of women, if you look at the countries that are struggling to become modern today where there's still regularly violence against women -- the general point I want to make to you is that it is in everyone's interest to see that everybody gets the best chance to live up to the fullest of their abilities.

On the other hand, it is in no one's interest to see that people get positions if they're completely unqualified to hold them. So the question is: How do we now go forward? And let me tell you the questions I've asked my folks to answer. I've said, first of all, how do these programs work, and do they have a positive effect? Okay, that's the first question. Secondly, even if they work, are they sometimes, at least, unfair to others? Could you argue that in some cases there is reverse discrimination, and if so, how? Thirdly, are there now others in need who are not covered by affirmative action programs?

Keep in mind that's really what's fueling this whole thing. You've got 20 years in this country where most hourly wage-earners have not kept up with inflation. Most Americans are working harder for lower wages than they were making 20 years ago. If so, how are we going to deal with them?

And, finally, let's look at what clearly works, and I'll give you three examples. I don't think anybody in America would like us to suspend what we are doing in the military -- the system that produced not only General Powell, but countless other generals and colonels who are not only African Americans and Hispanics and Asian Americans, but also women, doing things that never were available before. How does that system work? Why does nobody reject it? Because nobody thinks anyone unqualified gets promoted.

What do they do? They work as hard as they can to develop the capacities of everybody who signs up, they do their very best to see that each level in the promotional pool, there is a mix of people that reflect the population in the rank just below, and then nobody -- nobody gets promoted who is not qualified. But they really work hard to give everybody a chance and develop everybody's capacities.

A second example -- this is self-serving, but I'll give it to you, anyway. I have appointed at this point in my tenure to this point in the two years, more judges to the federal bench who were women or members of racial minorities than my three predecessors

combined, I believe. But my judges have the highest ratings, on

average, from the American Bar Associations of any of the last four presidents. So no one suggests that I am not promoting quality in the federal bench.

Fourth example: My Deputy Chief of Staff, Erskine Bowles was, before he came to the White House, the head of the Small Business Administration. And he spent 20 years helping people finance small business. And I said, we've got to bring enterprise into the depressed areas of this country, we have got to do it. So in one year, there was a huge increase in the volume of loans given to African Americans, Hispanics and women under the Small Business Administration without, in any way, discriminating against qualified white males, and every one of the loans was to a qualified person. Now, I don't believe any American would object to those three things.

The last thing I want to say is, I have also asked where does discrimination still exist among people who are not poor, or not economically distressed, in the traditional definition, based on race or gender. We just had the Glass Ceiling Report issued this last week, which was originally initiated, I believe, by Senator Dole, which said that there is still evidence of discrimination in promotional practices in large enterprises.

So I want to review all this, I want to make the best decision I can, and I've given you the questions.

I want to close with just two points. I'm against discrimination, I'm against giving people opportunities who are unqualified. But we all have an interest, including white males, in developing the capacities of all of us to relate to one another -- because our economy will grow quicker, it'll be stronger, and in a global society, our diversity is our greatest asset. We must not let this debate be another cheap political wedge issue to divide the American electorate. We can use this to come together, and that's what we ought to do.

Tell me your name and where you're from.

Q My name is Lori Wiechman. I go to the University of Georgia. And in your first remarks, you had mentioned that you're really concerned about the future of us as college students and as -- our children. And I was just wondering, looking back on your experience in politics, which areas would you suggest for the college students who attend all of the universities here who are wanting to go into politics to pursue before they begin their career?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, I do not believe that there is a specific academic discipline that is necessarily better than another one to pursue a political career. If you are pursuing a degree in science or mathematics, or economics, let's say, I would recommend that at least you take whatever electives you can in history and in the social sciences, like political science, and in psychology.

(Laughter.) And then -- but I think the most important thing is to develop your mind, is to learn to think.

And then the second thing I would say is, it's very important to spend your free time deciding whether you're interested in people as individuals and interested in public problems. Not everybody is, you know. And it's a good thing -- I mean, a lot of wonderful work has been done in the world by people who didn't want to spend hours a day talking to people who were different from them.

But if you really want to make a positive difference, in my judgment, you have to be able to imagine what life is like for people who are very different from you, and you have to be willing to invest some time in listening to those people.

If you think about what's happening, even in -- I read stories on college campuses, that kids are sort of separating by race, at least younger people and -- I'll give you something positive -- one of the best things that's happened is a lot of older people are now coming back to schools, especially to community colleges, but also to four-year colleges.

If you want to be effective in public life, you have to understand how other people view the world, and you have to be able to imagine yourself in their position. And then, the third thing I would say is, you should get some experience in campaigns and in other public endeavors to find out both how hard and how exhilarating it is to get people together and try to work to change something. Those are the three pieces of advice. But there is no single academic discipline that's the best.

Q My name is Shafeeq Qaasim. I'm from Los Angeles Trade Technical College. As opposed to the budget that everybody's concerned about, and we have all of these illegal aliens that mostly - - that affect all of us, including the taxpayers -- I would like to know, considering we passed a proposal of Proposition #187 in California, and it's now somewhere in the federal court system, what's being done, and how can it get back into the state where the voters have already voted?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the voters voted for it, and then like any law, it's subject to court challenge, and it's being challenged in the courts. Let me tell you what we've tried to do in the meanwhile. First of all, after I became President, I increased spending by 30 percent on programs designed to reduce the problem of illegal aliens. We have increased the number of border guards on the southern borders, assuming my next budget is adopted on this -- I think it will be -- by about 60 percent in three years, we are turning more people back.

We are also sending more people back home more quickly who come in contact with the criminal justice system. We are working to increase our ability to check workplaces for illegal immigrants,

and we're trying to standardize identification so people can't give phony papers and stay in jobs. And we are trying to alleviate some of the costs that states face. We've given California, for example, more money to deal with their costs of imprisonment and health care and other things. And I asked the Congress to do even more than they voted to do, but I think that we should, as a matter of principle, no illegal immigrant is entitled to the expenditure of American people's tax dollars.

I did not support 187 for a very different reason. I don't think it's in the interest of the American people to have kids here and have them not in school. I don't think it's in the interest of the American people who have families here and not be able to get into a health clinic and maybe have them get seriously ill and spread whatever illness they have to the population at large. So my problem with 187 was in the details.

We do not give welfare benefits, for example, to illegal immigrants, and we should not be spending our money there, except where it is in the interest of our larger sense of self-interest. And I think schools and health care are. But we've got to do a lot more to crack down on the borders, and we have to do a lot more to go into these workplaces and send people away. And I would hope again -- this was a great wedge issue in the last election, but I'd like to remind you of where this issue came from, in part.

A lot of the very same people that were out there for 187, just a few years ago when the California economy was booming, weakened the anti-immigration -- anti-illegal immigration legislation pending in Congress, so they could get more illegal immigrations into

workplaces in California who would work for lower wages -- for their supporters. Now, that's the truth.

And what we need to do is crack down in the workplace, crack down at the borders, crack down in the criminal justice system, and not spend any money that we don't have to spend. And that's our policy and the one we're going to pursue.

Q I'm from Ohio University -- we're represented by a freshman Republican in Congress -- to be a freshman Democrat -- he says he opposes cuts in student aid, yet he says we need to look at your direct funding program -- because it builds a billion-dollar bureaucracy here in Washington. Could you respond to that?

THE PRESIDENT: It's just a -- it's a myth. It's a myth. The direct lending program -- the Secretary of Education is here with me -- the direct lending program will save the taxpayers \$12 billion over six years, the same amount of money they propose to save by eliminating the interest subsidy on student loan. Why is that?

You know how the student loan program works now under the old system? It's a 90-percent guarantee. So you go to the bank and you borrow the money -- right? And the government guarantees 90

percent of it. And the bank gets payment in the middle. And then if somebody defaults on the loan, unless it's a huge amount of money, it's not worth it to the bank to go try to sue somebody and get the money back. Why? Because they're going to get 90 percent of it anyway. And they'll spend 10 percent or more on lawyer fees.

So what have we done? We have reduced the number of defaults. We have been tough on this -- over and above the previous administrations who were here before me -- we have reduced the loan defaults from a cost a year of \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion. This direct lending program is far less expensive to run than the alternative. It is pure ideology to say it costs a little money to run the direct loan program and we don't want to hire one government employee; we'd rather pay billions and billions and billions of dollars to banks that could be going for lower cost college loans to more students.

This program is working. It saves money for everybody, and we shouldn't limit its reach. I think it is a real error.

Yes. Go ahead.

Q Margretta Sundelin, from Brigham Young University. It seems the United States is a nation founded on -- and prided upon its diversity. However, in the course of the last few years, it seems its diversity is dividing us. What I want to know is, in your presidency, what have you done to bring cohesion back to the nation and to settle the unrest?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I've tried to do many things, but let me emphasize two or three. The first thing I've tried to do is to focus on initiatives that would provide opportunities to all Americans; that would unite us in getting more opportunities by, first of all in economic terms, but bringing down the deficit and expanding trade opportunities for American products, by working to create more jobs for the American people. Secondly, in education, by increasing everything from Head Start programs to college loans. I have tried to offer broad-based opportunity.

The second thing I've tried to do is to demonstrate to the American people that you could have diversity and excellence at the same time. That's what I just mentioned -- if you look at the people I've appointed to high public office, the people I've

appointed to the federal judgeships, and the things that I have tried to do that I think are important.

The third thing I have tried to do is to emphasize the importance of uniting the American people around shared values. That's what welfare reform is all about. That's what the attempts of the crime bill to clean up our streets from violence are all about. We should all be able to agree that we are going to pursue policies that promote family, that promote work, that strengthen communities, that look to the future. These are the things that I have tried to

do.

And I believe that the American people would think more in these terms -- I know that a lot of people are so bewildered by the changes and they feel so threatened by the changes going on today, that it's easy to lash out at someone who is different from us. But if we would focus on those three things I think we'd come together more.

Q I'm Jamie Sivlerstein, from Northwestern University. With the knowledge of computers and other types of technology becoming more crucial in order to succeed in the workplace, what steps is your administration taking to promote this type of education?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we are doing a number of things. First of all, I think you saw the White House on the Internet today, didn't you? We're trying to set a good example. But we're also promoting the availability of more computers and the use of more responsible computer education in our schools, starting in the earliest grades. It was a big part of the education reform legislation that Secretary Riley and I and the administration pushed last year.

One thing I note -- Mr. Gingrich said the other day something that I really agreed with, and then he said maybe it was an unrealistic thing. But I don't think it is. He said it would really help to cure poverty if every poor child in America had a little laptop computer. And then I think he backed off of it. I don't think that's a bad idea at all. I think that if we had enough resources to teach every poor child in this country how to interact with the whole world of information that's available, if you can work that it would be a very good thing.

So I believe we should continue to press technology. It is not an excuse, it's not a substitute for learning to read, for learning to write, for learning to express yourself clearly, for learning to reason and argue and think. But it is enormous leverage to us. And I think we should do more.

Q My name is Carrie Budoff. I'm from Rutgers University. Many colleges have policies of nondiscrimination. And your "don't ask, don't tell" policy for ROTC programs -- it applies to ROTC programs. And it's an obvious conflict with universities' policy. The ROTC program in the case of Rutgers may lose funding because of this, because they are not abiding by the nondiscrimination policy. How can these programs -- how can the ROTC program on college campuses deal with this if they have a nondiscrimination policy?

THE PRESIDENT: Explain what you mean. I'm sorry I don't understand it. Go ahead.

Q Okay. The ROTC program at Rutgers University may lose scholarship funding because they are on the campus. And the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, which extends --

THE PRESIDENT: Conflicts with Rutgers' nondiscrimination policy.

Q Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it's an act of Congress, so Rutgers will have to decide what to do about it. I mean, there isn't -- I'll say this. If the policy were implemented in spirit and in letter the way it was really written -- if you read the whole policy -- I don't think it would be in conflict. But if you read the whole policy -- I would urge you to go back and read the whole policy and see what it really says. I don't think it would be in conflict. But if Rutgers deems it's in conflict, then Rutgers will have to do whatever it decides to do, because that policy was written into law as an act of Congress and so it is not subject to change unless Congress changes it.

Q Christan Hanna, Western Michigan University. On our campus we had a nonviolent protest because a faculty member told a student that she asked "stupid -- blank -- questions." And instead of dealing with the problem of racism and talking about it on campus, the university's reaction has been to try to quell all of the surrounding problems instead of dealing with the issue -- the main issues, which is the racism and problems that people have with that. What do you think the university's role in educating beyond your study, your area of study is?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think it's a very important role. I mean, if you have the luxury of going to college, and you stay there for four years -- or in the case of a community college, two years -- it's maybe different if you've got a family to raise and a full-time job and all. But if basically you're a full-time student and you're in your formative years, some of the most important things that happen to you happen to you outside the classroom and involve things you don't get a grade on.

And I think one of the things -- I've been really quite concerned about the challenges that both students and faculty members face in this so-called political correctness atmosphere. I think we need to encourage people to say what they really think, but to do it in an atmosphere that is more tolerant. And I think universities ought to be laboratories all across this country for people airing their real feelings and convictions, but doing it in a way that other people can hear them, and really being honest and forthright about it. Because otherwise, then the universities can just become one more island of isolation for the American people. We don't need that. We don't need more islands of isolation. We need instruments to open us up to one another.

Q Jim Buchanan, St. Louis Community College. Mr. President, I congratulate your efforts to try to bring about health care reform. And I wonder if you're going to try that again. And do

you think a single-payer system might make it?

THE PRESIDENT: The answer is, I am going to try to health care reform again this year. Obviously, the American people made a judgment, or at least the Congress did, and I think the American people did -- that this was such a big issue, they didn't want me or anybody else to try to put together a program that purported to solve it all at one time. So I think we'll have to go back and take it a piece at a time.

My own view is -- this is something you need to know about this, by the way -- the entire problem with the federal deficit in 1995, 1994, 1993, now since our budget has come in, is interest on the debt and health care costs. Everything else is going down. Last year we reduced spending on both defense and domestic spending overall for the first time in 25 years. The deficit's going up

because of interest on the debt and health care costs. So we have an interest in doing that.

The second thing you need to know is that your country is the only advanced country in the world where there are a smaller percentage of working families with health insurance today than had it 10 years ago. That is not true in any other advanced country in the world. So we have to do it. We have to -- we should do it by reforming the insurance system, helping people when they're unemployed not to lose their insurance, giving incentives to cover children, and helping families with disabled kids or with parents who want care other than nursing homes, and where that would be a cheaper, more affordable thing to do.

Let me give a little -- go ahead in the back there. I'll take a couple more. Go ahead. Yes, go ahead. (Laughter.) You know, when they're here, they all stand up if I point in the general direction. (Laughter.)

Q My name is Evan Koblentz from Kean College of New Jersey. Much progress has been made in your administration for financially-strapped or opportunity-privileged students to get grants and loans. What are you doing with the Republican Congress to get more grants available for merit-based and academic-based scholarships?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me say, first of all, I'm not -
- I don't believe that that should primarily be the subject for the federal government. Historically, it hasn't been. And I'll come back to that in a moment. Secondly, let me emphasize that the direct loan program is not very much income limited. It's really available to quite a broad range of young people to participate in. And since there are at least four different options for repayment, the idea is that you don't lose the right to get a loan even if you're a middle-class student. And if you decide to take a job that doesn't pay a high wage, you can afford to pay it back if you want to be someone who's more interested in public service early on than higher incomes.

Now, on the merit-based scholarships, let me just say

what I meant by that. There are many states -- Georgia is one -- I know we have some journalists here from Georgia -- Georgia has now passed a law that says that if you have a B average in Georgia and you go to school there, you get a tuition scholarship. And I think you get some money for books as well. When I was the governor of my state, I instituted a governor's scholarship program that was similar to that. These programs are sweeping the country, but they are basically the province of state government.

Let me further state that this is the second year in a row when the economy of all 50 states has grown. So they're in a --if they don't do it, they're in a better position to do it than they were a couple years ago. And that's one I would direct you to the state legislatures for.

Q Yes, all day we've been hearing -- I'm sorry, Kelly McEvers, from the University of Illinois. All day we've been hearing about the growing disparity between those in the upper echelon of income and those in the lower -- those at the low poverty level. However, especially after the election in November, the rhetoric that seemed to be coming through, at least in the mainstream media, was solely toward the middle class. I guess one example is the Middle Class Bill of Rights. It seems to me that there's an attitude that we're becoming a classless society when, in fact, we're moving in opposite directions --

THE PRESIDENT: We are --

Q Is that because that's the class that goes to the polls?

THE PRESIDENT: No. It's because -- let me just say this. The argument of the Republicans in last November's election was the middle class should vote for us because all the Democrats do is take your taxes and spend it on poor people -- right? -- or minorities or illegal immigrants or criminals or whatever. That was the basic argument -- right? Government's bad, vote for us, we'll give you less government, lower taxes, and we'll be harder on all those groups.

And the voters bought it -- wrongly, I think -- at least those who voted, because we had done more for the middle class. But you have to understand what middle class is. Middle class is more than an economic designation in America. It's a statement about values. When we say middle class in America what we really mean is, everybody ought to have the chance to be rewarded for their work. If you work hard, raise your kids, obey the law, you ought to have a chance to do better.

And what is happening is we are becoming more stratified by economic class, but it's different than before. In other words -- and I guess -- I'm really glad you asked this, because I'll try to clarify the point I was trying to make before. We do have poor people in America. Mostly they're young women and their little children, but

there are also a lot of working people who are poor who are making the minimum wage or right near it, which is why I'm for raising the minimum wage. And then we have a lot of wealthy people in America, and our economy is producing more wealthy people, and that is good. Entrepreneurs -- more entrepreneurs are becoming millionaires today than ever before who started with nothing -- not inherited wealth, but are making money. That is a good thing, not a bad thing.

But what is happening is that the middle class itself is splitting apart. That's the point I'm trying to make. The great American middle class, which basically rose more or less evenly with the poor and the rich in income from the end of World War II to the late '70s -- everybody rose together about the same amount. The American middle class itself is now splitting apart, based largely on education, age and job description. And if you don't have the skills and you're not in the place -- in the workplace, where you can hook into one of these groups that is growing, then you tend to work harder every year for lower wages. That's what I'm pointing out.

So what do we try to do? In the economic plan in '93, we had one big tax cut. We cut taxes for working families with children to make sure nobody who was working 40 hours a week with children would be below the poverty line. That's what the earned income tax credit was about. On average this year it's worth about \$1,000 in lower taxes to families of four with income of under \$26,000. Why do we do that? To reward work and family and lift people, keep trying to push people toward the middle class.

So this whole education thing -- we know if our government here can continue to follow responsible economic policies, we can create jobs, we can have growth. But we still -- that will not raise incomes. And it won't overcome this inequality, this splitting apart of the middle class.

So that's what I'm saying. The middle class mentality, which has been -- what made America great, requires us to follow policies that lift everybody's income.

I will close with just one thing. I had an interview with Money Magazine the other day. Do you all know Money Magazine? It's a -- and they did a readers' survey, they told me. And they

said -- I guess I'm jumping my interview. They'll probably be made at me, but -- (laughter). They said -- they said that their readers said that they recognize that we have lowered the deficit, created jobs, sparked an economic recovery, and two-thirds of them were still worried about their future. Right? Yes, you lowered the deficit, created jobs, there's an economic recovery. Am I worried? You bet I am. Why? Because of all this churning instability in the global economy.

That is our challenge. We've got to find a way to keep the entrepreneurship, keep the growth going, but lift the middle-class folks that are good people that have been left behind.

That's why I'm glad to see some of the nontraditional students in the community college. That's means that they're going to make the transfer from the middle class that might be left behind to the middle class that's surging ahead. And we need more of that, which is why we don't need to be in a position of reducing our commitment to education at the end of this century when the next century will trigger opportunity to education more than ever before.

Thank you very much. I have to go. Thank you.
(Applause.)
END1:49 P.M. EST

Distribution:

TO: edowd@esusda.gov@INET
TO: ttate@esusda.gov@INET
TO: 1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC

-822\MWOLFE(A)MH1.JS.MIL@MRX@EOPMRX

TO: Dawn A. Alexander
TO: Steven A. Cohen
TO: Anne M. Edwards
TO: Jeremy M. Gaines
TO: Mary Ellen Glynn
TO: Julia R. Green
TO: Joshua A. King
TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman
TO: Marlene A. MacDonald
TO: Kathy McKiernan
TO: APRIL K. MELLODY
TO: Jonathan M. Prince
TO: Meeghan E. Prunty
TO: A. Victoria Rivas

-Vazquez

TO: Margaret M. Suntum
TO: Virginia M. Terzano
TO: Lorraine A. Voles
TO: Natalie S. Wozniak
TO: David B. Anderson
TO: C. Patricia Cogdell
TO: Peggy A. Lewis
TO: Lorraine McHugh
TO: Daniel G. Rauh
TO: Rica F. Rodman
TO: Jess Sarmiento
TO: Laura D. Schwartz
TO: Joshua Silverman
TO: Richard Strauss
TO: wh

-outbox

-distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET

TO: backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET

TO: BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX

TO: MATT GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX

TO: Donald A. Baer

TO: Gabrielle M. Bushman

TO: Carolyn Curiel

TO: Alan J. Stone

TO: Lori E. Abrams

TO: Walker, Angelina

TO: Karen L. Barbuschak

TO: Heather Beckel

TO: Robert O. Boorstin

TO: Elizabeth C. Bowyer

TO: Lisa M. Caputo

TO: Joseph W. Cerrell

TO: Helen H. Dickey

TO: Rahm Emanuel

TO: Barry G. Epstein

TO: Karen E. Finney

TO: Michael A. Gill

TO: Jason S. Goldberg

TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS

TO: Alexis M. Herman

TO: Heidi Kukis

TO: Brian J. Johnson

TO: Wayne C. Johnson

TO: James Kohlenberger

TO: G. N. Lattimore

TO: Cynthia J. Lizik

TO: Mike Lux

TO: Doris O. Matsui

TO: Paul Meyer

TO: Cheryl D. Mills

TO: Elizabeth A. Montoya

TO: Douglas S. Sheorn

TO: Susan P. Shepard

TO: Richard L. Siewert

TO: Barry J. Toiv

TO: Jodie R. Torkelson

TO: Michael Waldman

TO: usia01@access.digex.com@INET

TO: 62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET

TO: 73030.21@compuserve.com@INET

TO: Manager Infomgt

TO: newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET

TO: usnwire@access.digex.com@INET

TO: 1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@EOPMRX

TO: FAX (9

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Julia F. Bator (BATOR_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-MAR-1995 15:23:46.15

SUBJECT: Some good stuff

TO: Kyle M. Baker (BAKER_K) (WHO)

READ:23-MAR-1995 15:24:32.00

TEXT:

This has some good folksy stuff in it about affirmative action --
actually the whole thing is good. Lots of common-sense
descriptions about the Administration's policies.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:23-MAR-1995 14:49:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Lori E. Abrams

ATT SUBJECT: POTUS with college reporters

ATT TO: Julia F. Bator (BATOR_J)

ATT TO: James A. Dorskind (DORSKIND_J)

ATT TO: Lana Dickey (DICKEY_L)

ATT TO: Jennifer McCarthy (MCCARTHY_J)

ATT TO: Ellen B. Bloom (BLOOM_E)

ATT TO: Debbie K. Hardin (HARDIN_D)

ATT TO: Tracy A. Beckett (BECKETT_T)

ATT TO: FAX (9-565-2784,Laura Gassner) (TLXA1MAIL_ \F:9-565-2784\C:Laura Gassner

TEXT:

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 2 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:23-MAR-1995 14:35:00.00

ATT CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum

ATT SUBJECT: 1995-3-23 College Press Forum remarks

ATT TO: Remote Addressee (edowd@esusda.gov@INET)

ATT TO: Remote Addressee (ttate@esusda.gov@INET)

ATT TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-
822\MWOLFE(A)MHI.JS.MIL@MRX@EOPMRX)

ATT TO: Dawn A. Alexander (ALEXANDER_DA)

ATT TO: Steven A. Cohen (COHEN_SA)

ATT TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A)

ATT TO: Jeremy M. Gaines (GAINES_J)

ATT TO: Mary Ellen Glynn (GLYNN_M)

ATT TO: Julia R. Green (GREEN_J)

ATT TO: Joshua A. King (KING_J)

ATT TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman (LIEBERMAN_E)

ATT TO: Marlene A. MacDonald (MACDONALD_M)

ATT TO: Kathy McKiernan (MCKIERNAN_K)

ATT TO: APRIL K. MELLODY (MELLODY_A)

ATT TO: Jonathan M. Prince (PRINCE_J)

ATT TO: Meeghan E. Prunty (PRUNTY_M)

ATT TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez (RIVASVAZQU_A)

ATT TO: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M)

ATT TO: Virginia M. Terzano (TERZANO_V)

ATT TO: Lorraine A. Voles (VOLES_L)

ATT TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK_N)

ATT TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D)

ATT TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C)

ATT TO: Peggy A. Lewis (LEWIS_P)

ATT TO: Lorraine McHugh (MCHUGH_L)

ATT TO: Daniel G. Rauh (RAUH_D)

ATT TO: Rica F. Rodman (RODMAN_R)

ATT TO: Jess Sarmiento (SARMIENTO_J)

ATT TO: Laura D. Schwartz (SCHWARTZ_L)

ATT TO: Joshua Silverman (SILVERMAN_J)

ATT TO: Richard Strauss (STRAUSS_R)

ATT TO: Remote Addressee (wh-outbox-distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET)

ATT TO: Remote Addressee (backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET)

ATT TO: Remote Addressee (BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX)

ATT TO: Remote Addressee (MATT
GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX)

ATT TO: Donald A. Baer (BAER_D)

ATT TO: Gabrielle M. Bushman (BUSHMAN_G)

ATT TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C)

ATT TO: Alan J. Stone (STONE_A)

ATT TO: Lori E. Abrams (ABRAMS_L)

ATT TO: Walker, Angelina (Angelina Walker@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)

ATT TO: Karen L. Barbuschak (BARBUSCHAK_K)

ATT TO: Heather Beckel (BECKEL_H)

ATT TO: Robert O. Boorstin (BOORSTIN_R)

ATT TO: Elizabeth C. Bowyer (BOWYER_E)

ATT TO: Lisa M. Caputo (CAPUTO_L)

ATT TO: Joseph W. Cerrell (CERREL_J)

ATT TO: Helen H. Dickey (DICKEY_H)

ATT TO: Rahm Emanuel (EMANUEL_R)

ATT TO: Barry G. Epstein (EPSTEIN_B)

ATT TO: Karen E. Finney (FINNEY_K)

ATT TO: Michael A. Gill (GILL_M)

ATT TO: Jason S. Goldberg (GOLDBERG_JS)

ATT TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS (HAAS_L)

ATT TO: Alexis M. Herman (HERMAN_A)

ATT TO: Heidi Kukis (Heidi Kukis@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: Brian J. Johnson (JOHNSON_BJ)
ATT TO: Wayne C. Johnson (JOHNSON_WC)
ATT TO: James Kohlenberger (Jim Kohlenberger@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: G. N. Lattimore (LATTIMORE_G)
ATT TO: Cynthia J. Lizik (LIZIK_C)
ATT TO: Mike Lux (LUX_M)
ATT TO: Doris O. Matsui (MATSUI_D)
ATT TO: Paul Meyer (MEYER_P)
ATT TO: Cheryl D. Mills (MILLS_C)
ATT TO: Elizabeth A. Montoya (MONTOYA_E)
ATT TO: Douglas S. Sheorn (SHEORN_D)
ATT TO: Susan P. Shepard (SHEPARD_S)
ATT TO: Richard L. Siewert (SIEWERT_R)
ATT TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B)
ATT TO: Jodie R. Torkelson (TORKELOSON_J)
ATT TO: Michael Waldman (WALDMAN_M)
ATT TO: Remote Addressee (usia01@access.digex.com@INET)
ATT TO: Remote Addressee (62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET)
ATT TO: Remote Addressee (73030.21@compuserve.com@INET)
ATT TO: Manager Infomgt (INFOMGT)
ATT TO: Remote Addressee (newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET)
ATT TO: Remote Addressee (usnwire@access.digex.com@INET)
ATT TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN
UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@EOPMRX)

ATT TO: FAX (9-862-0340,William Safire) (TLXA\MAIL_\F:9-862-0340\C:William Safire
TEXT;
PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER
TOP ALL

- \p -

BOTTOM ALL
MORE

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 23, 1995

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT COLLEGE PRESS FORUM

The East Room

1:05 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you and welcome to the White House. This is, as I'm sure you agree, a fascinating time to be in our Nation's Capital. We are now having a great debate about how we can best assure the American Dream for your generation and for your children well into the next century. The choices we make here will have a profound effect on all of your lives.

This is an historic era -- we have the end of the Cold War, the dawn of the Information Age, a globalized economy, an explosion of entrepreneurialism; an enormous amount of opportunity. At the same time, we have profound challenges. We have almost 20 years of stagnant incomes in the United States. We have growing inequality of incomes based primarily on educational differentials. We have deep strains within our society and still profound problems related to the breakdown of family and community, and the rise of crime and violence. We have challenges abroad in terrorism, environmental destruction, population explosion, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The issue we are most debating around here now in many different ways is what is the proper role of the national government in working with the American people to meet our challenges. The old view is that government is inherently a positive force and that there is a one-size-fits-all, big government solution for every big problem. The new view that's all the rage around here is that the federal government is the cause of every problem and if we just didn't have one we might not have any problems.

My view is different from both of these. I ran for president to advance that view, and I still believe it is the proper one. I believe government does have a role to play as a partner in meeting the challenges of the future with all of the American people. I believe the role of government is to increase opportunity as we

shrink bureaucracy, to empower people to make the most of their own lives, and to enhance our security at home and abroad.

We have to work economically to expand the middle class and to shrink the underclass. We have to work to promote mainstream values of work and family and future. We have to do it with a government that is smaller and less bureaucratic, but still effective. The key to our future is our ability to create more opportunity and, at the same time, the willingness of our citizens to assume more responsibility. That's what I have called The New Covenant.

I agree that we have to cut outmoded government, and our administration has lead the way. There are already more than 100,000 fewer people working here for the national government than there were on the day I became President. We're on our way to the smallest federal establishment since President Kennedy worked here.

But I also believe that this government should invest in your future and in your capacity to contribute and to live up to the fullest of your abilities. Therefore, I support more investments in education and technology and training, and empowering people to make the most of their own lives.

I also believe that if you look at the end of two years, the evidence is pretty good that our approach is right. We have reduced the deficit three years in a row for the first time since Mr. Truman was here. We have 6.1 million new jobs, the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 25 years, the first time in 20 years the African American unemployment rate has been under 10 percent. We have in 1993 the largest number of new businesses incorporated in any given year in American history. Finally, in 1994, we began to make some progress on the wage issue when we had more high-wage jobs coming into the economy than in the previous five years combined.

Notwithstanding that, the American people said they wanted a different sort of debate here in Washington last November, and so we are having it. Now, I believe that nothing will more clearly define the contours of this debate than what we decide to do in the area of education and training.

In the global economy into which we are moving, we can see what is happening to American jobs and incomes. Those who are able to grasp the high-wage jobs of the future are doing very well, indeed. We're going to have record numbers of millionaires created in this four-year period.

But we also see more and more and more Americans in the grip of insecurity as they work harder than they were working 20 years ago for wages that are the same or lower. And, overwhelmingly, it is because technology and global economic competition have depressed wages in areas that are not high skilled, with the capacity

to grow and learn for a lifetime.

Therefore, I do not agree that we should cut our investments in education and training, starting with the advances we made in Head Start, going through the school lunch program, all the way to the apprenticeship programs for young people who don't go to college, to college loans, to the subsidies for college loans for working young people -- right the way through. I don't believe we should cut them, certainly not to pay for tax cuts and not even to reduce the deficit. We do not have to cut education to reduce the deficit.

The leaders of Congress have targeted two areas that I would like to mention -- three, if I might, although only one reduces the deficit -- or two. The first is, the student loan program. We have, through our direct loan program, offered the opportunity for millions of young people to borrow money at lower costs on better repayment terms in a way that is less hassle for colleges and universities, less paperwork, and actually saves the government money because we take out the middle man. We don't have guarantees to banks, we just make the loans directly. That has actually reduced the deficit and reduced the costs of college loans.

At the same time, we have gotten tougher on collecting delinquent loans, reducing the costs to the taxpayers of delinquent loans from \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion. So, more loans, lower costs to the students, lower costs to the taxpayers, less hassle to the schools. It's a win-win deal.

The Republicans in the Congress want to change all of that. They, first of all, want to put a lid on the number of students who can participate in the direct loan program, which will add to the deficit. And then, they want to eliminate the student

loan subsidy for four million college students and charge people interest on their loans while they're in college, even if they come from very modest backgrounds.

Interestingly enough, this cut in education will only replace the money that they want to keep giving middlemen in the old student loan program so we could have the same reduction in the deficit by leaving the interest subsidy in place and making the direct loan program available to all the students in America. I think it's clear that our decision is a better one than theirs, and I hope that we will prevail. We are doing some things together, you know. We signed the unfunded mandates bill yesterday, we're about to get a bipartisan consensus for a line-item veto, which I have worked very hard for. So I hope that my view can prevail here, because it's very important to you.

The other thing that has happened in the House is that the Republicans have voted to cut the National Service Program, AmeriCorps, to the bone. I think that is a mistake. The AmeriCorps program is giving thousands of young Americans a chance to serve

their communities, serve their country, and earn money for higher education.

I don't believe we need to trade in our future for what is a pittance amount on the deficit, but will have an enormous negative symbolic and substantive impact on what we're trying to do in this country.

There is an article in The Washington Post this morning by Mary McGrory, whom I see sitting in the back who quotes a Georgetown student who happens to be a Republican who says, "I understand that taxpayers are heavily burdened, but if we give up what's best about America, what kind of legacy will we leave?"

So I will close with that. I urge you to think about this question. Yes, we have to continue to reduce the deficit, and we will. Yes, we have to move ourselves into the future economically. How can we do both? What are our other challenges?

One of the things we know is that the countries that do the best job of developing the full capacities of every one of their citizens will be the most successful in the 21 century. That's in all your interests, and that's what we should be debating here.

Thank you very much. I'd like to now call on as many of you as we possibly can. I'd like to ask you when I recognize you, please, to say what your name is and what your school is. And we'll start here.

Q Jeff Glasser, from Yale. How do you plan to stop Congress from capping direct loans, or cutting Pell grants, or paying the interest on loans taken out during college? Are you willing to veto legislation if it comes across your desk?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, of course, I am in the areas of education, which are so important to me. But let me say again what my first choice has been all along -- is to try to prevail in the debate in the Congress. We are making progress. As I said, we -- I signed a bill yesterday that I strongly believe in -- the unfunded mandates bill -- which limits the ability of Congress to pass laws that require state and local governments to raise taxes or otherwise pay for things that we require. We're going to get the line-item veto I hope and believe, which is a good way to cut out unnecessary spending. So maybe we can make some progress here.

I don't think there's as much enthusiasm in the Senate among Republicans, and I know the Democrats will oppose eliminating the subsidies, cutting the Pell grants, eliminating the direct loan program. So I hope we can prevail in the Congress. But the veto pen is always there.

And this is a -- look, I wouldn't be standing here today, no way in the world would I be standing here today if it

hadn't been for the opportunities America gave me through education. When I was born in my state in 1946, the per capita income of my state was barely over half the national average. And my whole generation owes everything we have to the educational opportunities our country gave to us. And now education is even more important to the general welfare of America than it was when I was your age.

I cannot sit by and watch it go backward. We need to bear down and do more, not ease up and go back.

Yes.

Q Francine Friedman, from Georgetown. As a fellow Hoya about to graduate and start paying back my loans, I was wondering if you could share with us how you financed your Georgetown education.

THE PRESIDENT: I had a \$500 -- as I remember, it was a \$500-a-year scholarship and a job. I worked in the Congress for two years. And when I went to Yale to law school I had a grant, a loan, a tuition postponement option, which works like the direct loan does now -- that is, I paid it back as a percentage of my income. I had a national defense loan and six jobs. But never more than three at once. (Laughter.)

Q Kristal Adams, from the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. On a lighter note, I was wondering who do you have picked for the Arkansas-Memphis game, and do you think Arkansas will make it all the way to the championship game this year?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I feel somehow, after the last two games, there is some divine providence that keeps us going. (Laughter.) So I'm more hopeful now than I was when they started the tournament. Thank you.

Q Yes. My name is Peter McKay. I'm a sophomore at Florida A&M University. And my question deals with the White House review of affirmative action that's been going on for several weeks now. What is the status of the review, and what conclusions have you reached about affirmative action?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first, the status is ongoing. I'll talk a little about where we are now, but I want to emphasize that the review is still underway.

And let me urge you -- I know there must be a lot of discussion about this on college campuses as it affects admissions policies. But I want to emphasize to begin you, if you spark a debate about this it's important to know what people are talking about when they're talking about affirmative action. There are policies of the government and policies in the private sector that affect admissions to colleges, availability of financial aid to schools, admissions to workplaces and promotional policies within the workplace, and access to contracts in the public sector; and,

sometimes, in the private sector as well, like big companies contracting with smaller ones. So you're basically talking about a range of programs.

When there is evidence of past discrimination, as found in a court, then there can be more strenuous rules and regulations. Otherwise, there are actually a lot of strictures on how far affirmative action can go in giving preferences to people based on race or gender.

But let me back up a little bit and again talk about a little history. When I was your age and I began to work in political campaigns, which I know was a long time ago -- almost 30 years ago now, but it's not so long in the life of the country -- there were still courthouses on squares in county seats in my state that had segregated restrooms -- in my lifetime, when I was your age, in the mid-'60s, there were still older African Americans in my state who did not know that they could vote without buying a poll tax, because it had only been abolished by the Supreme Court a couple of years before. I can remember when there were no women in any number of jobs now where we take it for granted that women will be.

The point I want to make to you is that we have made a lot of progress in this country. It has been inexact, it has been imperfect, there are still problems. We have made a lot of progress because we tried to take action to open up more opportunities to people without regard to their race or gender. And all of us, including white males, are better off because of that.

If you look at the countries around the world today that are being absolutely ripped apart because of violence based on ethnic or religious or racial disputes, and sometimes also related to the role of women, if you look at the countries that are struggling to become modern today where there's still regularly violence against women -- the general point I want to make to you is that it is in everyone's interest to see that everybody gets the best chance to live up to the fullest of their abilities.

On the other hand, it is in no one's interest to see that people get positions if they're completely unqualified to hold them. So the question is: How do we now go forward? And let me tell you the questions I've asked my folks to answer. I've said, first of all, how do these programs work, and do they have a positive effect? Okay, that's the first question. Secondly, even if they work, are they sometimes, at least, unfair to others? Could you argue that in some cases there is reverse discrimination, and if so, how? Thirdly, are there now others in need who are not covered by affirmative action programs?

Keep in mind that's really what's fueling this whole thing. You've got 20 years in this country where most hourly wage-earners have not kept up with inflation. Most Americans are working harder for lower wages than they were making 20 years ago. If so,

how are we going to deal with them?

And, finally, let's look at what clearly works, and I'll give you three examples. I don't think anybody in America would like us to suspend what we are doing in the military -- the system that produced not only General Powell, but countless other generals and colonels who are not only African Americans and Hispanics and Asian Americans, but also women, doing things that never were available before. How does that system work? Why does nobody reject it? Because nobody thinks anyone unqualified gets promoted.

What do they do? They work as hard as they can to develop the capacities of everybody who signs up, they do their very best to see that each level in the promotional pool, there is a mix of people that reflect the population in the rank just below, and then nobody -- nobody gets promoted who is not qualified. But they really work hard to give everybody a chance and develop everybody's capacities.

A second example -- this is self-serving, but I'll give it to you, anyway. I have appointed at this point in my tenure to this point in the two years, more judges to the federal bench who were women or members of racial minorities than my three predecessors combined, I believe. But my judges have the highest ratings, on

average, from the American Bar Associations of any of the last four presidents. So no one suggests that I am not promoting quality in the federal bench.

Fourth example: My Deputy Chief of Staff, Erskine Bowles was, before he came to the White House, the head of the Small Business Administration. And he spent 20 years helping people finance small business. And I said, we've got to bring enterprise into the depressed areas of this country, we have got to do it. So in one year, there was a huge increase in the volume of loans given to African Americans, Hispanics and women under the Small Business Administration without, in any way, discriminating against qualified white males, and every one of the loans was to a qualified person. Now, I don't believe any American would object to those three things.

The last thing I want to say is, I have also asked where does discrimination still exist among people who are not poor, or not economically distressed, in the traditional definition, based on race or gender. We just had the Glass Ceiling Report issued this last week, which was originally initiated, I believe, by Senator Dole, which said that there is still evidence of discrimination in promotional practices in large enterprises.

So I want to review all this, I want to make the best decision I can, and I've given you the questions.

I want to close with just two points. I'm against discrimination, I'm against giving people opportunities who are unqualified. But we all have an interest, including white males, in

developing the capacities of all of us to relate to one another -- because our economy will grow quicker, it'll be stronger, and in a global society, our diversity is our greatest asset. We must not let this debate be another cheap political wedge issue to divide the American electorate. We can use this to come together, and that's what we ought to do.

Tell me your name and where you're from.

Q My name is Lori Wiechman. I go to the University of Georgia. And in your first remarks, you had mentioned that you're really concerned about the future of us as college students and as -- our children. And I was just wondering, looking back on your experience in politics, which areas would you suggest for the college students who attend all of the universities here who are wanting to go into politics to pursue before they begin their career?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, I do not believe that there is a specific academic discipline that is necessarily better than another one to pursue a political career. If you are pursuing a degree in science or mathematics, or economics, let's say, I would recommend that at least you take whatever electives you can in history and in the social sciences, like political science, and in psychology. (Laughter.) And then -- but I think the most important thing is to develop your mind, is to learn to think.

And then the second thing I would say is, it's very important to spend your free time deciding whether you're interested in people as individuals and interested in public problems. Not everybody is, you know. And it's a good thing -- I mean, a lot of wonderful work has been done in the world by people who didn't want to spend hours a day talking to people who were different from them.

But if you really want to make a positive difference, in my judgment, you have to be able to imagine what life is like for people who are very different from you, and you have to be willing to invest some time in listening to those people.

If you think about what's happening, even in -- I read stories on college campuses, that kids are sort of separating by race, at least younger people and -- I'll give you something positive -- one of the best things that's happened is a lot of older people are now coming back to schools, especially to community colleges, but also to four-year colleges.

If you want to be effective in public life, you have to understand how other people view the world, and you have to be able to imagine yourself in their position. And then, the third thing I would say is, you should get some experience in campaigns and in other public endeavors to find out both how hard and how exhilarating it is to get people together and try to work to change something. Those are the three pieces of advice. But there is no single academic discipline that's the best.

Q My name is Shafeeq Qaasim. I'm from Los Angeles Trade Technical College. As opposed to the budget that everybody's concerned about, and we have all of these illegal aliens that mostly -- that affect all of us, including the taxpayers -- I would like to know, considering we passed a proposal of Proposition #187 in California, and it's now somewhere in the federal court system, what's being done, and how can it get back into the state where the voters have already voted?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the voters voted for it, and then like any law, it's subject to court challenge, and it's being challenged in the courts. Let me tell you what we've tried to do in the meanwhile. First of all, after I became President, I increased spending by 30 percent on programs designed to reduce the problem of illegal aliens. We have increased the number of border guards on the southern borders, assuming my next budget is adopted on this -- I think it will be -- by about 60 percent in three years, we are turning more people back.

We are also sending more people back home more quickly who come in contact with the criminal justice system. We are working to increase our ability to check workplaces for illegal immigrants, and we're trying to standardize identification so people can't give phony papers and stay in jobs. And we are trying to alleviate some of the costs that states face. We've given California, for example, more money to deal with their costs of imprisonment and health care and other things. And I asked the Congress to do even more than they voted to do, but I think that we should, as a matter of principle, no illegal immigrant is entitled to the expenditure of American people's tax dollars.

I did not support 187 for a very different reason. I don't think it's in the interest of the American people to have kids here and have them not in school. I don't think it's in the interest of the American people who have families here and not be able to get into a health clinic and maybe have them get seriously ill and spread whatever illness they have to the population at large. So my problem with 187 was in the details.

We do not give welfare benefits, for example, to illegal immigrants, and we should not be spending our money there, except where it is in the interest of our larger sense of self-interest. And I think schools and health care are. But we've got to do a lot more to crack down on the borders, and we have to do a lot more to go into these workplaces and send people away. And I would hope again -- this was a great wedge issue in the last election, but I'd like to remind you of where this issue came from, in part.

A lot of the very same people that were out there for 187, just a few years ago when the California economy was booming, weakened the anti-immigration -- anti-illegal immigration legislation pending in Congress, so they could get more illegal immigrations into

workplaces in California who would work for lower wages -- for their supporters. Now, that's the truth.

And what we need to do is crack down in the workplace, crack down at the borders, crack down in the criminal justice system, and not spend any money that we don't have to spend. And that's our policy and the one we're going to pursue.

Q I'm from Ohio University -- we're represented by a freshman Republican in Congress -- to be a freshman Democrat -- he says he opposes cuts in student aid, yet he says we need to look at your direct funding program -- because it builds a billion-dollar bureaucracy here in Washington. Could you respond to that?

THE PRESIDENT: It's just a -- it's a myth. It's a myth. The direct lending program -- the Secretary of Education is here with me -- the direct lending program will save the taxpayers \$12 billion over six years, the same amount of money they propose to save by eliminating the interest subsidy on student loan. Why is that?

You know how the student loan program works now under the old system? It's a 90-percent guarantee. So you go to the bank and you borrow the money -- right? And the government guarantees 90 percent of it. And the bank gets payment in the middle. And then if somebody defaults on the loan, unless it's a huge amount of money, it's not worth it to the bank to go try to sue somebody and get the money back. Why? Because they're going to get 90 percent of it anyway. And they'll spend 10 percent or more on lawyer fees.

So what have we done? We have reduced the number of defaults. We have been tough on this -- over and above the previous administrations who were here before me -- we have reduced the loan defaults from a cost a year of \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion. This direct lending program is far less expensive to run than the alternative. It is pure ideology to say it costs a little money to run the direct loan program and we don't want to hire one government employee; we'd rather pay billions and billions and billions of dollars to banks that could be going for lower cost college loans to more students.

This program is working. It saves money for everybody, and we shouldn't limit its reach. I think it is a real error.

Yes. Go ahead.

Q Margretta Sundelin, from Brigham Young University. It seems the United States is a nation founded on -- and prided upon its diversity. However, in the course of the last few years, it seems its diversity is dividing us. What I want to know is, in your presidency, what have you done to bring cohesion back to the nation and to settle the unrest?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I've tried to do many things, but

let me emphasize two or three. The first thing I've tried to do is to focus on initiatives that would provide opportunities to all Americans; that would unite us in getting more opportunities by, first of all in economic terms, but bringing down the deficit and expanding trade opportunities for American products, by working to create more jobs for the American people. Secondly, in education, by increasing everything from Head Start programs to college loans. I have tried to offer broad-based opportunity.

The second thing I've tried to do is to demonstrate to the American people that you could have diversity and excellence at the same time. That's what I just mentioned -- if you look at the people I've appointed to high public office, the people I've

appointed to the federal judgeships, and the things that I have tried to do that I think are important.

The third thing I have tried to do is to emphasize the importance of uniting the American people around shared values. That's what welfare reform is all about. That's what the attempts of the crime bill to clean up our streets from violence are all about. We should all be able to agree that we are going to pursue policies that promote family, that promote work, that strengthen communities, that look to the future. These are the things that I have tried to do.

And I believe that the American people would think more in these terms -- I know that a lot of people are so bewildered by the changes and they feel so threatened by the changes going on today, that it's easy to lash out at someone who is different from us. But if we would focus on those three things I think we'd come together more.

Q I'm Jamie Sivlerstein, from Northwestern University. With the knowledge of computers and other types of technology becoming more crucial in order to succeed in the workplace, what steps is your administration taking to promote this type of education?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we are doing a number of things. First of all, I think you saw the White House on the Internet today, didn't you? We're trying to set a good example. But we're also promoting the availability of more computers and the use of more responsible computer education in our schools, starting in the earliest grades. It was a big part of the education reform legislation that Secretary Riley and I and the administration pushed last year.

One thing I note -- Mr. Gingrich said the other day something that I really agreed with, and then he said maybe it was an unrealistic thing. But I don't think it is. He said it would really help to cure poverty if every poor child in America had a little laptop computer. And then I think he backed off of it. I don't think that's a bad idea at all. I think that if we had enough

resources to teach every poor child in this country how to interact with the whole world of information that's available, if you can work that it would be a very good thing.

So I believe we should continue to press technology. It is not an excuse, it's not a substitute for learning to read, for learning to write, for learning to express yourself clearly, for learning to reason and argue and think. But it is enormous leverage to us. And I think we should do more.

Q My name is Carrie Budoff. I'm from Rutgers University. Many colleges have policies of nondiscrimination. And your "don't ask, don't tell" policy for ROTC programs -- it applies to ROTC programs. And it's an obvious conflict with universities' policy. The ROTC program in the case of Rutgers may lose funding because of this, because they are not abiding by the nondiscrimination policy. How can these programs -- how can the ROTC program on college campuses deal with this if they have a nondiscrimination policy?

THE PRESIDENT: Explain what you mean. I'm sorry I don't understand it. Go ahead.

Q Okay. The ROTC program at Rutgers University may lose scholarship funding because they are on the campus. And the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, which extends --

THE PRESIDENT: Conflicts with Rutgers' nondiscrimination policy.

Q Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it's an act of Congress, so Rutgers will have to decide what to do about it. I mean, there isn't -- I'll say this. If the policy were implemented in spirit and in letter the way it was really written -- if you read the whole policy -- I don't think it would be in conflict. But if you read the whole policy -- I would urge you to go back and read the whole policy and see what it really says. I don't think it would be in conflict. But if Rutgers deems it's in conflict, then Rutgers will have to do whatever it decides to do, because that policy was written into law as an act of Congress and so it is not subject to change unless Congress changes it.

Q Christan Hanna, Western Michigan University. On our campus we had a nonviolent protest because a faculty member told a student that she asked "stupid -- blank -- questions." And instead of dealing with the problem of racism and talking about it on campus, the university's reaction has been to try to quell all of the surrounding problems instead of dealing with the issue -- the main issues, which is the racism and problems that people have with that. What do you think the university's role in educating beyond your study, your area of study is?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think it's a very important role. I mean, if you have the luxury of going to college, and you stay there for four years -- or in the case of a community college, two years -- it's maybe different if you've got a family to raise and a full-time job and all. But if basically you're a full-time student and you're in your formative years, some of the most important things that happen to you happen to you outside the classroom and involve things you don't get a grade on.

And I think one of the things -- I've been really quite concerned about the challenges that both students and faculty members face in this so-called political correctness atmosphere. I think we need to encourage people to say what they really think, but to do it in an atmosphere that is more tolerant. And I think universities ought to be laboratories all across this country for people airing their real feelings and convictions, but doing it in a way that other people can hear them, and really being honest and forthright about it. Because otherwise, then the universities can just become one more island of isolation for the American people. We don't need that. We don't need more islands of isolation. We need instruments to open us up to one another.

Q Jim Buchanan, St. Louis Community College. Mr. President, I congratulate your efforts to try to bring about health care reform. And I wonder if you're going to try that again. And do you think a single-payer system might make it?

THE PRESIDENT: The answer is, I am going to try to health care reform again this year. Obviously, the American people made a judgment, or at least the Congress did, and I think the American people did -- that this was such a big issue, they didn't want me or anybody else to try to put together a program that purported to solve it all at one time. So I think we'll have to go back and take it a piece at a time.

My own view is -- this is something you need to know about this, by the way -- the entire problem with the federal deficit in 1995, 1994, 1993, now since our budget has come in, is interest on the debt and health care costs. Everything else is going down. Last year we reduced spending on both defense and domestic spending overall for the first time in 25 years. The deficit's going up

because of interest on the debt and health care costs. So we have an interest in doing that.

The second thing you need to know is that your country is the only advanced country in the world where there are a smaller percentage of working families with health insurance today than had it 10 years ago. That is not true in any other advanced country in the world. So we have to do it. We have to -- we should do it by reforming the insurance system, helping people when they're unemployed not to lose their insurance, giving incentives to cover children, and helping families with disabled kids or with parents who

want care other than nursing homes, and where that would be a cheaper, more affordable thing to do.

Let me give a little -- go ahead in the back there. I'll take a couple more. Go ahead. Yes, go ahead. (Laughter.) You know, when they're here, they all stand up if I point in the general direction. (Laughter.)

Q My name is Evan Koblentz from Kean College of New Jersey. Much progress has been made in your administration for financially-strapped or opportunity-privileged students to get grants and loans. What are you doing with the Republican Congress to get more grants available for merit-based and academic-based scholarships?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me say, first of all, I'm not -- I don't believe that that should primarily be the subject for the federal government. Historically, it hasn't been. And I'll come back to that in a moment. Secondly, let me emphasize that the direct loan program is not very much income limited. It's really available to quite a broad range of young people to participate in. And since there are at least four different options for repayment, the idea is that you don't lose the right to get a loan even if you're a middle-class student. And if you decide to take a job that doesn't pay a high wage, you can afford to pay it back if you want to be someone who's more interested in public service early on than higher incomes.

Now, on the merit-based scholarships, let me just say what I meant by that. There are many states -- Georgia is one -- I know we have some journalists here from Georgia -- Georgia has now passed a law that says that if you have a B average in Georgia and you go to school there, you get a tuition scholarship. And I think you get some money for books as well. When I was the governor of my state, I instituted a governor's scholarship program that was similar to that. These programs are sweeping the country, but they are basically the province of state government.

Let me further state that this is the second year in a row when the economy of all 50 states has grown. So they're in a -- if they don't do it, they're in a better position to do it than they were a couple years ago. And that's one I would direct you to the state legislatures for.

Q Yes, all day we've been hearing -- I'm sorry, Kelly McEvers, from the University of Illinois. All day we've been hearing about the growing disparity between those in the upper echelon of income and those in the lower -- those at the low poverty level. However, especially after the election in November, the rhetoric that seemed to be coming through, at least in the mainstream media, was solely toward the middle class. I guess one example is the Middle Class Bill of Rights. It seems to me that there's an attitude that we're becoming a classless society when, in fact, we're moving in opposite directions --

THE PRESIDENT: We are --

Q Is that because that's the class that goes to the polls?

THE PRESIDENT: No. It's because -- let me just say this. The argument of the Republicans in last November's election was the middle class should vote for us because all the Democrats do is take your taxes and spend it on poor people -- right? -- or minorities or illegal immigrants or criminals or whatever. That was the basic argument -- right? Government's bad, vote for us, we'll give you less government, lower taxes, and we'll be harder on all those groups.

And the voters bought it -- wrongly, I think -- at least those who voted, because we had done more for the middle class. But you have to understand what middle class is. Middle class is more than an economic designation in America. It's a statement about values. When we say middle class in America what we really mean is, everybody ought to have the chance to be rewarded for their work. If you work hard, raise your kids, obey the law, you ought to have a chance to do better.

And what is happening is we are becoming more stratified by economic class, but it's different than before. In other words -- and I guess -- I'm really glad you asked this, because I'll try to clarify the point I was trying to make before. We do have poor people in America. Mostly they're young women and their little children, but there are also a lot of working people who are poor who are making the minimum wage or right near it, which is why I'm for raising the minimum wage. And then we have a lot of wealthy people in America, and our economy is producing more wealthy people, and that is good. Entrepreneurs -- more entrepreneurs are becoming millionaires today than ever before who started with nothing -- not inherited wealth, but are making money. That is a good thing, not a bad thing.

But what is happening is that the middle class itself is splitting apart. That's the point I'm trying to make. The great American middle class, which basically rose more or less evenly with the poor and the rich in income from the end of World War II to the late '70s -- everybody rose together about the same amount. The American middle class itself is now splitting apart, based largely on education, age and job description. And if you don't have the skills and you're not in the place -- in the workplace, where you can hook into one of these groups that is growing, then you tend to work harder every year for lower wages. That's what I'm pointing out.

So what do we try to do? In the economic plan in '93, we had one big tax cut. We cut taxes for working families with children to make sure nobody who was working 40 hours a week with children would be below the poverty line. That's what the earned income tax credit was about. On average this year it's worth about \$1,000 in lower taxes to families of four with income of under

\$26,000. Why do we do that? To reward work and family and lift people, keep trying to push people toward the middle class.

So this whole education thing -- we know if our government here can continue to follow responsible economic policies, we can create jobs, we can have growth. But we still -- that will not raise incomes. And it won't overcome this inequality, this splitting apart of the middle class.

So that's what I'm saying. The middle class mentality, which has been -- what made America great, requires us to follow policies that lift everybody's income.

I will close with just one thing. I had an interview with Money Magazine the other day. Do you all know Money Magazine? It's a -- and they did a readers' survey, they told me. And they

said -- I guess I'm jumping my interview. They'll probably be made at me, but -- (laughter). They said -- they said that their readers said that they recognize that we have lowered the deficit, created jobs, sparked an economic recovery, and two-thirds of them were still worried about their future. Right? Yes, you lowered the deficit, created jobs, there's an economic recovery. Am I worried? You bet I am. Why? Because of all this churning instability in the global economy.

That is our challenge. We've got to find a way to keep the entrepreneurship, keep the growth going, but lift the middle-class folks that are good people that have been left behind.

That's why I'm glad to see some of the nontraditional students in the community college. That's means that they're going to make the transfer from the middle class that might be left behind to the middle class that's surging ahead. And we need more of that, which is why we don't need to be in a position of reducing our commitment to education at the end of this century when the next century will trigger opportunity to education more than ever before.

Thank you very much. I have to go. Thank you.
(Applause.)

END1:49 P.M. EST

===== END ATTACHMENT 2 =====

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-MAR-1995 17:30:23.69

SUBJECT: 1995-3-23 McCurry Briefing

TO: Remote Addressee (edowd@esusda.gov@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (ttate@esusda.gov@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-
822MWOLFE(A)MH1.JS.MIL@MRX@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dawn A. Alexander (ALEXANDER_DA) (WHO)
READ:24-MAR-1995 09:08:05.04

TO: Steven A. Cohen (COHEN_SA) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 17:47:40.47

TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jeremy M. Gaines (GAINES_J) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mary Ellen Glynn (GLYNN_M) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julia R. Green (GREEN_J) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 19:24:56.20

TO: Joshua A. King (KING_J) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 18:20:32.40

TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman (LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Marlene A. MacDonald (MACDONALD_M) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 17:56:43.46

TO: Kathy McKiernan (MCKIERNAN_K) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 18:16:54.34

TO: APRIL K. MELLODY (MELLODY_A) (WHO)
READ:27-MAR-1995 16:38:25.31

TO: Jonathan M. Prince (PRINCE_J) (WHO)
READ:27-MAR-1995 10:03:12.95

TO: Meeghan E. Prunty (PRUNTY_M) (WHO)
READ:24-MAR-1995 08:46:32.46

TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez (RIVASVAZQU_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 17:30:35.37

TO: Virginia M. Terzano (TERZANO_V) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lorraine A. Voles (VOLES_L) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Lorraine A.
Voles@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK_N) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 17:44:15.38

TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ:27-MAR-1995 07:29:58.27

TO: Peggy A. Lewis (LEWIS_P) (WHO)
READ:24-MAR-1995 10:38:54.92

TO: Lorraine McHugh (MCHUGH_L) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 18:39:21.32

TO: Daniel G. Rauh (RAUH_D) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Rica F. Rodman (RODMAN_R) (WHO)
READ:24-MAR-1995 15:28:54.32

TO: Jess Sarmiento (SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
READ:24-MAR-1995 13:45:13.68

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (SCHWARTZ_L) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 18:08:53.41

TO: Joshua Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 18:51:03.22

TO: Richard Strauss (STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (wh-outbox-distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Donald A. Baer (BAER_D) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Gabrielle M. Bushman (BUSHMAN_G) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Alan J. Stone (STONE_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lori E. Abrams (ABRAMS_L) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 18:41:18.84

TO: Walker, Angelina (Angelina Walker@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen L. Barbuschak (BARBUSCHAK_K) (OA)
READ:24-MAR-1995 09:24:18.42

TO: Heather Beckel (BECKEL_H) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 17:35:52.53

TO: Robert O. Boorstin (BOORSTIN_R) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elizabeth C. Bowyer (BOWYER_E) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lisa M. Caputo (CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Joseph W. Cerrell (CERREL_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Joseph W.
Cerrell@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX (VPO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Helen H. Dickey (DICKEY_H) (WHO)
READ:24-MAR-1995 09:53:14.93

TO: Rahm Emanuel (EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barry G. Epstein (EPSTEIN_B) (STP)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen E. Finney (FINNEY_K) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael A. Gill (GILL_M) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (MICHAEL A.
GILL@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (VPO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jason S. Goldberg (GOLDBERG_JS) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS (HAAS_L) (OMB)
READ:25-MAR-1995 20:20:46.62

TO: Alexis M. Herman (HERMAN_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Heidi Kukis (Heidi Kukis@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brian J. Johnson (JOHNSON_BJ) (CEQ)
READ:23-MAR-1995 18:13:26.11

TO: Wayne C. Johnson (JOHNSON_WC) (OA)
READ:24-MAR-1995 09:09:27.04

TO: James Kohlenberger (Jim Kohlenberger@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: G. N. Lattimore (LATTIMORE_G) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Cynthia J. Lizik (LIZIK_C) (OA)
READ:28-MAR-1995 14:06:12.02

TO: Mike Lux (LUX_M) (WHO)
READ:28-MAR-1995 09:22:48.16

TO: Doris O. Matsui (MATSUI_D) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 18:11:00.29

TO: Paul Meyer (MEYER_P) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (MILLS_C) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 17:31:32.96

TO: Elizabeth A. Montoya (MONTOYA_E) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Douglas S. Sheorn (SHEORN_D) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 19:10:46.80

TO: Susan P. Shepard (SHEPARD_S) (OA)
READ:24-MAR-1995 07:04:37.24

TO: Richard L. Siewert (SIEWERT_R) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 17:30:11.15

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 20:18:29.48

TO: Jodie R. Torkelson (TORKELSON_J) (WHO)
READ:23-MAR-1995 18:09:30.50

TO: Michael Waldman (WALDMAN_M) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (usia01@access.digex.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (73030.21@compuserve.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Manager Infomgt (INFOMGT) (SYS)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (usnwire@access.digex.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (I=US@2=WESTERN
UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: FAX (9-862-0340, William Safire) (TLXA1MAIL_ \F:9-862-0340\C:William SafireREAD:NOT READ

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER
TOP ALL
- \p -

BOTTOM ALL
MORE #39-03/23

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 23, 1995

PRESS BRIEFING
BY

MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

3:23 P.M. EST

MR. MCCURRY: Well, a cheery good afternoon to you all. I hope you enjoyed the President's news conference with the college editors, the briefing just concluded on our Southern Regional Economic Meeting. And I will hold forth on any other remaining questions on other areas that you might --

Q Guatemala.

MR. MCCURRY: Guatemala. It's a country that is struggling to have a democratic form of government and respect for human rights.

Q You said earlier that some of the news accounts out there were not quite truthful and you promised to enlighten us about it.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I believe a lot of the news accounts today are based on a letter, a draft letter, from Congressman Torricelli that I believe has not been sent. You might want to check with the Congressman, but I don't believe that the letter that's reported today has been sent to the White House. We don't have any copy of a letter from him. So you might want to check in there. But I can talk a little bit about that.

I'll say at the outset here, I'm handicapped by one central thing. There is a limit -- those of you who know how we in the government deal publicly with classified information know that there's a very -- a lot of restrictions on what we can say and what we can't say. And I think we've made an effort to scrub through what we can tell you publicly and go through a lot of what has been said publicly on this matter and try to make sure everyone understands exactly how our government responded.

The case of Jennifer Harbury since the early days of the administration of President Clinton has been a source of very deep concern to us because obviously we have an American citizen who has no concrete evidence about what happened to her husband, who was a Guatemalan rebel who the United States government believes was killed shortly after he was taken captive after a firefight between government authorities and rebels in Guatemala.

We have, through the embassy in Guatemala, pursued this matter diligently, I would say, at a variety of levels since -- the first contact that I am aware of since President Clinton has served as President dates back, I think, to March of 1993, and consistently with President De Leon Carpio, even prior to his elevation to

President when he was, in fact, the Human Rights Ombudsman in Guatemala, we have raised this case and expressed the deep concern that we have to learn more information. That has gone on without much success because there hasn't been much concrete information for most of 1993 and 1994. And we have, at every step along the way as we had information that was available we have, subject to national

security restrictions that do exist, shared that information with Jennifer so that she understands the information that's available to the government.

Now, you might want to check over at the Central Intelligence Agency later, but I believe that the Acting Director will be making it very clear today that any suggestion that the CIA itself had information about the deaths of either Michael Devine or Efrain Bomaca Velasquez at the time of their deaths is just not true. That statement, I think, by Admiral Studeman will speak for itself.

Why don't I just kind of walk through some of the White House's participation in trying to resolve the question of what happened to Bamaca.

Q Before you do that -- you may not be able to answer this, but the allegation made, of course, is that the perpetrator here was someone who we had a relationship with. Is that something you can comment on?

MR. MCCURRY: That is an area -- as you would well expect, I can't from here at this podium get into the questions of relationships that exist between anyone who provides information in the CIA.

Q Well, this CIA statement today be made by a person or simply a piece of paper?

MR. MCCURRY: I do not know the answer to that.

Q The allegation is also made by Congressman Torricelli that the United States government learned who the perpetrator was sometime between November and January and did not tell the widow, and that he learned this information independently of any briefing. You had mentioned earlier that he didn't attend the briefings. He acknowledges that he did not attend any such briefings because he did not wish to know from classified sources the information he later learned on the outside.

MR. MCCURRY: That would apply to his staff, too.

Q It wasn't asked. Are you implying --

MR. MCCURRY: No. No, I'm not. Why don't we just -- why don't I go through just some of the --

Q Can you respond to it specifically?

MR. MCCURRY: Okay. Let me take it then from -- if I understand, you're saying from November forward what was available to us -- why don't I start with that, then, because in November the information available to us was very much that that had been relayed by Ambassador McAfee in Guatemala to Jennifer.

We, at that time -- best information available to us gave no indication at all that Bamaca was alive much beyond the first few weeks of his capture. She was here -- I believe here at the White House in late November and met with Tony Lake, and Tony, at that point, gave her an assessment of our understanding of the intelligence and information on the case consistent with what Tony had to do to protect sources and methods.

He affirmed that we had no information that indicated that Bomaca was alive; that we had been informed, but we that we couldn't verify that he was held prisoner, but alive in July of 1992. And we emphasized that the case was a continuing concern of ours. We continue to press it with Guatemalan officials, that we would work

with the U.N. Human Rights Verification Mission in Guatemala to try to find out what we could find out.

We then pursued it with Guatemalan officials. Tony met with the Guatemalan Foreign Minister at one point. The President himself raised this case with President De Leon Carpio in Miami during the Summit of the Americas in December. We continue -- I believe State Department people, the Assistant Secretary over there -- Deputy Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs stayed in fairly regular contact with her to let her know what we knew.

In January, precisely on January 25th, the CIA provided to us here, to the National Security Council, some new information regarding the circumstances of Bomaca's death. That information was not easily corroborated, and it did conflict with information that we had had available to us in the past. So, as a result of that, the NSC directed a comprehensive assessment of all the information that was available on the circumstances surrounding Bamaca's death and what we knew about it.

I guess about two days after that, it would have been January 27th, Admiral Studeman at the CIA directed the Inspector General at the CIA to review all of the facts that were underlying both the Bamaca case and the case -- the 1990 death of Michael Devine who was a hotel owner, hotel entrepreneur in Guatemala, an American citizen.

On February 3rd -- so this would have been just several days after that new information became available to us in January -- the CIA briefed the Chairs, the Vice Chairs and the staff of the House Intelligence Committee. They also provided briefings on the Senate side to the Senate Intelligence Committee. The briefings involved a very detailed description of the information that had been

provided to us on the 25th of January and information about the Bamaca and the Devine cases.

We had just very shortly after that also went in and demarched De Leon Carpio, too. The Ambassador went in and saw the President, indicated that we had some new information that was available to us. We asked that Guatemalan authorities, through their own investigators, go back in to the field and re-interview Guatemalan army officers who were present in the area where Bamaca was captured in March of 1992. And we also asked that the U.N. Human Rights Mission also be involved in some of those interviews.

We passed all this information on to Jennifer, I believe the next day. And based on that new information, the State Department told Jennifer on February 8th that the information that was available to us at that point, while it was not conclusive, suggested that her husband had been killed following his capture, and that we were doing everything we could to encourage the Guatemalan military authorities to investigate all the circumstances surrounding his death.

We had some follow-up contact with the chief prosecutor, with other officials in Guatemala. We met -- some NSC staffers remained in contact with Jennifer Harbury in February to kind of apprise her on the status of some of the diplomatic contacts we've had down in Guatemala.

On March 7th, following some of the follow-up contact that we had, Ambassador McAfee met with Jennifer down in Guatemala and told her at that time that we had reached a conclusion at that point that her husband was dead, based on the evidence as we knew it at that point. I should say that sort of confirmed what had been the predominant view in our government for sometime. But clearly the new information available to us as of January 25th, as we developed it

and looked at it, suggested in more concrete terms that he had died shortly after being taken captive in March of 1992.

On March 10th -- some of you might remember -- on March 10th, the State Department put out a press release, and it was the -- I think the story, as I recall, the story -- we had, the United States government, partly because of our concern about lack of progress on these human rights cases, had suspended some of the remaining military training assistance funds that we had -- military assistance arrangements we had with the Guatemalan military. But in that statement, it also said publicly for the first time that the U.S. government had reason to believe that the guerrilla commander, Bamaca, was captured alive by the Guatemalan army in March of 1992 during an armed confrontation between guerrilla forces and the army. Although we have no conclusive evidence, we've communicated to the government of Guatemala and to Ms. Harbury our considered assessment that Commander Bamaca died in military custody in 1992 after a short but indeterminate period of detention and interrogation. We've examined all information regarding his whereabouts, but have found no

credible reports to contradict this assessment. And we will continue to urge the Guatemalan government to provide a full accounting of this and other cases.

That is, for the most part, where matters stand, as some of this becomes a little more public now. But I would point out that throughout the process, we have done everything we can, one, to get the facts from the Guatemalan authorities; two, to make sure Jennifer Harbury had access to those facts in a timely -- when they were available to us, consistent with our own obligations to protect our own national security. And, three, as soon as we could make that information publicly available, we did so, specifically in the March press release from the State Department.

Q Mike, why in November was the administration able to say that they had no indication that Bamaca remained alive much beyond his capture?

MR. MCCURRY: Because this case had been of very intense interest to the U.S. government and we'd pursued every piece of information that was available to us. And there were some times, as there often is in the murky world of reports from informants, there was contradicting and conflicting information. So when we would get -- when our government would get conflicting information, we would pursue it and do everything we could to get to the truth, because we wanted to determine what had happened to Jennifer's husband.

Q So in November, you said that you also had no indication that he was killed.

MR. MCCURRY: We had no conclusive evidence indicating that he had been executed, killed or terminated. Our problem was we didn't have any facts. We had a very real suspicion that he had died shortly after being taken captive. Most of the information, as the information was triangulated, squared to that conclusion. But that's not as good.

I mean, just think of her situation. I mean, there were these sporadic reports publicly, some of which she talked about publicly, that her husband might be alive, might have been spotted in a prison camp, someone thinks they might have seen him at such and such a location. So, of course, as a very human reaction, she wants to believe anything that indicates that her husband might still be alive -- and even worse, fears that if he is alive he's being held by people who might be torturing him. And, of course, that is a very real concern to him, even though during this whole period, especially late in 1994, we begin to reach the conclusion that it's not likely that he is alive. And then in January of this year, we get

information that is more helpful and making a more definitive conclusion, although it can't be conclusive because we don't have all the facts that he's probably died shortly after being taken captive.

Q Just one more follow-up. If the CIA informed the

White House on January 25th that they had information that he was killed, how much in advance of that January 25th date did the CIA know that Bamaca had been killed?

MR. MCCURRY: I do not know that fact. All I know is that that information was brought here to the White House on January 25th. The CIA, I believe, will indicate that they, as they developed that information, they made it available promptly to all the agencies within the government. In fact, I think that they will say that they, as they acquired information, they shared it immediately with relevant government authorities.

Q Well, you're denying then, on the CIA's behalf apparently, what seemed to be Congressman Torricelli's main point in his news conference this morning, which is that the CIA knew for a period of two and a half to three years that Bamaca was dead, but because of security concerns or whatever, refused to tell his widow and let her go on hunger protests and the rest of that despite the fact that knowing that her husband was already dead.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, that -- I am not aware of any information available to the White House, nor to the CIA that indicated with certainty that anyone in the government knew that he was dead shortly after being taken captive in March of 1992. I do know that we shared with her our own view that that was likely the case. And that has consistently been our view.

Q You started doing that early on, started suggesting the possibility? Is that --

MR. MCCURRY: I can't really pick up the thread here much prior to November, other than to say that throughout 1993 and 1994 we were pursuing the matter with the Guatemalan government. But I do know that the first White House meeting with Jennifer Harbury I'm aware of is one that occurred in late November between Tony Lake and Jennifer in which he said, look, here's the information that we have and it certainly suggests that this is the fate. It doesn't help you because, if it's true, if your husband's dead, you, of course, want to be able to get access to the remains, want to be able to give him a decent burial. That continues to be our chief concern now, that we follow up with this so that we can help her get some of the dignity that she is entitled to receive.

Q To take Bill's question one step further, with the exception of sources and methods and the security material, was any information at all withheld from Jennifer Harbury by the CIA, or have you determined whether any was withheld from the administration?

MR. MCCURRY: There would be -- I mean, I would answer that by saying, we, of course, given concerns with sources and methods, had to be oblique in providing some information to her, but in good faith believe that we gave her everything available that would suggest what our own assumption was about the fate of her husband. But, of course, there are some things that just couldn't be

shared with her because it would have been against the law for anyone in the federal government to share that kind of information with her.

Q But on Mike's other point about whether or not the administration is satisfied that the CIA was forthcoming and conveyed everything that it knew about this case quickly to the White House and to the appropriate authorities here --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, Admiral Studeman's statement will speak very directly to that point on behalf of the agency today, and we have no reason, obviously, to doubt it.

Q Can you categorically deny that none of the killers or killer were on the payroll of the U.S.?

MR. MCCURRY: But we don't know who killed Efrain Bamaca so, of course, I can't. I don't know the answer to the question who killed him or how he was killed.

Q Are you trying to find out?

MR. MCCURRY: Absolutely. We are, as I suggested, we are not only pressing Guatemalan authorities and now exercising some sanction in withholding assistance funds, pressing them to do everything they can to investigate this murder. We've also given them -- based on the new information that became available to us on January 25th of this year, we suggested to them several Guatemalan military officers that they should re-interrogate. I think that that would indicate to you that we are pressing as hard as we can for them to get the answer to the question, how did Bamaca die, and, if he was, in fact, executed or murdered, who was responsible for that crime.

Q Does that include Julio Roberto Alpirez, who -- suggested should be interrogated?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, it does.

Q Do you suspect him in both the deaths?

MR. MCCURRY: We have not done anything other than to suggest to Guatemalan authorities that they should re-interrogate him. It is known, I believe, in Guatemala that he was in the vicinity of the region in which this firefight occurred in March of 1992 in which we believe Bamaca was taken captive.

Q Does that also apply then to the Devine case, that you asked that he be interrogated in that case as well?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm only speaking here about the Bamaca case.

Q What do you know about the reasons for the killing

of Devine?

MR. MCCURRY: What do I know? I know very little about it.

Q -- any information?

MR. MCCURRY: I have not looked into the question of what information is available to us on that, but we have suggested that it would be a good idea for Guatemalan authorities to pursue a re-interview of some of these individuals.

Now, I should say in the case of the Devine murder, that is one in which the Department of Justice is involved because it does involve the death of an American citizen overseas.

Q Mike, specifically on Devine, apparently Ambassador White has said that Devine was a DEA informant. Do you have any information on that?

MR. MCCURRY: No, I don't.

Q There were suggestions in the Department earlier that you might be willing to release copies of the demarche given to President De Leon Carpio of February 7th or 8th. I guess you're not prepared to do that?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I'll tell you what would be useful is I've -- in working up this presentation today, I've got a very good chronology that's been put together. I think that might be useful to people. Can we -- I don't see any reason why we shouldn't make this available. Why don't you make this available. Make sure that everyone's okay on that, but I think that would be helpful.

That contains some of the language of the presentation. I think that includes -- it might in fact include a quote from the demarche. Let me just read this for a second. Well, it gives the -- it certainly suggests the general thrust of the demarche. I don't know that it quotes directly from it, but it gives you a good sense of what the presentation was that the Ambassador made.

Q Mike, Representative Torricelli is on the Intelligence Committee. He's been briefed by the CIA on all of this, and he concludes that on the basis of his understanding that the CIA or some element of it is out of control. Are you saying that the White House has no such concern?

MR. MCCURRY: Look, you need to be very careful with that. You just accused him of breaking the law, and I don't know if that is, in fact, the case.

Q -- reported on the front page of The New York Times.

MR. MCCURRY: If he took classified briefings and then put them into the public domain, that's a violation of federal law. Now, I had an earlier question here that suggested to the contrary that he's saying he deliberately did not attend these briefings so that he could independently develop his own information, and I believe I've seen him suggest -- I've seen some of the news accounts that suggest that he developed his own information on that. So you should really ask that question of the Congressman.

Q Well, if his conclusion is that the CIA or some element is out of control, what is the White House response to that?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, you know, I think that's -- I'll tell you what we've done here. What we've done is to try to get to the truth. We've gotten -- we've done that by going to Guatemala and pursuing pieces of information as they become available to us. And I believe it's a bit of an exaggeration to say that anything about the CIA's attempt to provide that information to us and to Jennifer Harbury represents an organization that's out of control. I just don't think that's a fair characterization.

Q Is the White House satisfied, Mike, that the CIA was in no way involved in the killings of either Devine or Bamaca?

MR. MCCURRY: The White House is satisfied that the Acting Director of Central Intelligence has asked the Inspector General to review everything that we know about the Bamaca case.

Q So at this point you don't know?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, as I've indicated several times here, the whole problem, the thing that is such a heartache about this case is we don't know everything we would like to know with certainty.

Q Mike, also, in hearings on Deutch coming up, Torricelli also was talking about bringing up this issue and getting into some great detail on it. What is your reaction to that? Will the administration be prepared to --

MR. MCCURRY: He's a member of Congress and he's entitled to raise those questions. We have a process by which we consult with Congress on this matters, that's designed to protect our national security, and, among other things, make sure that we keep people alive.

Q Mike, to paraphrase Howard Baker, the question seems to be, what did the CIA know and when did they know it. Are you able to answer that?

MR. MCCURRY: I can report to you the statement that I believe that the Acting Director of Central Intelligence is going to

make that the information that the CIA had about the deaths of both Michael Devine and Efrain Bamaca -- first of all, the information about their deaths was available to them after the fact, not before the fact, and that the Agency shared the information that it acquired with the appropriate U.S. government authorities.

Q -- talks about time.

MR. MCCURRY: I have. I've given you a fairly detailed chronology about when the White House became aware that the information available to us as of January of this year. I don't believe -- I have no reason to believe that there was any great delay in the transmission of that information to the National Security Council.

Q Since you say that the one thing you do know is that the CIA did not have information at the time of their deaths, any suggestion that the CIA had information at the time of their deaths is just not true, that leaves us to surmise that if someone with a link with the CIA was involved in the killing, they were doing this on their own.

MR. MCCURRY: Look, you can spin many webs from the facts that I've presented here. I can only -- you can only conclude from what I've presented here the facts that I've presented. If you have additional access to facts or theories or conclusions and you can substantiate them, that would be of deep interest to us because we will share them with the appropriate law enforcement authorities in Guatemala.

Q -- one of those webs. Are you saying that the CIA Inspector General is reviewing only the Bamaca case or Bamaca as well as Devine?

MR. MCCURRY: They are reviewing the Bamaca and the Devine cases -- the Inspector General is.

Q In the past, Mike, when threatened or faced with a cutoff of U.S. funds of some kind, when questions are raised about their human rights record, the Guatemala government has said, fine, take your funds and we'll continue on. What has been the reaction so far of the Guatemalan government in this case?

MR. MCCURRY: I think those of you who follow this know that after some of our presentations, President De Leon has ordered new inquiries to be made. I'm not aware that any of those inquiries have amounted to much to date.

Q Does the U.S. think that the Guatemalan government is sincere in the pursuit of these investigations?

MR. MCCURRY: I think the views of the United States government are reflected in the fact that we terminated additional

military training assistance in March of this year.

Q I'm not sure if you're able to answer this, but I guess we're duty bound to ask -- are there Guatemalan military officers on the CIA payroll?

MR. MCCURRY: That's an area that I will not talk about at the podium.

Q On a different subject?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes.

Q During the President's briefing with college reporters, one of the students asked him about Rutgers University and don't ask, don't tell, and ROTC. The President said, "If the policy were implemented in spirit and in letter the way it is really written, I don't think it would be in conflict." It seems that by that response that there's question of whether or not he thinks that it's being implemented in spirit and in letter. Does the President believe that don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue, is being implemented the way it should be?

MR. MCCURRY: The President is confident it's the right policy. He is concerned about some of the news reports that he's seen, anecdotally, providing information that some people have -- the circumstances of which would seem to suggest there might be some problem implementing the policy. But he is -- we have been in contact with the Pentagon on that and General Shalikashvili and Secretary Perry have both been very public and very detailed in explaining how the policy is working.

Q Mike, could you go back to a question I asked yesterday and just confirm if Deval Patrick is testifying tomorrow, and if so, what is he going to be saying?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, you are not surprised that his testimony will reflect very much the presentation on the subject of affirmative action that the President made at his news conference with the college editors earlier. The President gave, I think it's fair to say, a fairly detailed account and update on the status of the review and some of the areas of concern that he has, some of the questions that he's been posing. And I think that information will be of interest to the members of Congress who question Mr. Patrick tomorrow.

Q Two questions -- a follow-up, that will probably come up tomorrow, if he's asked, what is the President's timetable? And when the President finishes his review, what is it that he plans to do? Would he propose legislation, or just make the information available? What are the answers to those?

MR. MCCURRY: I think -- I suspect his answer tomorrow will be that we will do the review in a careful and deliberate way, and it'll be done when it's done, and we will -- and know the answer

to the question, what follows as a result of the review when it is completed and when it's discussed publicly. I'd be surprised if the answer is any different than that.

Q Also coming out of the newspaper editors' session, does the President think there's any role for government in providing laptop computers to poor children?

MR. MCCURRY: I think he found Speaker Gingrich's idea intriguing, as he clearly indicated.

Q Specifically, tax credits?

MR. MCCURRY: He didn't -- I didn't hear a comprehensive policy proposal. I said he -- I think he said the Speaker had an interesting idea.

Q Would that be DOS or Macs?

MR. MCCURRY: I vote for MacIntosh, but that's -- oh, we have -- well, in this age of interoperability, I think it's all --all electrons are fungible, or something. (Laughter.)

Q It's all very graphic.

Q A follow again to Rutgers. He also said that it was up to Rutgers to decide what to do with this ROTC program, and he didn't seem to indicate one way or another. Is it the President's belief that universities can, indeed, kick off ROTC divisions? I mean, does he think that that's an acceptable practice?

MR. MCCURRY: The answer the President gave on the Rutgers matter indicated pretty clearly that he was not entirely familiar, but he indicated what his policy was, and his policy is rooted in the policy that's been articulated publicly. I didn't hear him direct himself to that question, and I would have to check into that further to answer that question.

Q On another subject, on welfare reform -- I know it's moving fast up there and there's a lot of stuff day by day. But how -- in the White House estimation, where does it stand now from your perspective in the final, the bill that may emerge? What's your evaluation?

MR. MCCURRY: The House -- I mean, there was a fascinating development in the bill last night because the Republicans in the House made it very clear that the budget cuts that they're talking about in welfare reform that are going to hurt children the most are exactly the cuts that are going to be used to pay for the tax breaks that are going to go to the wealthy. They voted on that straight up last night. I think it was a very telling moment for the new Republican majority in the Congress that are now basically making it clear that they're taking this money out of the

programs that are going to help kids and use it to pay for the tax breaks that they still want disproportionately skewed towards the very wealthy in our country.

So that's a fair commentary, and I think where the debate is at the moment is one indication of why they've got a long ways to go on welfare reform. But we remain hopeful that they will iron some of these questions out and produce a bill that represents the type of welfare reform that'll change welfare as we know it, and that the President would be delighted to support.

Q How close is it getting to now? There are changes on child care, some other things that are --

MR. MCCURRY: They clearly are hearing the argument that Democrats in Congress and the President are making in the beginning to try to figure out how to respond to that and how to adjust some of these measures so that they are a little smarter. But the bill remains, on balance, one that is still way too tough on kids and not tough enough on those who are dependent on welfare and who need to move off of welfare and into work situations.

Q What is the President doing tomorrow?

MR. MCCURRY: What's he doing tomorrow? He's going to go into Bethesda and having his annual physical tomorrow.

Q What time?

Q Do you have the details? What time and --

MR. MCCURRY: You can get it from Ginny and Mary Ellen afterwards.

Q Mike, in his talk with the college journalists today the President touched on Prop 187, and he said that some of those who were arguing for Prop 187 were earlier doing things that encouraged the flow of illegal immigrants into this country. He was oblique, but was he thinking of any recent entrants to the presidential race when he said that?

MR. MCCURRY: No, he was commenting on the debate as it's been aired publicly in California, a debate that he's followed closely. I don't believe he was directing that at any individual person, but you're familiar with the debate in California, and that certainly is a point that many have made.

Q Mike, on the President's physical tomorrow, to the best of your knowledge, has he complained of anything lately?

MR. MCCURRY: No, he's feeling good. I can't say he's looking forward to his physical, because I doubt that he is. Who would be. But it's an annual deal and he'll go and endure it, and

then enjoy himself.

Q You've got to tell us a little bit more -- how it's handled, whether you're going to put out a written report, who is his doctor.

MR. MCCURRY: I understand. We will.

Q Can you tell us exactly why he isn't looking forward to it?

MR. MCCURRY: We'll do it with the customary fanfare. We'll probably do it by paper.

Q You can tell us what time.

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know. These guys know. Ask them. They know.

Q One last thing.

MR. MCCURRY: We'll find out. Do you want me to find out? Do you want me to be able to answer the question?

Q Sure.

MR. MCCURRY: Okay, we'll go get the answer. She's going to get the answer.

Q It's an important story.

MR. MCCURRY: I understand; it is every year. And it's handled the same way every year, and it keeps at least one or two cycles moving on the wires.

Q The French now are getting more critical, as are others --

MR. MCCURRY: The President's schedule tomorrow includes a departure from the White House at 7:30 a.m. and an appointment at Bethesda Naval Hospital at 7:40 a.m. He'll be there until about noontime, and then he'll prepare to return.

Q Is he going to have one of those, what you call a flexible sigmoidoscopy? Is that part of the -- (laughter.)

Q The whole nine yards, Mike?

MR. MCCURRY: Brit, that sounds dirty. I don't know if I can answer --

Q Then what are your plans? Are you going to be -- any announcements at the hospital?

MR. MCCURRY: What we'll do is put out, as we did last year, a written statement from the Press Office that provides the results of the exam as they relate to us by Dr. Connie Mariano -- and we will follow up anything --

Q You're taking a pool?

MR. MCCURRY: Am I taking a pool?

Q -- to oversee the change --

MR. MCCURRY: I'd refer you to the Press Office staff, and they can provide you more on the logistics.

Q Can we just do this for a moment?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, we'll do -- well, let's do it at the end. Any other questions on other areas, and then we'll --

Q Mike, at the upcoming Reinventing Government event, can we expect the President and the Vice President to describe initiatives that will have savings that add to the \$81 billion in the budget, in the '96 budget, or are these initiatives that are already fed into the budget?

MR. MCCURRY: That is a good, precise budget question. I don't know the answer to that. I mean, they will obviously describe the way we're going to generate budget savings, but I don't know whether they're included in our FY '96 budget proposal or not. But thank you for taking our FY '96 budget proposal seriously. And we wish others would as well.

Q Can you give us some broad ideas of some types of things we're going to hear on Monday?

MR. MCCURRY: No, I can't make Monday's news today.

Q The Russian Security Council apparently is saying that there will be a military parade in Moscow on V-E Day, that it will include thousands of troops and a couple of hundred at least armored vehicles. Is that consistent with what we know and what the President is planning on seeing when he goes there?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know the answer to that. I don't know what understanding we have with them. And I actually would like to defer that. We've got our Secretary of State meeting with the Russian Foreign Minister today, I think -- now. They're done now -- on the plane and on the way home.

Q Mike, it's now looking as if Turkish troops are going to stay in Iraq for perhaps a month. What does the U.S. think about that?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, as our statement said earlier in the week, we believe that this precisely-defined mission ought to be of limited duration. That would be a duration not inconsistent with previous episodes of this nature. But we'll continue to monitor the developments closely.

Q Is there any increasing concern -- a lot of the allies now are saying it goes far beyond hot pursuit.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it is an action directed at what the Turkish government tells us are terrorist camps, largely in the control of the PKK. As our statement earlier in the week indicated, we would be very concerned if the scope of the operation went beyond that and interrupted or disrupted the lives of innocent civilians or interfered with their property.

Q Well, what have we been told by the Turkish government?

MR. MCCURRY: Exactly what I told you the Prime Minister told the President when they talked by phone earlier in the week.

Q How can you condone the invasion of another country?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it's not, a, not an invasion, because the government of Turkey indicated to us that they continue to respect the territorial integrity of Iraq. They indicate that it is a mission designed precisely to attack camps at which they believe there are terrorist elements present. We share their concern about terrorist operations, specifically those conducted by the organization, PKK. But we have made it very clear that we also believe that it ought to be a mission of limited duration and one that respects the lives of innocent civilians and noncombatants.

Q Mike, the President told the student journalists that the nondelinquent loans had been reduced from \$2.8 billion to about \$20 million. Is that all on his watch? It sounds a remarkable reduction for two years.

MR. MCCURRY: We're being very careful with statistics these days, so we will check very carefully that one.

Q The President has from time to time said that the government is now the smallest it's been since the Kennedy years. Then he said today that it's going to be the smallest it's been since the Kennedy years. By what measure is that? Is that in relation to the total population? Is that an absolute number? Is that -- I mean, how does he ever get to that number? Obviously we've got HUD and other departments, EPA, that have been created since then, and have swollen the size of the government and its -- and you've also got this question of the military personnel. How is that -- can you find out how much -- how he's getting to that?

MR. MCCURRY: Let's firm that one up. That's a good question. We'll firm it up and give you the answer tomorrow.

Q Do you have any reaction to the Iraqi trade minister's comments about the two Americans that Iraq is detaining?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not sure what -- the only thing I knew is that the public indication that they said that they are being "well treated." Is that what you're referring to? Well, we would expect that the two Americans in detention would be well treated.

The point is are they going to be released, and that's what we keep pressing to find out.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

MR. MCCURRY: You're welcome. See you tomorrow.
END4:00 P.M. EST

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Joe Trahern (TRAHERN_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-MAR-1995 17:19:13.07

SUBJECT: Weekly Report

TO: Karen L. Hancox (HANCOX_K) (WHO)
READ:24-MAR-1995 17:26:35.25

TO: Amanda Crumley (CRUMLEY_A) (WHO)
READ:24-MAR-1995 17:37:40.42

TEXT:

It's attached. I'll send one over on stationary.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:24-MAR-1995 17:18:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Joe Trahern

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN
March 24, 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Doug Sosnik
RE: Weekly Report

Below are some items of political news I thought would interest you.

1996 Presidential News

Robert Casey. Former two-term Pennsylvania Governor Robert Casey became the first Democrat to pose a challenge to your re-election today when he filed an official exploratory committee with the FEC. Casey has said he will make a decision regarding his candidacy in the presidential race in April or May. A challenge by Casey would make abortion the key issue of debate within the Democratic Party.

New Hampshire Poll. A University of New Hampshire poll this week reports that you have a 44% approve/45% disapprove job performance ratio among all Granite State voters but that your ratio among Democrats is 75% approve/15% disapprove. Both figures represent

great improvement over the poll's December, 1994 sample, in which your ratio was 38% approve/53% disapprove among all voters and 61% approve/31% disapprove among Democrats. Sixty-two percent of Democrats said you deserve re-election while only 18% said you do not.

Pete Wilson. Flanked by leaders of crime victim, law enforcement and anti-tax organizations, Governor Wilson made his much-anticipated exploratory committee announcement yesterday. Pledging to run a message-oriented campaign, Wilson punched the familiar buttons of immigration, affirmative action, welfare, taxes and crime. Not letting his contradictory political history obscure his new themes, Wilson ignored his many flip-flops and declared it is his "duty" to bring his California agenda to the country. His opportunistic positioning will attract tough scrutiny from California reporters familiar with his previous actions and uncharmed by his dour personality. Nonetheless, Wilson stands out in the pedestrian Republican field and will mount a disciplined professional effort to bypass the right-wing ideologues and win the support of mainstream Republican voters.

Pat Buchanan. Vowing to wage and win "the cultural war for the soul of America," Pat Buchanan formally entered the presidential race in Manchester, NH on 3/20/95. Buchanan emphasized his opposition to "political correctness" in his remarks, saying that the history and symbols of America are under assault through a campaign "to malign America's heroes and defile America's past." At the beginning of the speech, four protesters, members of the Coalition for Jewish Concerns, forced their way up to the stage carrying signs calling Buchanan

a racist. The protesters were forcibly removed by some members of the group and dragged outside. Nobody was seriously injured though the protesters suffered some bumps and bruises. As they were being extricated, Buchanan told the group, "Now you know what we're fighting against, friends."

The Manchester Union Leader editorialized that the "trust factor redounds strongly to Buchanan's benefit. He has earned great respect for saying precisely what he means and meaning what he says."

On the Iowa swing of his announcement tour, Buchanan attacked the Des Moines Board of Education for once considering a pro-tolerance curriculum that he said would "instruct the schoolchildren of Iowa in the homosexual rights agenda." He also blasted the Administration for allegedly dropping the use of the term "V-J Day" saying that "Bill Clinton is in the forefront of the political correctness movement."

Louisiana/Iowa Caucus Dispute. The Louisiana Republican State Central Committee voted to hold caucuses to select 21 of the state's 27 convention delegates in early February before the Iowa Caucuses. (The other six delegates would be selected by Louisiana's Super Tuesday primary.) The move brought a sharp retort from Gov. Terry Branstad (R-IA), who noted that "these are the people that nominated David Duke for governor, so I don't

think they're exactly what I would call in the mainstream of Republican thinking." In a letter to Louisiana GOP Chair Mike Francis, Branstad told the Louisiana Party to "back off" and warned that Louisiana's move would trigger a legal mechanism forcing Iowa to move its date forward, into 1995 if necessary. Francis refused to back down, demanded an apology for the "inference involved" in the Duke reference and pointed out that "RNC rules ... do allow Louisiana to take this action."

Lawyers for the Iowa GOP are looking into the question of whether the Voting Rights Act will require Justice Department approval before moving the date, something which would give Iowa enough notice to ensure its caucus is first. Louisiana argues that because the change is not in law but in party rules, Justice Department approval is not necessary.

You may recall that Phil Gramm, who suffered a serious blow in New Hampshire by being associated with Arizona's attempts to move its primary date, won a recent straw poll in Louisiana and is believed to be the best organized in the state. His main rivals are trying to curry favor with Iowa and New Hampshire by opposing the move. Lamar Alexander urged Francis to reconsider and, in a letter to Phil Gramm, said that "as the winner of the recent Louisiana Republican straw poll, I was hoping you could use your influence with the state party leadership to convince them not to upset the Iowa or New Hampshire schedules." Later, Alexander compared Louisiana's move to Arizona's -- saying "we're beginning to see a pattern" -- and pointed out Arizona's and Louisiana's proximity to Texas. For his part, Branstad said Gramm called him an assured him that he thought Iowa should go first. Bob Dole, meanwhile, wrote Haley Barbour to say that "the current process with Iowa and New Hampshire [in the front] ... is working. Your assistance in working ... to ensure that Iowa retains its status as the nation's first caucus would be greatly appreciated."

Bob Dole. Dole this week responded to charges from groups who claimed that they were disturbed by his comments in the New York Times Magazine that he had not "made a judgment" on gays in the military. In a letter to the Washington Times he said that "I oppose lifting the ban on gays-in-the military. I haven't moved one inch on the issue." Dole's campaign did not

dispute the accuracy of the Times quote but complained that the article failed to provide background on the Senator's attempts to block the change in military policy.

Bob Dornan. Dornan was in Iowa on 3/17/95 and announced he will seek the Presidency, saying "somebody has to defend virtue in this society. Somebody using this bully pulpit has to explain the danger society's in." Dornan filed the required FEC papers earlier that day but will not make his candidacy official until next month. Dornan also said that "I can't endorse Gramm, maybe ever" because of Gramm's draft record.

Lamar Alexander. Lamar Alexander will net \$236,000 as a result of the merger of Martin Marietta, on whose board he sat, and Lockheed. The amount is part of a \$92 million compensation package paid to former firm executives and is based on what

Alexander would have received in the three years remaining on his term as director. The Department of Defense will pay \$31 million of the package, of which \$162,000 will go to Alexander's settlement.

Phil Gramm. Gramm challenged some of Pete Wilson's immigration prescriptions this week, especially his proposal to rewrite the Constitution to deny automatic citizenship to the U.S.-born children of illegal immigrants. He said he would be "loathe to go to a system like in Europe where your citizenship is based on ethnicity." Gramm said that "instead of putting our states through the gut-wrenching process of Proposition 187 ... I want us to commit the resources --whatever we have to do -- to gain control of our borders[.]" Phil Gramm named Orange County Representative Christopher Cox, a former Reagan White House staffer, as his California State Chair.

Colin Powell. A New Hampshire-based effort aimed at drafting Colin Powell for President held its first organizational meeting in Nashua on 3/23/95. Approximately 40 people attended. Charles Kelley, Jr., head of Citizens for Colin Powell for President and who worked on Dwight Eisenhower's campaign, compared Powell to Eisenhower and said 1952 was "almost identical to what we have today. That is why I think he will run." A clip is attached.

Jerry Brown. The incipient "Draft Jerry Brown" committee is being disavowed by the subject of its entreaties. Brown professes no interest in running for President and reportedly asked his acolyte to shut down the operation.

1995 Races

1995 Mississippi Gubernatorial Race. Secretary of State and de-facto Democratic nominee Dick Molpus received the results of his benchmark poll this week in the Mississippi gubernatorial race. The poll showed incumbent Governor Kirk Fordice (R) with a re-elect score of 41%, and showed Molpus with a moderate 55% name identification rating statewide. In a general election match-up, Fordice led Molpus by 20-30 points.

1995 Louisiana Gubernatorial Race. Senator Bennett Johnston is rumored to have commissioned a poll to "test the waters" for a 1995 gubernatorial bid. If Johnston scores well enough statewide to ensure a spot in the runoff, he is expected to announce his candidacy in the near future. There is also speculation that New Orleans Mayor Marc Morial (D) has discussed endorsing Johnston in the gubernatorial race should he decide to run. State Treasurer Mary Landrieu (D) released a copy of her latest poll this week, which showed Landrieu defeating frontrunner Buddy Roemer (R) in a general election match-up 49% to 35%. Some party leaders

in Louisiana believe Landrieu's poll may be an attempt to marginalize the campaign of Lt. Governor Melinda Schwegmann (D), who currently stands as Landrieu's strongest competition for the runoff.

Denver Mayoral Race. Governor Romer made an impromptu reiteration

of his endorsement of Mayor Wellington Webb last Wednesday, following a joint appearance at a public school. Romer had previously endorsed Webb during his gubernatorial campaign. The governor's close relationship with mayoral candidate John Frew precipitated the low-key nature of the statement, which was not widely reported in the Denver media.

1996 Races

Nebraska Senate Race. Speculation about next year's Senate race continues to be a favorite topic in Nebraska political circles.

Governor Ben Nelson (D) continues to say that he is listening to the arguments of his fellow Democrats but that he is "unaware of any circumstances" that would make him change his mind. He did note, though, that he found the idea of Attorney General Don Stenberg (R), who has announced, being a U.S. Senator to be "scary." Lt. Gov. Kim Robak (D), meanwhile, says "you never say never" but that her "young family" would make it "tremendously difficult" to make the race. Former Rep. Peter Hoagland said "it's too early" to speculate on his candidacy but added that "I wouldn't count Gov. Nelson out. Ben would be an excellent candidate."

On the Republican side, investment banker Chuck Hagel (R) announced last week that he will run and 1994 Senate nominee Jan Stoney (R) said that she is considering the race though she will take her time to make a decision. Rep. Bill Barrett (R) announced he will not run.

Other Political News

Recent Polling: Kentucky. Kentucky's annual Bluegrass Poll was released by the Louisville Courier-Journal last week, which showed your job approval rating evenly split among voters 47% positive/47% negative. The poll also showed Democratic Governor Brereton Jones enjoying an exceptionally high statewide approval rating of 62%.

In terms of the '95 Democratic gubernatorial primary, the Bluegrass poll showed Lt. Governor Paul Patton (D) with a solidly favorable standing among registered voters. Patton received a 52% favorable/29% unfavorable rating among voters, while Secretary of State Bob Babbage (D) received a rating of 40% favorable/16% unfavorable. The third major Democratic primary candidate, state Senator President Eck Rose, received a 37% favorable/29 percent unfavorable rating with 34% of voters undecided. The poll did not ask voters their choice in the May 23rd primary election. Also in the news, both Patton and Babbage received more than \$1 million in matching funds toward their campaigns this week as part of the state's new public financing laws.

Recent Polling: Maryland. A poll recently conducted for the Baltimore Sun showed your approval rating at 49% favorable/39% unfavorable. Of 808 likely Maryland voters polled, 37% said they would vote for your re-election in 1996. Twenty seven percent said they would consider voting for you in 1996, while 36% said they would vote to replace you next year. The

same poll showed newly elected Governor Parris Glendening's (D) rating at 38% favorable/37% unfavorable. Maryland voters gave Glendening an 18% excellent/good and 65% fair/poor job rating. Among Republicans, the poll showed Colin Powell with a 74% favorable/four percent unfavorable rating. Senator Dole followed with a rating of 56% favorable/12% unfavorable and Buchanan with 41% favorable/21% unfavorable. In a GOP primary without Colin Powell, Dole received 42% of the vote, Gramm received 15% and Wilson six percent. Buchanan received only four percent of the vote, Keyes three percent and Alexander two percent.

Recent Polling: Louisiana. A poll released last week by the Baton Rouge Advocate showed that 49% of Louisiana voters feel you are doing an excellent/good job in office, while 48% said you are doing a "not so good" or poor job. Thirty five percent of those polled said they would vote to re-elect you if the election was held today. Fifty three percent said they would not support your re-election while 11% were undecided. About 60% of white voters gave you an unfavorable job rating and approximately 68% of white voters said they would not support your re-election.

Recent Polling: Minnesota. A poll released to the St. Paul Pioneer Press this week reports that you are the most popular politician in the state with a 47% favorable/29% unfavorable ratio. Gov. Arne Carlson (R) is second with a 45% favorable/27% unfavorable ratio. Newt Gingrich has a 21% favorable/51% unfavorable ratio. The poll also shows Senator Paul Wellstone (D) holding a 46%-32% lead in a rematch against former Senator Rudy Boschwitz (R). Wellstone has a 41% favorable/32% unfavorable ratio while Boschwitz has a net negative ratio of 27% favorable/33% unfavorable. Forty-two percent of respondents identified themselves as Democrats while 35% identified themselves as Republicans, a switch from the poll in January when the Republicans held a six point edge in partisan identification. A clip is attached.

Governor Lowry. A 51 page report issued yesterday by an independent investigator (who was appointed by Lowry) sent a mixed message that will have an uncertain impact on the governor's future prospects. The report concluded that the governor may have inappropriately touched former press aide Suzanne Albright, but "probably did not sexually harass" her, largely because he was unaware that his behavior was offensive. The report does chronicle in detail specific allegations of inappropriate touching, caressing and commenting, however, and the specificity of the report will likely spur a public and political debate over the accepted definition of sexual harassment. Adding drama to the story, Albright spent Thursday night in a hospital after an unsuccessful suicide attempt. Following Albright's trauma, the report's author, Mary Alice Theiler, appeared to grow more sympathetic to the victim and issued a statement which placed blame squarely on the governor. Theiler apologized to Albright for any pain she may have caused and said, "this report does not clear Mike Lowry. This report puts responsibility squarely on his shoulders for conduct which distressed and offended a valuable employee." Lowry, whose approval ratings hovered at 28% before the accusations surfaced, will hold a press conference today.

Louisiana Party Switch. State Senator Hank Lauricella (D) announced last week that after 31 years in the Louisiana legislature, he is leaving the Democratic party and will run for re-election as a Republican in the fall election. In January, Baton Rouge Mayor Tom Ed McHugh and five other Baton Rouge Democrats also switched to the GOP.

Lee Brown. The Dallas Morning News reports that Lee Brown has begun privately testing the waters with several local politicians for a bid for mayor of Houston, his adopted home town, in 1997. (In 1997, term limits will force Bob Lanier to retire from the job.)

Rep. Bill Hefner (D-

NC). Hefner is publicly stating that he will seek re-election in 1996 but some of his friends in the district are concerned that he will retire. He was very distressed by the loss of Democratic control and his Administrative Assistant, who is not from North Carolina, recently moved into the district, presumably with an eye towards running.

Colorado Judgeship. The Administration nominated Carlos Lucero, a Hispanic attorney from southern Colorado, to serve as the federal judge on the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals. The appointment garnered positive media coverage in Pueblo and it should be well received in southern Colorado's estranged Hispanic community. Innuendo was still circulating this week in the Denver media regarding the controversial withdrawal of Judge Maes' nomination. For the first time, local media cited Denver attorney Jim Lyons' name in connection with the failed nomination.

Dreamworks. Dreamworks, the company founded by David Geffen, Steven Spielberg, and Jeffrey Katzenberg, made major news this week. The incipient firm secured a \$500 million commitment from a former partner of Microsoft founder Bill Gates, and Gates himself entered into a joint venture with Dreamworks to produce and market interactive software. The company, which is now capitalized to about \$2 billion, was also featured in a Time magazine cover story (attached).

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Erich Vaden (VADEN_E) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:27-MAR-1995 09:47:08.12

SUBJECT: You've got mail

TO: Kyle M. Baker (BAKER_K) (WHO)
READ:27-MAR-1995 09:48:59.65

TO: Monica H. Mullens (MULLENS_M) (WHO)
READ: 5-APR-1995 16:34:42.81

TO: Maureen F. Lewis (LEWIS_M) (WHO)
READ:27-MAR-1995 09:51:12.64

TO: Thomas W. Tanner (TANNER_T) (WHO)
READ:27-MAR-1995 15:13:18.26

TO: Seth E. Masket (MASKET_S) (WHO)
READ:28-MAR-1995 15:50:28.06

TO: Lark M. Park (PARK_L) (WHO)
READ:27-MAR-1995 09:49:46.50

TO: Daniel W. Burkhardt (BURKHARDT_D) (WHO)
READ:27-MAR-1995 09:56:20.44

TO: Lori E. Abrams (ABRAMS_L) (WHO)
READ:27-MAR-1995 11:01:06.06

TEXT:

A number of people asked me to follow through on my threat to write mean things about people. However since most of you read this and my efforts aren't for naught, I'll just think mean thoughts.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:24-MAR-1995 18:04:00.00

ATT CREATOR: Daniel P. Meyer

ATT SUBJECT: News Calendar

ATT TO: Carter Wilkie (WILKIE_C)

ATT TO: Dawn A. Alexander (ALEXANDER_DA)

ATT TO: S. Collier Andress (ANDRESS_S)

ATT TO: John C. Angell (ANGELL_J)

ATT TO: Joan Baggett (BAGGETT_J)

ATT TO: Lavora R. Barnes	(BARNES_L)
ATT TO: Heather Beckel	(BECKEL_H)
ATT TO: Eric Berman	(BERMAN_E)
ATT TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein	(BERNSTEIN_E)
ATT TO: Robert O. Boorstin	(BOORSTIN_R)
ATT TO: Liz Bowyer	(BOWYER_L)
ATT TO: Ken Chitester	(CHITESTER_K)
ATT TO: Nestor M. Davidson	(DAVIDSON_N)
ATT TO: Jeffrey L. Eller	(ELLER_J)
ATT TO: Rahm Emanuel	(EMANUEL_R)
ATT TO: Patricia A. Enright	(ENRIGHT_P)
ATT TO: Deborah L. Fine	(FINE_D)
ATT TO: William Galston	(GALSTON_W)
ATT TO: Mark Gearan	(GEARAN_M)
ATT TO: Ernest D. Gibble	(GIBBLE_E)
ATT TO: Jonathan P. Gill	(GILL_J)
ATT TO: Marcia L. Hale	(HALE_M)
ATT TO: Alexis Herman	(HERMAN_A)
ATT TO: Steven M. Hilton	(HILTON_S)
ATT TO: Dwight Holton	(HOLTON_D)
ATT TO: Julie Hopper	(HOPPER_J)
ATT TO: Kimberly S. Hopper	(HOPPER_K)
ATT TO: Sharon Kennedy	(KENNEDY_SM)
ATT TO: FAX (93952560,Kristie Kenney)	(TLXA1MAIL_F:93952560\C:Kristie Kenney
ATT TO: David Leavy	(LEAVY_D)
ATT TO: Carola McGiffert	(MCGIFFERT_C)
ATT TO: Regina T. Montoya	(MONTOYA_R)

ATT TO: Lisa Mortman	(MORTMAN_L)
ATT TO: Dee Dee Myers	(MYERS_D)
ATT TO: Kathleen L. O'Neill	(ONEILL_K)
ATT TO: R. Paul Richard	(RICHARD_R)
ATT TO: John Podesta	(PODESTA_J)
ATT TO: Meeghan E. Prunty	(PRUNTY_M)
ATT TO: Bruce Reed	(REED_B)
ATT TO: Marla Romash	(ROMASH_M)
ATT TO: Ricki Seidman	(SEIDMAN_R)
ATT TO: David Seldin	(SELDIN_D)
ATT TO: Stephen B. Silverman	(SILVERMAN_S)
ATT TO: Patti Solis	(SOLIS_P)
ATT TO: Jason M. Solomon	(SOLOMON_J)
ATT TO: Gene Sperling	(SPERLING_G)
ATT TO: Todd Stern	(STERN_T)
ATT TO: Richard Strauss	(STRAUSS_R)
ATT TO: Stephanie Streett	(STREETT_S)
ATT TO: Kimberly Tilley	(TILLEY_K)
ATT TO: Maria M. Tio	(TIO_M)
ATT TO: Stuart E. Trevelyan	(TREVELYAN_S)
ATT TO: Christine A. Varney	(VARNEY_C)
ATT TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez	(RIVASVAZQU_A)
ATT TO: Lorraine A. Voles	(VOLES_L)
ATT TO: Michael Waldman	(WALDMAN_M)
ATT TO: Ann F. Walker	(WALKER_A)
ATT TO: Anne Walley	(WALLEY_A)
ATT TO: Carter Wilkie	(WILKIE_C)

ATT TO: Marilyn Yager	(YAGER_M)
ATT TO: Kathy McKiernan	(MCKIERNAN_K)
ATT TO: David B. Anderson	(ANDERSON_D)
ATT TO: Jess Sarmiento	(SARMIENTO_J)
ATT TO: Andre C. Oliver	(OLIVER_A)
ATT TO: Kelly A. Crawford	(CRAWFORD_K)
ATT TO: Deborah L. Coyle	(COYLE_D)
ATT TO: Betty W Currie	(CURRIE_B)
ATT TO: Erich Vaden	(VADEN_E)
ATT TO: Payne, Julia M	(Julia M. Payne@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: Carver, Holly D	(Holly D. Carver@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: Alpert, Dennis W	(Dennis W. Alpert@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: Wilson, Anthony T	(Anthony T. Wilson@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: Jack Quinn	(QUINN_J)
ATT TO: Harris, Skila S	(Skila S. Harris@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: Gire, Cynthia L	(Cynthia L. Gire@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: Aman, Sally J	(Sally J. Aman@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: Amanda Crumley	(CRUMLEY_A)
ATT TO: Jonathan M. Prince	(PRINCE_J)
ATT TO: Jennifer A. Allan	(ALLAN_J)
ATT TO: Cathy R. Mays	(MAYS_C)
ATT TO: Carol H. Rasco	(RASCO_C)
ATT TO: Mark D. Gearan	(GEARAN_M)
ATT TO: George Stephanopoulos	(STEPHANOPO_G)
ATT TO: David M. Kusnet	(KUSNET_D)
ATT TO: David Dreyer	(DREYER_D)
ATT TO: Andre C. Oliver	(OLIVER_A)

ATT TO: Alan J. Stone (STONE_A)
ATT TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C)
ATT TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A)
ATT TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D)
ATT TO: FAX (93956947,Tom O'Donnell) (TLXA1MAIL_\\F:93956947\\C:Tom O'Donnell
ATT TO: Julie A. Watson (WATSON_JA)
ATT TO: Ilizabetch S. Gonchar (GONCHAR_I)
ATT TO: Amanda Crumley (CRUMLEY_A)
ATT TO: Andre C. Oliver (OLIVER_A)
ATT TO: Kathleen M. Neugold (NEUGOLD_K)
ATT TO: Linda L. Moore (MOORE_L)
ATT TO: Thomas S. Epstein (EPSTEIN_T)
ATT TO: Ronald D. Lewis at PROFS (PR_U=RLEWIS@PR_L=CPUB@MRP@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: Gloria P. Johnson (JOHNSON_GP)
ATT TO: Dianna A. Pierce (PIERCE_D)
ATT TO: David R. Gergen (GERGEN_D)
ATT TO: Mitchell S. Warren (WARREN_M)
ATT TO: Jason S. Goldberg (GOLDBERG_JS)

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN
NEWS CALENDARWEEKLY EDITION

March 25, 1995

The information below is tentative and issued only for internal planning purposes:

SAT

3/25 POTUS: Gridiron Dinner; Live Radio Address (T)

VPOTUS & Mrs. Gore: Mtg w/ EC Pres. Santer-Brussels; Gridiron Dinner

FLOTUS: Gridiron Dinner; Depart to Islamabad, Pakistan

EVENTS: US-North Korea talks-Berlin; Mike Tyson to be released from prison;

Evacuation of UNOSOM troops from Mogadishu to start;

QEII and Duke of Edinburgh to visit South Africa; Zhirinovsky to Libya

ANNIVERSARIES: Churchill Entering Germany (50th); 1st of Hebron massacre

SUN

3/26 FLOTUS: Travel to Pakistan

VPOTUS & Mrs. Gore: Dinner w/ King Hussein/Queen Noor Homeless Event;

EVENTS: Date for entry into effect of Schengen accord in West. Europe;

African foreign ministers discuss economic plight of the continent;

Bangladesh celebrates Independence Day; Shabazz trial to begin;

Local elections in Moldova's Dnestr republic; Alan Keyes to announce candidacy;
Start of two-week Nat'l Cherry Blossom Festival celebrating US-Japanese friendship;
Senate Agri. Comm. hearing on the 1995 Farm Bill

MON

3/27 POTUS: Mtg w/ Bolger of New Zealand; Nat'l Assoc of AG's at WH; ReGo Event;
Tea w/ King Hussein and Queen Noor
VPOTUS: PM Bolger of New Zealand; DNC Fundraiser-DC; Status Reports Mtg;
ReGo Event
FLOTUS: Pakistan
EVENTS: Economic Summit; 67th Academy Awards ceremony;
Israeli and Arab naval forces to plan their first joint maneuvers near the Tunisian coast;
House begins debate on Term Limits bill; Queen Beatrix of Holland to visit Israel;
EU social affairs ministers mtg; EU farm ministers mtg; Pan American Games end;
Sec. of Commerce Brown returns from telecomm. summit in Latin America

TUES

3/28 POTUS: Nat'l Assoc. of Atty Generals Reptn, WH(T); Travel to North Carolina
VPOTUS: Cap. Hill Lunch
FLOTUS: Travel to India-'til Mar. 30
EVENTS: Economic Summit; UN Global Climate Protection Conference-Berlin; Scheduled
vote on Term Limits;
Russ. For. Minister Kozyrev to visit Egypt, Syria, Lebanon and Israel;

WED

3/29 POTUS: Regional Econ. Conf.-Atlanta, Georgia
VPOTUS: Reg'l Econ. Conf.
EVENTS: Awarding of Lemelson-MIT Prize, the world's largest prize for inventors;
Polish Pres. Walesa to Sweden; King of Spain to Beijing;
Israeli conference on diplomacy-Over 50 for. ministers to attend
Sec. Christopher to speak on US policy towards Russia-Indiana;
Former ruling party chairman Kim Jong-pil to inaugurate new polit. party-Seoul;

THUR

3/30 POTUS: Address to joint session of the Florida Legislature-Tallahassee
VPOTUS: Sci/Tech Speech
FLOTUS: Visit to Taj Mahal and Katmandu
EVENTS: Sen. Arlen Specter to announce bid for GOP presidential nomination;
EU conference on social policy

FRI

3/31 POTUS: Travel to Haiti
FLOTUS: Trip to Nepal
EVENTS: Mandate expires for UN peacekeepers in Croatia;
Nat'l Trade Estimate Report goes to Congress;
Sec. Perry to Ukraine, Russia, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan;
Ruling on "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" lawsuit challenging Clinton admin. policy-NYC
4th in a series of hearings on the 1995 Farm Bill in the Senate;
Date set for complete withdrawal of UN forces from Somalia
BIRTHDAY: Vice-President Gore (47th)

APRIL

SAT

4/1 April Fool's Day
Alcohol Awareness Month

Cancer Control Month
POTUS: Travel to Arkansas
FLOTUS: Nepal
Mrs. Gore: Visit to Minnesota
EVENTS: Effective date for elimination of some Amtrak routes;
US and Kuwaiti forces to begin Intrinsic Action 95-2 to test rapid response capab.;
Nat'l start date for Liberian disarmament; NCAA Women's Final Four;
Sen. Arlen Specter to announce
ANNIVERSARIES: 50th of the Beginning of the Battle of Okinawa

SUN

4/2 POTUS: Arkansas
FLOTUS: Bangladesh
Mrs. Gore: Minnesota
EVENTS: Daylight Savings; Opening day for baseball;
Pres. Suharto of Indonesia to visit Germany;
Annual Nat'l Managed Health Care Congress-DC

MON

4/3 POTUS: Arkansas
FLOTUS: Bangladesh
EVENTS: Europ. Parliament plenary session;
Spring session opens for French Parliament; EU culture and audiovisual ministers meet;
Verdict expected in trial of Guenter Parche for stabbing Monica Seles

TUES

4/4 POTUS: Mtg w/ PM Major of the U.K.; Kennedy FR-VA
VPOTUS: Comm-Tech Bkfst; Staff Mtg; Cap. Hill Lunch; Major/Renwick Bkfst Visit
FLOTUS: Bangladesh/ Sri Lanka
Mrs. Gore: NYC for WLF Event
ANNIVERSARIES: Assassination of MLK (1968)
EVENTS: American Society Newspaper Editors Convention-Dallas, TX (T)-thru Apr. 7;
Last hearing of Senate Agri. Committee on '95 Farm Bill;
Last day for candidates to declare intention to run in French presidential election;
German President Roman Herzog to visit Pakistan; Chicago mayoral election
Nat'l Trans. Safety Board to discuss probable cause of USAir crash in NC

WED

4/5 POTUS: Mtg w/ Mubarak of Egypt
VPOTUS: Mtg w/ Mubarak of Egypt; Rego B-fast
FLOTUS: Sri Lanka
EVENTS: Swedish PM to visit Baltic states

THUR

4/6 POTUS: ReGo Event;
VPOTUS: Enviro Bkfst; Reg. Review Speech; Lunch w/ Potus; Reg. Reform Mtg
FLOTUS: Returns from South Asia
ANNIVERSARIES: 1st of start of genocide in Rwanda

FRI

4/7 FLOTUS: Trip to California
EVENTS: Informal mtg of EU finance ministers

SAT

4/8 POTUS & FLOTUS: California Fundraiser
VPOTUS: Ohio Democratic Dinner
FLOTUS: DNC Fundraiser

EVENTS: Commemoration of Buchenwald liberation-Weimar, Germany

SUN

4/9 Palm Sunday

EVENTS: General elections in Peru; NOW plans "Rally for Women's Lives"-DC;

Wide-ranging local elections in Japan;

Chad's 1st multi-party presidential and parliamentary elections

ANNIVERSARIES: 130th of the ending of Civil War; 50th of liberation of Buchenwald

MON

4/10 POTUS: Diplomatic Corps Reception(T)

VPOTUS: Diplomatic Corps Reception

EVENTS: Senate Maj. Ldr Dole to announce presidential candidacy;

EU foreign ministers mtg

TUES

4/11 POTUS: Mtg w/ PM Bhutto of Pakistan (T)

VPOTUS: Mtg w/ PM Bhutto (T)

ANNIVERSARIES: 50th of liberation of V2 plant in Mittelbau Dora,Germany

WED

4/12 POTUS: PA State Day Reception @WH

VPOTUS: MEG-TN Rego Bkfst; PA State Day Reception

FLOTUS: State Day Reception

EVENTS: PM Bhutto of Pakistan to address Los Angeles World Affairs Council

ANNIVERSARIES: 50th of the death of FDR

THUR

4/13 POTUS: Mtg w/ Cardoso of Brazil

VPOTUS: Enviro Bkfst; GLOBE Mtg

FLOTUS: Mother of the Year Award-NY

ANNIVERSARIES: 252nd of Thomas Jefferson's Birthday;

50th of the liberation of Vienna by the Russian army

EVENTS: UN Sec. Boutros-Ghali to address LA World Affairs Council

FRI

4/14 Good Friday

Passover begins

ANNIVERSARIES: 130th of the assassination of Abraham Lincoln

SAT

4/15 100th Day of Contract with America

FLOTUS: Mother of the Year Award-NY

EVENTS: Deadline for filing of US income taxes

ANNIVERSARIES: 50th of liberation of Nazi camp at Bergen-Belsen

SUN

4/16 EASTER

EVENTS: Nat'l Preschool Immunization Week; Rep. Dornan to announce candidacy

MON

4/17 EVENTS: WH Easter Egg Roll; Income tax return deadline;

Pulitzer Prize winners to be announced

ANNIVERSARIES: Gore Seniors' Anniversary

TUES

4/18 VPOTUS: Comm-Tech Bkfst; Reg. Reform Mtg

EVENTS:

WED

4/19 POTUS: Mtg w/ Cardoso of Brazil

VPOTUS: UN/NPT-NY; Rego Reform Bkfst
EVENTS: Sen. Lugar-IN to announce candidacy

THUR

4/20 VPOTUS: Enviro Bkfst; Lunch w/ Potus; Mtg w/ Cardoso of Brazil
FLOTUS: State Visit and Dinner-Brazil
Mrs. Gore: Brazil State Visit

FRI

4/21 VPOTUS: Enviro-Science Bkfst
ANNIVERSARIES: 50th of liberations of Ravensbrueck and Sachsenhausen camps

SAT

4/22 25th Earth Day
EVENTS: NFL Draft

SUN

4/23 EVENTS: 1995 Environmental Conf. in DC (thru 4/25); Nat'l Volunteer Week;
Nat'l Crime Victims' Rights Week (T); 1st stage of French pres. election;
Additional local elections for mayors and council members in Japan

MON

4/24 POTUS: NY State Day Reception @ WH
VPOTUS: State Day Reception
FLOTUS: State Day Reception
EVENTS: EC Pres. Santer and Trade Comm. Brittan meet Hong Kong Chief Sec. Chan
ANNIVERSARIES: 195th of Congressional Act Establishing Library of Congress

TUES

4/25 VPOTUS: Comm-Tech Bkfst; Reg. Reform Mtg; DLC FR-FL
FLOTUS: NY Univ. Law School (T)
EVENTS: US Supreme Court to hear gay discrimination case
ANNIVERSARIES: 50th of last allied bombing of Germany;
50th of Russian and US forces meeting at Torgau on the Elbe

WED

4/26 VPOTUS: Cap. Hill Lunch; MEG-TN Rego Bkfst; DLC FR-FL

THUR

4/27 POTUS: WH Craft Fair
VPOTUS: Enviro Bkfst; GLOBE Mtg; Lunch w/ Potus
EVENTS: Mtg of RNC state chairmen;
Main ceremony by German Jewish community ends anniv. liberation events

FRI

4/28 VPOTUS: Travel to Tennessee-'til Apr. 29
FLOTUS: Take Our Daughters to Work Day
EVENTS: Rescheduled sentencing of Webster Hubbell

SAT

4/29 VPOTUS: WH Correspondents Dinner;
FLOTUS: WH Correspondents Dinner
Mrs. Gore: WH Correspondents Dinner
EVENTS: UN international conf. on crime prevention and treatment of offenders;
Sen. Lugar to announce his candidacy for the Repub. pres. nomination
ANNIVERSARIES: 50th of liberation of Dachau

SUN

4/30 EVENTS: Jewish Heritage Week; Commemorations of Dachau;

Title VII decision on watchlisting Japan for computer procurement comes due

ANNIVERSARIES: 20th of end of Vietnam War; 50th of Hitler's suicide

MAY

MON

5/1 May Day

EVENTS: Older Americans Month; Four-month Bosnian truce expires;

Rescheduled date for Qubilah Shabazz trial

TUES

5/2 VPOTUS: Comm-Tech Bkfst; Staff Mtg; Cap. Hill Lunch

FLOTUS: State Day Rcptn

EVENTS: South Asian annual seven-nation summit

ANNIVERSARIES: 50th of Soviet army taking Berlin

WED

5/3 FLOTUS: Covenant House

Mrs. Gore: Race for the Cure Health Fare-DC

THUR

5/4 POTUS: PM Klaus of Czech Repub.

VPOTUS: Enviro Bkfst; Lunch w/ Potus; PM Klaus of Czech Repub.

EVENTS: Nat'l Day of Prayer (T);

Trade ministers from world's largest trading nations to meet-Whistler, Brit. Columbia

FRI

5/5 Cinco de Mayo

FLOTUS: Dimcock Comm. Ctr-Boston (T)

Mrs. Gore: WH Fellows Alumni Event

SAT

5/6 FLOTUS: V-E Day Party

EVENTS: 121st running of the Kentucky Derby; America's Cup race series begins

SUN

5/7 EVENTS: 2nd stage of French presidential election;

Ceremonies marking the anniversary of Germany's surrender-Berlin

MON

5/8 POTUS: Ceremony at Nat'l Cemetery

VPOTUS: Const. Rights Found. Dinner-LA; Represents US in ceremonies in Europe

EVENTS: Former First Lady Imelda Marcos and son to run in congressional election;

Celebrations in Moscow to mark end of WWII-Potus invited to attend;

Ceremony in Berlin marking 50th anniv. of war's end

ANNIVERSARIES: 50th of V-E Day

TUES

5/9 POTUS: Visit to Moscow to participate in WWII commemorative ceremonies

VPOTUS: Comm-Tech Bkfst

FLOTUS: Senate Spouses Dinner

Mrs. Gore: Senate Ladies Luncheon for the First Lady

WED

5/10 VPOTUS: Cap. Hill Lunch

ANNIVERSARIES: 1st of Inauguration of Mandela

THUR

5/11 VPOTUS: Enviro Bkfst; GLOBE Mtg; Lunch w/ Potus; Arts Reception

FLOTUS: Arts & Embassies

Mrs. Gore: Arts & Embassies

FRI

5/12 VPOTUS: Enviro-Science Bkfst

EVENTS: UN Secur. Council holds regular review of Iraq sanctions

SAT

5/13 EVENTS: Candlelight vigil to commemorate officers killed in the line of duty

SUN

5/14 Mother's Day

EVENTS: Argentinian presidential election

MON

5/15 EVENTS: Cannes Int'l Film Festival

TUES

5/16

WED

5/17 FLOTUS: Cong. Club Luncheon; State Day Reptn

Mrs. Gore: Cong. Club Luncheon

THUR

5/18 POTUS: US Conf. on trade and investment in Ireland

FRI

5/19

SAT

5/20 ANNIVERSARIES: 2nd of Motor Voter Bill

SUN

5/21 EVENTS: NBA Lottery to be held

Mitterand's term formally expires

MON

5/22 EVENTS: The Pope to visit Poland

FRI

5/26 EVENTS: Commonwealth of Independent States summit

SUN

5/28 EVENTS: Nationwide municipal elections

MON

5/29 MEMORIAL DAY

JUNE

SUN

6/4 EVENTS: 1st round of voting in Haitian general elections

TUES

6/6 POTUS: Mtg w/ PM Horn of Hungary

WED

6/7 ANNIVERSARIES: 30th of Griswold v. Connecticut

THUR

6/8 ANNIVERSARIES: 70th of Gitlow v. New York (1st Amendment applicable to States)

FRI

6/9 EVENTS: US Conf. of Mayors opens (thru 6/11); Wisconsin straw poll ('til 6/11)

SAT

6/10 EVENTS: League of Women Voters Council-DC

SUN

6/11 White House Nat'l Conf. on Small Business (thru 6/15)

FRI

6/16 EVENTS: Virginia straw poll ('til 6/18)

SUN

6/18 Father's Day

MON

6/19 EVENTS: OPEC Meeting in Vienna

SUN

6/25 ANNIVERSARIES: 50th of UN-celebration in San Francisco

JULY

SAT

7/1 EVENTS: Opening of 1995 Special Olympics World Games;
Target date set by Israel and the PLO on Israeli troop withdrawal in West Bank;
Start of the Tour de France

SUN

7/2 Nat'l Literacy Day

TUES

7/4 INDEPENDENCE DAY

MON

7/24 EVENTS: US to host 1st mtg of West. Hemisphere defense ministers-Williamsburg, VA

7/25 Anniversary of Israeli-Palestinian Peace Accord

SAT

7/29 EVENTS: National Governors Association Annual Mtg-Burlington, VT (thru 8/1)

AUGUST

8/2 ANNIVERSARIES: 5th of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait

8/6 ANNIVERSARIES: 30th of signing of 1965 Voting Rights Act;
50th of the Enola Gay bombing on Hiroshima

8/10

2nd Anniversary of Signing of Economic Package

2nd Anniversary of Student Loan Reform Act

AUG. 13

Family Week

8/18 EVENTS: Iowa straw poll

ANNIVERSARIES: 75th of 19th Amendment

8/20

37th Internat'l Congress on Alcohol and Drug Dependence in San Diego (thru 8/25)

8/26

Women's Equality Day

8/27

32nd Anniversary of the March on Washington

SEPTEMBER

SAT

9/2 POTUS: Clinton to attend ceremony on the end of WWII-Pearl Harbor (T)

SEPT. 4

Labor Day

8/7 ANNIVERSARIES: 1st of signing of Crime Bill

WED

9/13 ANNIVERSARIES: 2nd of the signing of the Israeli-PLO Mideast peace accord

SEPT. 15

Nat'l Hispanic Heritage Month

SEPT. 17

Citizenship Day

Constitution Week

SEPT. 19

Nat'l Historically Black Colleges / Universities Week

SEPT. 21

2nd Anniversary of Signing of National Service Act

SEPT. 24

Rosh Hashanah begins at sundown

SEPT. 30

4th Anniversary of the Haitian Military's overthrow of Aristide

OCTOBER

OCT. 1

Minority Enterprise Development Week

AIDS Awareness Month

OCT. 2

Child Health Day

Supreme Court begins its 1995

-1996 term

OCT. 3

Yom Kippur begins at sundown

Fourth anniversary of German unification

OCT. 7

First Anniversary of US Troops Arrival in Kuwait

OCT. 9

Columbus Day is observed

OCT. 15

Anniversary of Aristide's Return to Haiti

10/19 EVENTS: Nevada straw poll ('til 10/23)

OCT. 23

United Nations Day is observed

OCT. 26

Anniversary of Israeli-Jordan Peace Accord

OCT. 31

Halloween

Nat'l UNICEF Day

NOVEMBER

11/4 Maine straw poll

NOV. 11

Veteran's Day

NOV. 12

American Education Week

NOV. 16

Anniversary of Ukrainian Parliament's Passage of Arms Agreement

11/17 EVENTS: Florida straw poll ('til 11/18)

NOV. 19

Nat'l Adoption Week

NOV. 22

32nd Anniversary of JFK's Assassination

NOV. 23

Thanksgiving

NOV. 30

2nd Anniversary of Brady Law

31st Anniversary of 1964 Civil Rights Bill

DECEMBER

DEC. 1

World AIDS Day

DEC. 5

40th Anniversary of Montgomery Bus Boycott

40th Anniversary of AFL-CIO

DEC. 8

2nd Anniversary of NAFTA Signing

DEC. 12

125th Anniversary of First Black to Serve in House

DEC. 18

130th Anniversary of 13th Amendment

DEC. 25

Christmas

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====