

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Tampa, Florida)

For Immediate Release

March 30, 1995

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN ADDRESS TO THE FACULTY AND STUDENTS
OF HILLSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Gymnasium
Hillsborough Community College
Tampa, Florida

2:34 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Bill Lanthrop, for that introduction. Thank you, President Poloumpis and thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for making me feel so very, very welcome here today. (Applause.) I also want to thank those of you who brought the little children here; it's wonderful to see them -- that little girl back there in her green dress, and that little girl there, this young man there; he looks great -- thank you. (Applause.)

I want to thank some of my partners in trying to make your future better who are here with me -- your Governor and Lieutenant Governor, Lawton Chiles and Buddy McKay -- (applause) -- I thank my friend, Congressman Gibbons, for being here. The Speaker of the House, Peter Wallace, and your representative, the Majority Leader of the House, Jim Davis. I thank them all for being here. (Applause.)

I also want to say that I almost got here in time, I got here a day ahead of the new mayor's inauguration, so I want to thank on the next to the last day of her tenure, my longtime friend, your Mayor, Sandy Friedman, for doing such a good job for Tampa. (Applause.) And I want to wish your new Mayor, Dick Greco, all the best, and I look forward to working with you. (Applause.)

Ladies and gentlemen, if I could start on a more serious note, I just had the opportunity to meet at the airport with the families of the two Tampa police officers, Mike Vigil and Kevin Howell, who were shot and wounded last week. (Applause.) I also had the opportunity to meet an HCC student, Mike Meyer, who saved one of those officer's lives, because he's a certified emergency medical technician. (Applause.) He told the police he was a paramedic, and they brought him there, he grabbed his bag and rushed to the fallen officers, and he did a very fine job. And I had a chance to thank him for that, and it's an encouragement to all of us to learn some of

the skills that he knows. You never can tell when you will need them.

I understand that Officer Vigil remains in critical but stable condition, but I was just informed by his family that the doctors say his chances are now better than 50-50 that he's going to make a good recovery. (Applause.)

I am delighted to be back in Florida. I had the opportunity to spend the night at the Governor's Mansion last night and to address the Florida Legislature today about the challenges facing our country and what we're going to do about it. Today, I want to talk to you about your future. I spend a lot of time in community colleges like this one, because I think in many ways, this is the most important institution in American society as we move toward the next century. (Applause.)

With all of the challenges we face, we basically know what works. What works is, educating all of our people; what works is doing what it takes to generate more jobs; what works is bringing people together across racial and income and other lines. What works is a commitment to give more people a shot at the American Dream, to grow the middle class and to shrink the under class, and to prepare for the future. And that's what community colleges do. (Applause.)

In a very real sense, what I have been trying to do as President is to bring that spirit and those ideas into the national government. I've worked for a dozen years as a governor, in which time I had the honor and privilege to spend countless hours in educational institutions, from elementary schools to community colleges, to vocational training schools, to our four-year universities. And I found when I went to Washington that every reason that I worried about the country when I ran for president turned out to be true.

I ran because I thought this country was on the verge of a new century, dominated by the end of the Cold War, the emergence of the global economy, wealth tied more to knowledge than ever before, when we had new opportunities, but new challenges, and that Washington was in the grip of old-fashioned partisan political rhetoric, dividing us when we needed to be united, holding us back when we needed to go forward. (Applause.)

Now, we are now all engaged in a great debate which you hear every day on the news as you watch events unfold about what your government should be doing at this moment. The old view was that there was a government solution in Washington for every big problem in the country, and that government could actually help people with big problems. Well, we know that that's not exactly right; they're not one-size-fits-all, government knows best, out of Washington. And we know that there are great limits on how much government can help people to fulfill their abilities.

The new rage is to say that the government is the cause

of all of our problems, and if only we had no government, we'd have no problems. I can tell you, that contradicts evidence, history and common sense. (Applause.) Now, the truth is -- so the question is, what are we going to do? I can tell you what my view is, and it is different from either extreme. I believe we need a government that doesn't pretend to be a savior, but that doesn't sit on the sidelines. I believe in a partnership. I believe that the national government's mission at the end of this century is as follows: Number one, we ought to be creating opportunity and demanding responsibility. (Applause.)

Number two, I think we ought to be doing everything we can to empower the American people through education for a lifetime to make the most of their own lives. (Applause.) Number three, I believe we ought to be enhancing the security of the American people, not only by making the world a safer place, but by making our streets and our schools and our homes and our work places safer places. (Applause.)

And, number four, I think we have got to dramatically change the national government to make it smaller, less bureaucratic, less meddlesome, but still helpful to move this country forward. (Applause.) Now, if you look at the record in creating opportunity, we have brought down the deficit, we have expanded trade, we have increased our investments in new technology, and in the last two years our nation has produced over six million new jobs, the unemployment rate in Florida has dropped three percent from 7.4 to 4.3 percent. (Applause.) We are clearly moving forward and creating more opportunity.

If you look at the empowerment issue, we have increased investments in education, everything from expanding Head Start to expanding the efforts of states to make apprenticeships for people that don't go to college to dramatically -- and I mean dramatically -- increasing the availability of scholarship for middle class people to get a higher education. (Applause.)

If you ask: Well, what have we done on security? Well, look around the world. We are making progress in troublesome areas of the world, like the Middle East, in bringing peace in Northern Ireland. We have made agreements with Russia and with other countries in the former Soviet Union to drastically reduce the number of nuclear weapons. And for the first time since the dawn of the Nuclear Age, there are no nuclear missiles pointed at the children of the United States of America. (Applause.)

Now, if you ask what have we done to reduce the size of government -- and I want to compliment Governor Chiles for his leadership in this -- Florida is one of the -- really, the ground-breaking state in America, I think, in slashing unnecessary regulation. And I congratulate him on that. (Applause.)

What are we doing in Washington? Well, we've reduced the size of the federal bureaucracy by 100,000. We're going to

reduce it by 270,000 over five years. It'll be the smallest federal government since John Kennedy was President of the United States. (Applause.)

We have reduced the government deficit so much that if it weren't for interest on the debt, incurred in the 12 years before I showed up, we'd have a surplus today, not a deficit, in the government account. (Applause.) We're paying our operating bills. We're now giving government regulators the authority not to fine people the first time they make a mistake.

And Carol Browner, from Florida, who's the head of the EPA, has opened up an office in which people -- good, honest business people can go, and say look, I'm afraid I'm in violation of some environmental law. And instead of getting a fine, they'll get six months to fix it.

We have changed the rules so that now if somebody makes a mistake in good faith, our federal agencies have the right not to fine people, but to say, you keep the fine if you'll spend it in fixing the problem. Making the work place safer. Making the environment cleaner. (Applause.)

So we are moving forward. With this new Congress, we are finding some areas of agreement that are quite important. I signed a law that I campaigned for President to support that applies to Congress -- all the laws they put on the private sector -- I think it's high time. (Applause.)

I signed a law the other day which limits the ability of the Congress to impose on state governments and local governments, so-called "unfunded mandates," requiring them to raise your taxes because of -- some people in Washington want, instead of what you decided the mayor should do, or the governor and the state legislature should do. And it's high time. (Applause.)

And we're about to get agreement -- we passed a line-item veto, which most governors have, which allows a president to go into a big bill where a lot of pork barrel spending might be hidden with a lot of good things, so you can't afford to veto the bill and find the pork. And we're going to get that passed soon. And that's a good thing. (Applause.)

But there still are some disagreements. And the American people, without regard to their party, will have to be heard on these disagreements. Because you have to decide what you think the main mission of our country is. Is the main mission to make sure there is no federal government, or is the main mission to grow the middle class, shrink the underclass and support family and community and the future of this country. I think that -- (applause) -- is what the main mission of this country is. (Applause.)

And let me give you some ideas. With all the cutting of the budget we have done -- and last year, I gave the Congress the

first budget in 25 years that cut defense and domestic spending together. Only medical costs went up because of inflation. Everything else was cut. But I did not cut within that education. We increased our investment in education. Why? Because -- look around you. It is the future of America. (Applause.)

So are we going to grow the middle class, shrink the underclass and be a safer country if more poor little kids go through Head Start? I think we are. (Applause.) Are we going to grow the middle class if more kids who get out of high school but don't want to go college, at least get two years of some kind of training afterward in a community college -- that type of thing? I think we are. (Applause.) Will we be growing the middle class and shrinking the underclass if every person who wants to go to college can get a college loan at a lower cost and a better repayment schedule? (Applause.) I think we are. (Applause.)

So this is a big decision we have to make in Washington. Let me give you a clear, explicit example. I recommended that we could save some money and do a better job by our young people, if we changed the college loan program because it was a big bureaucracy. You know it was a guarantee, so the government would guarantee a loan a bank would give you. The bank charges a fee, then if somebody doesn't pay it back, the bank gets 90 percent of the money from the government. So they never sue, because the lawyer fee would cost more than 10 percent. Right? We were spending, when I became President, \$1.8 -- \$2.8 billion a year of your money for delinquent loans, because people weren't paying their student loans.

Colleges and universities were complaining all over America that the paperwork was driving them bananas -- to process the student loans. The students were complaining that they couldn't get the loans in a hurry. And then when they had to repay them on a 10-year schedule, if you borrowed a whole bunch of money, you couldn't take a job that you might want if it has a salary so low you could never make your loan repayment. And it didn't just apply to people in what you call public service jobs.

Yesterday in Atlanta, I had an economic forum and I had two married medical students -- a husband and wife from the University of Florida, come and testify. They are fourth-year medical students. They will owe \$140,000 when they get out of medical school. You say well, doctors make a lot of money. They do, but not when they're residents. Right? They were going to literally have to spend one-half of their income, combined, paying off their students loans, while they're residents working 60-70-80 hours a week. Under our plan, they can pay it off as a percentage of their income. So when they start making money, they pay more. But now they get to make a living and work and become doctors. (Applause.) It's a better system. (Applause.)

So how does this affect you? Today, 40 percent of American institutions are eligible to participate in that. What I said is, let's let everybody participate. We'll cut the fraud

rate -- we've already taken it from \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion a year. We've cut the fraud by nearly two-thirds. We'll cut the cost of the program. We'll loan more money to more students. We'll be less trouble to the institutions of higher education, and the deficit will go down because we'll save \$6 billion. That was my proposal. (Applause.)

Now, here is the other proposal in the Congress. The other proposal is leave the banks with the money, cap the number of colleges that can participate at 40 percent and instead, make students start paying interest on their loans while they're in college -- add \$2 billion a year to the cost of college.

AUDIENCE: Nooooo.

THE PRESIDENT: To me, I don't think you have to be Einstein to conclude that does not make sense. Let's stay with our program, let's save money and educate people and not go back to charging people more for student loans. (Applause.)

Let me tell you something else. There's a lot of talk about tax cuts in Washington today. There is a limit to how much we can cut taxes because the deficit's big. We need to keep bringing the deficit down. But I believe we should have a modest tax cut for middle class people targeted to raising incomes and increasing the wealth of the country over the long run. Don't just write people a check, give people who are playing by the rules some incentives to do more. That's why my bill says let's give people a tax deduction for the cost of education after high school. Get more people to get educated and do that. Why? (Applause.) Why? Because it's just like the G.I. Bill after World War II -- everybody who goes to school is going to make a higher income and pay more taxes and run the deficit down and run the wealth of the country up. And if we keep it disciplined and small, we can afford it.

But we can't afford just to go out here with these tax cuts with a deficit of the country as big as it is. The reason the Florida economy dropped in unemployment by three percent is that we brought the deficit down and increased our investment and expanded trade. So we got interest rates down and business opportunities up and generated more jobs. The most important thing is to keep the American people working and get their incomes up. And that's what we have to do. (Applause.)

Now, you will see these debates over and over and over again. I want to mention two more, because they affect you. We're having a big argument about what to do about crime. Well, we finally passed a tough Crime Bill last year; your Mayor helped us pass it, your Governor, your Attorney General, your law enforcement official helped us pass it. (Applause.)

And what that Crime Bill does is to -- it says, first of all, it was virtually written by law enforcement officials. It says that we should have the national government do three things to help

bring the crime rate down. Help the states build more prisons so we don't let dangerous criminals out too soon -- (applause) -- help local communities give kids something to say yes to and not just something to say no to, so we prevent crime and keep people out of trouble. (Applause.) And have a 20 percent increase in the police forces of the country so we can catch criminals and prevent crime. Those are the three things we did.

Now, the Congress has proposed to reduce the amount of money we're spending on the Crime Bill, but require the states to spend more on prisons and spend less on police and prevention, and tell the communities do whatever you want to with the money. And I'm opposed to that, and I want you to know why. Violent crime has tripled in the last 30 years, and we have to do something about it. All kinds of violent crime. I just announced last week that the former Attorney General of Iowa, Bonnie Campbell, is going to head the first-ever division of the Justice Department on Domestic Violence -- violence against parents and children. We have to do something about this.

Now, in 30 years, violent crime triples, but the police forces of the country increased by only 10 percent. You don't have to be a genius to figure out that there's some connection between a huge increase in crime and nearly no increase in the police force. How are they supposed to do what they're doing? Not to mention how much better armed the criminals have become. Right? Which is part of the problem with these fine police officers.

Now, we know, also, that one of the good news stories that often does not get told in this country is -- I have seen this with my own eyes -- there's city after city after city where the crime rate has gone down because of strategies that have been adopted like some of the strategies adopted right here in Tampa. When you put people out and you deploy police in the proper way, and they work with people in the community, they not only catch criminals quicker, but they also deter crime. I have seen it all across America. This is a good deal. Florida has already been awarded funds for more than 960 police officers, 18 of them right here in Tampa. We don't need to tamper with the Crime Bill; we ought to stay with it and implement it. (Applause.)

I'm just going to give you one last example, because we have to decide what kind of country we're going to be and what we're going to do together. These young people that were introduced over here, the AmeriCorps volunteers -- and they clapped and I was glad to see them -- they're part of our national service program. It's a program basically to bring the idea of the Peace Corps to the streets of America. It's a program designed to say, if you will work, essentially, for minimum wage for a year, we'll give you about the equivalent college education benefit of the G.I. Bill, if you'll help us to deal with our security problems here at home, help to volunteer and to rebuild America here at home. (Applause.)

Now, there are those who say, well, we can't afford

this, it's too expensive. We have 20,000 young Americans in AmeriCorps today, thousands of more who want to get in, who want to work for minimum wage and earn this education credit and build up our country. There are more people in AmeriCorps today than ever served in the Peace Corps in any single year in its history since President Kennedy started it -- (applause) -- because the American people are dying to get out there and do something to lift this country up.

Let me just give you a couple of examples. Two years ago, just 89 of our volunteers immunized 104,000 infants in poor areas in Texas. Believe me, they paid for the whole program in that one year. (Applause.) Here in Florida after the hurricane, our volunteers, working with Habitat for Humanity, built 75 homes, and they built them quicker and better because of that. (Applause.)

These AmeriCorps volunteers are from Pinellas County. They're members of three local law enforcement agencies involved in community police departments -- the Clearwater Department, the St. Petersburg Department and the County Sheriff's Office. They're working together to make what I just talked to you about, community policing, a reality, to make the streets safer. They're out there doing things that uniformed officers don't have to do that lower the crime rate and make people safer. That is what we ought to be doing. I think it is worth the investment.

I'm cutting spending as quick as I can. We've cut more spending in the last two years than had been cut in a month of Sundays, and I will cut more and I will work with the Congress to cut more. But it is not right to cut out AmeriCorps. We should be lifting up young people like this and giving them a chance to serve. (Applause.)

I want you to be a part of this. America needs to work like the community colleges work. People get in and they're just judged based on their merit, and everybody gets a fair shot. And you know if you conclude the course, you've got a good chance to get a job and a better chance to live out your dreams. That's the way this country ought to work. It ought to be flexible, unbureaucratic, changing to meet the needs of a changing society. But it requires a partnership between the public sector and the private sector. Your government in Washington -- I am doing my best to change it to make it more like this.

But we are creating opportunity. We are empowering people. We are enhancing our security. And we are downsizing this government. We are making America a better place together. And I urge you to enter this debate and tell everybody that you can. We do not need more of the old-fashioned, hot air, partisan political rhetoric. We need a strategy to move this country forward. (Applause.)

Just let me say this in closing. I got a letter the other day from a guy I went to grade school with. And he said, you know, Bill, one of the problems that you're having as President is

that you're living out your dream. But too many people our age are living with broken dreams.

I ran for this job because I wanted all the people my age to be able to live their dreams. And because I want you younger people here to be able to look forward to a life that is as full and rich as the one I've enjoyed. And those of you who are young and don't have any children yet, I want you to think about having children with an atmosphere of excitement and hope and conviction that your kids will see America's best days.

And I'm telling you, if we will keep our heads on straight and think about how we can pull together, instead of how we can be driven apart, we will do that. (Applause.)

God bless you and thank you. (Applause.)

END 3:00 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 13, 1995

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

The Washington Hilton

1:02 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Carolyn, for that warm introduction. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the wonderful welcome you have given me. I'm glad to be here on this podium with all your officers, including Mayor Lashutka of Columbus. Did I pronounce that right? Close? Lashutka.

I just had the Nebraska football team -- (applause) -- over at the White House -- lot of practice pronouncing names this morning. (Laughter.) The Nebraska football team are so big, that's the only group of people in American I could stand with and look like the resident ballet dancer. (Laughter.)

Mayor James, it's good to see you here, and all the other mayors who are here, and all of the other representatives of the cities and towns of our country.

I like to come here and meet with you because you deal with people at the level where you can have the greatest contact with them. When I was governor, nothing was more important to me than actually being able to spend a lot of time with the citizens at the grass roots community level who were interested in solving the problems of people. And I've always said that one of the things I like most about the job I used to have and one of the things I like least about the job I have now is that the closer you get to the people, the less political the work is. And the closer you get to Washington, the more political it becomes.

The most frustrating thing about being President is that I don't get enough time to speak with ordinary Americans in terms that they can understand about what we're trying to do up here. Although I must say, when I was driving up here today, I thought, these local officials may be out of touch, too -- this is the most beautiful we've had in Washington in six months. (Laughter.) And here you are listening to a politician inside -- (laughter) -- I don't know.

You have the opportunity to see people struggling to keep the American Dream alive everyday. And when you think of these issues, it must stun you at times what you hear in the news about what's going on up here, when it seems to be rhetorical. Because I know when you think of these issues you know a name, you see a face, you know a life story. That gives meanings to the problems that we are dealing with. And I think Washington has suffered grievously from losing that connection, losing that touch with the people who sent us here, and trying to communicate with people from such a long way away over the mass media through so many millions of conflicting messages with high levels of rhetoric.

I want to try to move back from that today and just to speak frankly about the choices that we face here and the choices that you face in doing your job and how we both can make the right decisions. As we stand on the edge of a new century and a new millennium, I think there are two great tasks facing America and our

MORE

generation. The first is to make sure that we enter the next century with the American Dream alive and well for all of our people -- for the middle class whose interests are so often forgotten, for those who are struggling to make it in the global economy, for all the poor people in this country who are working hard to play by the rules and to live up to their God-given capacity.

The second thing we have to do is to make sure we enter the next century making sure that America is still the strongest country on Earth, still the greatest force in the world for freedom and democracy and opportunity. There are two great threats to this endeavor. One is the stagnation of middle class economics. The other is the erosion of mainstream values.

And the third thing that I want to talk to you about is the fact that the government has often made these problems worse, not better, in the last several years. So we have to ask ourselves, what can we do to restore middle class economics, the opportunity part of the American Dream? And what can we do to restore mainstream values, the responsibility part of the American Dream? And what kind of government changes do we need here to make sure we're good partners with the American people, where you live and work.

For the last 20 years, most people have worked the same hours, or even longer hours, for the same or even lower, wages. There is a new class of permanently poor people, mostly young women and their small children. And they're growing. And the anxieties of people are pronounced, economically. Even in this time of economic recovery, people worry about downsizing everywhere and whether they really count in the workplace anymore. And there is a huge inequality growing among our workers, where those with good education and those capable of learning new skills tend to get good jobs with growing incomes and those without tend to be stuck in a rut forever.

We have all this good news. We had -- in 1993, we haven't gotten the '94 figures yet -- in '93 we had the largest number of new businesses started in the United States of America in any year in our history. (Applause.) And that's something to be proud of. (Applause.)

But we also see people struggling just to hold on and to maintain their lifestyle, even though in many families both the husband and the wife are working and having less and less time to spend with their children.

On the social front, the values we all cherish -- work and family and community -- are threatened as crime and violence and drug use rises all across America. And even when it falls, it's still too high. The rate of children that are born out of wedlock continues to go up. Our social problems, in many ways, seem more profound today than they have in a long time.

And you see the traditions of breakdown in family, community, rooted in a loss of allegiance to these mainstream values and a lack of opportunity. This is a dangerous erosion of the things that made America great and kept us strong for over 200 years.

We are now in the midst of a great debate here in Washington about what we ought to do about this. How can we make the good things more present and how can we reduce the bad things in America? How can we do the things we need to do to keep the American Dream alive and keep our country strong? How we answer these questions will say an awful lot about what kind of people we're going to be and what kind of country we're going to pass on to our children in the 21st century.

There is on one side of the debate, on the extreme, the old, and now discredited, Washington view, that a big, bureaucratic,

one-size-fits-all government can provide big solutions to all America's big problems, and maybe to some of America's not so big problems.

The other extreme is the view of the Republican Contract, that government is the source of all the problems; and if we could just get rid of it completely, or at least reduce the federal government's spending role, every problem in American would miraculously solve itself.

I have a different view, and it's probably rooted in the fact that I didn't live and work here until two years ago. My view is rooted in the fact that my experiences as a Governor of a small state are much more like yours than they are like most of the people who make most of the decisions in this community. I think we have to chart a course between and beyond the old way of big government and the new rage of no government.

No great country can survive without a national government that in the information age is more limited but is still strong and effective. We do have, after all, common problems as a people. We have common opportunities. And these require a common response. We need the government, in short, to be a partner with people in their private lives as citizens, a partner with state and local government, a partner with all of us.

I believe in a government that promotes opportunity and demands responsibility, that deals with middle class economics and mainstream values; a government that is different radically from the one we have known here over the last 30 to 40 years, but that still understands it has a role to play in order for us to build strong communities that are the bedrock of this nation.

That's what the New Covenant I talk about all the time is really all about -- more opportunity and more responsibility.

Our job is to work together to grow the middle class, to shrink the under class, to expand opportunity and to shrink bureaucracy, to empower people to make the most of their own lives. We can't give any guarantees in this rapidly changing world, but we can give people the capacity to do for themselves. And we must do that -- all of us must do it.

And finally we have to work to enhance our security on our own streets and around the world. I believe, in short, that the role of this government is to be a partner in the fight for the future, not a saviour -- it can't be that -- but not a spectator on the sidelines either. We've tried that and it didn't work out very well.

We must face the fact that we live in a certain historical period in which the economy is global, the information age means that the basis of most wealth in the future will be knowledge, and that we can be far more decentralized and flexible than we ever have been before. No one will ever again have to rely on a distant bureaucracy to solve every problem in today's rapidly changing environment.

We have to focus more on equipping people with the resources they need to tackle their own problems, and to give people the responsibility to determine how best to do that. We have to send more and more decisions back, not only to state and local government, but to citizens themselves.

We must cut spending. We must cut government. But I believe we must also invest more in jobs, incomes, technology, education and training. That's what will make us wealthy.
(Applause.)

I ran for President because I felt these challenges were not being met. Because I felt that there was no economic strategy for putting our people first. We had 12 years of trickle-down economics in which the deficit quadrupled, and our future was mortgaged. But we didn't invest in our people or our economy. We had both less opportunity and less responsibility. In Washington all I ever heard was the blame game. And it often reminded me of -- I felt often when I was out there in the country like you, like people must feel in a jury box, you know when two lawyers get in an argument with a judge over what they can say or not? All the jury wants to know is who did it. (Laughter.)

And the American people, what they want to know is, what are we going to do? And are we going to do? And so I ran for this job because I was tired of a system in which both middle class economics and mainstream values were suffering. And the government was doing well by special interest, but not the public interest. I felt very strongly that we had to do something to stop the conditions in which most Americans were living -- where people were working harder and harder and harder for less and less and less security. And I still believe that's what we ought to be about.

Now, we have begun to change all that. We have begun to change all that. And it required some pretty tough decisions, some of them were unpopular. Some of the people who made those unpopular decisions lost their seats in Congress last year, because people were told for years and years and years they could have a free lunch -- that there were no tough decisions to be made.

Everything here operated at the level of rhetoric. We got down to business. They talked about cutting the deficit; we did, by \$600 billion. (Applause.) And we did it with over a quarter of a trillion dollars in spending cuts, with income tax increases on the wealthiest 1.2 percent of our people, with discipline -- (applause) -- not, by the way, because I think that's a good thing to do, but because they were the ones best able to pay. And those were the people were benefiting most economically from the economy. (Applause.)

And at the same time, we were cutting 300 domestic programs. We were also providing tax relief for 15 million working families who were working at or near the poverty line to make sure that nobody who works 40 hours a week with children in their home should ever live in poverty. It's the biggest incentive to stay off welfare to know that if you work hard and you raise your kids, you're going to be able to make a living wage. These are the things that we worked on. (Applause.)

Now, we eliminated or consolidated or cut about 300 programs. And in this new budget that I've got -- we'll talk more about that in a minute -- we propose to eliminate or consolidate 400 more. We reduced the size of the federal work force in two years by over 100,000. And if no new laws pass -- (applause) -- thank you -- if no new laws pass, the work force will be reduced over a six-year period to its smallest size since John Kennedy was President. It will be 272,000 fewer people working here than on the day I was inaugurated President. I'm proud of that. (Applause.)

We have shifted power away from Washington to more responsibility for states and counties and cities and towns. The Vice President has lead our reinventing government initiative, which has already saved the taxpayers \$63 billion, and will save more. We've already cut regulations in banking and intrastate trucking and many other areas that make it now easier for businesses to create jobs and create opportunities. And we must do more, and we will. We've worked to hard to try to make it easier for you to do your jobs and to improve the lives of the people that we both serve.

Now, we've done a lot of other things, as well, that often get lost in the smoke around here. We passed the family leave law after six years of arguing about it. We passed the crime bill after six years of arguing about it. (Applause.) We expanded Head Start and provided for the immunization of all children under two by 1996. (Applause.) And we made lower cost, better repayment college loans available to 20 million young Americans so more people could go to college. We were busy around here in the last two years. (Applause.)

And along the way we were able to pass two major trade agreements, resolve major trade disputes with China and other countries, and expand trade by more than at any time in a generation. Very important when you consider the fact that low-cost goods from other countries come into our open markets if we have no trade agreements, but the trade agreements open markets for high value-added American goods and American services and American jobs all around the world. (Applause.)

I say this to point out how much different it is where you live than where we live. If you had done that, your voters would know it. (Laughter and applause.) Right? (Applause.) And all the naysayers said, oh, if they put this economic plan in, it'll be the worst thing that ever happened to the country; the economy will collapse immediately; everything will be terrible. Now they're all going to New Hampshire and giving the same speech all over again. (Laughter.) I heard it for two years.

You know, since no country has permanent growth, if they keep predicting a recession, eventually we'll get around to it. (Laughter.) They said, oh, this is a terrible thing. If they pass this program, oh, it's terrible. The economy will just -- it'll be terrible.

Well, what's happened in the last two years? We've got the lowest combined rate of unemployment and inflation in 25 years -- (applause) -- because we took it on. (Applause.) Over 6.1 million Americans have new jobs in the last two years. That is a good beginning. (Applause.)

Now, having said all that, let's face the facts. You live with these folks, and you know as well as I do, there are still profound problems out there. Most people still have not gotten a raise. Every year more and more people lose their health insurance even though they're in the work force. This is the only advanced country in the world that has a smaller percentage of people in the work force covered by health insurance in 1995 than had it in 1985. No other country can say that.

And we know these other problems are still with us. Half of all Americans are living on less money than they had 15 years ago. So we now have to focus not only on creating jobs, but raising incomes, and improving the security of working life and family life when people do the right thing. If we're going to strengthen the middle class and shrink the under class, we have got to do those things which will enable people to really feel the American Dream. We've got to begin by equipping people with the skills they need to compete in today's economy.

Even as we cut yesterday's government, we must invest more in the education and training of our people. (Applause.) We must. (Applause.) We must. (Applause.)

We have tried to approach that work as the partner of people at the local level. Most folks around here think last year was the best year for education legislation passing through Congress in 30 years as we expanded Head Start and provided more funds for

apprenticeships for young people who don't go onto college, and made those college loans more affordable, and wrote into federal law the Goals 2000, the world class standards for our schools.

But we changed the way we were making education law in Washington pretty dramatically. We didn't neglect our responsibilities to help create educational opportunity, but we didn't presume to tell the people at the grass roots level how to meet the standards as the government had done so much in the past. Instead, we gave to local educators and to parents the power to decide how to meet global standards of excellence.

We said, here are some things that have to be done to improve our children's education. Here are things we'd like to do to help you do it. But you decide how to do it. In many ways, in dealing more directly with city government, our empowerment zones and enterprise communities are the embodiment of that kind of approach -- to create opportunity, to shrink bureaucracy, to demand more responsibility, and then let you decide what you want to do with it and how you can best create jobs and opportunities.

We said to distressed communities, give us a comprehensive plan to create jobs, to revitalize neighborhoods, to bring the community together, to involve the private sector. Find the solutions together. The opportunity you get will be some cash money and tax incentives to encourage investment and resources to deal with other problems, like transportation or safety. And we'll cut the red tape so you can apply those resources as you see fit. This is a partnership between government, the private sector and communities to encourage investment, to create jobs in places where too many people have been left completely behind.

If you think about it, our country has had major initiatives in the last several years to invest in Latin America, to invest in the Caribbean, to invest in all different kinds of places. They're fine. But this is the first major initiative we've had to get people to invest in America, to create jobs and markets in our best opportunity. (Applause.)

And, by the way, I hope that before this session is over, we will see an expansion of that program, not a contraction of it -- one that is paid for; one that is funded -- but we ought to work to expand it, to involve more communities. We had hundreds of communities wanting to be involved in it who had good proposals that could not be funded.

We have to recognize that if we want people to live by the work ethic, there must be work for them to do. (Applause.) That also is something we should remember as we deal with the next issue that is coming in this session of Congress that affects some of you more than others, depending on how the system operates in your state, but all of you in some ways -- and that is, how are we going to fix the welfare system? I believe we should offer more opportunity in the form of education and work to people on welfare, and then insist on more responsibility -- requiring work after two years, tougher child support enforcement, responsible parenting. I've been working on this issue -- (applause) -- I've been working on this issue for 15 years now, and I know that Washington doesn't have all the answers, and neither does anybody else or we'd have solved it by now.

But we have done our best here to give more and more and more authority to conduct sweeping welfare reform efforts to the states. We have given 25 states waivers from the federal rules and regulations to pursue welfare reform. Today, we will give a waiver to Oklahoma, the 26th state to pursue a welfare reform proposal. (Applause.) That is more combined shift of power from the federal government to the states than occurred under my two predecessors combined. I believe in this. I believe in this. (Applause.)

I know that the government shouldn't dictate all the rules from Washington. On the other hand, I don't think we should give states welfare money without any standards at all. We do have a national interest in promoting work and responsible parenting, the reduction of out of wedlock births. We have a national interest in doing this.

Last year, I sent to Congress the most sweeping welfare reform plan ever proposed by an administration. It included the toughest possible child support enforcement. Let me just mention child support for a minute. Do you know if we collected all the money owed in this country by deadbeat parents, we could move 800,000 mothers and children off the welfare roles immediately -- (applause) -- 800,000. (Applause.)

Now, one of the things that we have reached agreement with the Congress on is that in this area there has to be some national standard setting, because 30 percent of these cases cross states lines. So even though we want to move decisions back to the states, when the governors came to town they said, look, we know we've got to have some national action on child support enforcement, otherwise we can't ever collect on these orders that cross state lines. Justice should not depend solely on geography.

Reforming welfare is now a top priority for both parties, and that's good news. And we've worked together to find common solutions. And that's good news. We still have our differences. My plan and the one our administration has been behind for over a year now, sends a clear message to young people. It says, take responsibility to turn your life around. Teen fathers must pay child support. Teen mothers should stay at home or in other appropriate settings. And they have to stay in school if they want to get a check.

But the Republican plan sends a different message at some points. It says, for example, if you make a mistake before you're 18, and you have a baby, you're on your own. No benefits for teenagers and their children who have babies before they're 18 -- until they turn 18, and then if the states want to keep them out of benefits forever, that's okay. I think that's a mistake. I think what we ought to be saying to people is, you should not have done that; you made a mistake; we don't want anybody else to do it; but we're going to help you succeed as a student and a parent and a worker; and you have to help yourself by playing by these rules. I think that is a better approach. (Applause.) And I think it's in your interest.

Look, when people get -- if we just cut people off without putting them to work or keeping them in school, without making sure they have child care, if we just end all this, well, the federal government will save a little money. And you know what will happen, don't you? They'll be on your doorstep. They won't be part of some federal statistic, and people say, oh, we're not spending money on that up here like we used to; we'll just give you the problem, and you figure out what to do with it.

Well, my own view is that just shifting the problem is not enough. Like many of the cuts currently being debated, I think it will ultimately be counterproductive. It will cost us more than we will save. The federal government, the cities, the states, the taxpayers all will pay more down the road if we do something that fundamentally undermines the health of our children, the future of our children, and our commitment to getting more Americans to live with the opportunities of middle class economics and the responsibilities of mainstream values. (Applause.) That's what I believe. (Applause.)

Now, yes, yes, we do have to continue to cut the deficit. We do have to continue to save money. My new budget cuts the deficit another \$81 billion and has over \$140 billion in spending cuts. And I want to work with the Republicans to do more. We have already reduced the rate of health care cost increases in the federal budget over the next five years by \$100 billion. We have to keep working on the deficit.

But we have to do it in the right way. One of the things that the Republican leadership and I agree on is the line-item veto. We're about to take up debate on the line item-veto in the Senate. I hope it will pass quickly because it will give the President the opportunity and the responsibility to look at every single line-item in the budget for waste. It will give us the chance to cut pork without hurting people. And that is an important distinction. (Applause.)

Let me give you an example of what I mean. Everybody knows we have to shrink the Department of Agriculture. Ross Perot had the best line of any of the candidates in the 1992 election. It grieves me to say that, but he did. (Laughter.) Ross Perot had this great line where he said, did you hear about the employee at the Department of Agriculture that had to go see a psychiatrist because he lost his farmer? (Laughter.) And what he meant by that was, of course, that the number of farmers was shrinking and that technology and the modern world had reduced the need for some of the size and scope of organization of the Agriculture Department. So we all wanted to do that. Everybody knows we've got to save money.

We can -- one of the reasons I fought so hard for that GATT world trade agreement is so we could cut agricultural subsidies here without hurting our farmers in the global market. So my budget cuts agricultural subsidies, but now our competitors have to cut theirs more, to give our people a fair break.

I'll give you another example. We wanted to cut the Agriculture Department, so we just closed 1,200 offices -- 1,200. That's a lot of money. I do not think the way to cut the Agriculture Department is to freeze the school lunch program and send it to you, which means we're going to cut school lunches as the price of food goes up, and the number of kids goes up. (Applause.) I don't agree with that. (Applause.)

And you cannot make me believe with all the poor kids in this world today and in this country who show up hungry to school every day, whose only decent meal occurs in school -- you cannot make me believe that we cannot find a way to eliminate unnecessary spending from the government budget without cutting the school lunch program. We can, and we will -- we will. (Applause.)

I'll give you another example that affects a lot of you here. Some in Congress want to eliminate our Community Development Bank Initiative. Most of you probably have never heard of that, but let me tell you what it does. It's an initiative that would spend \$500 million to either establish or support banks that are set up in economically distressed areas, whose primary purpose is to get lower income people in high unemployment areas into the free enterprise system. (Applause.)

Now, I found out about this a few years ago when I was in Chicago, when I had a friend working for the South Shore Development Corporation. And we set up a community development bank in Arkansas when I was governor that operated in a rural area, and it did amazing things. People got credit who could never get credit from any bank before, and they set up businesses, and they started working, and they started hiring people. And it changed lives for a lot of people in these communities.

So when I ran for president, I said here's a good idea that came out of grass roots America. We could put a little money in it and make a lot of difference. It is estimated that the \$500 million that we could spend on the Community Development Bank Initiative in your communities all over the country, will generate \$22 billion in activity in the free enterprise system in places that have no enterprise today. So I think it would be a mistake to eliminate it. That's what I believe. (Applause.)

Believe you me, there's a lot of government programs that don't have that kind of return. And keep in mind, what is the purpose of the government? It's to empower people to make the most of their own lives, to enhance their security, and to help create opportunity as a partner. That's what this does.

I'll give you another example. The things that I don't think should be cut; our national service project, AmeriCorps, is all about opportunity and responsibility. A lot of you have AmeriCorps projects in your communities. Young people get a helping hand -- (applause) -- with their college in exchange for helping people solve their problems at the local community.

Thousands of young people now are participants, as partners, as nurses, as teachers, working with pastors, working with police officers at the grass roots level. They walk police beats in Brooklyn, they build homes in Georgia, they fight fires in Idaho. But some people in the House want to cut this effort; to deny 15,000 young people the chance to participate in it. Now I've offered spending cuts, and I'll find some more. But I think it is a mistake to cut AmeriCorps because it's a good deal. It gives us better citizens, stronger communities, more education for limited money. And it enables a lot of people to do things in their communities that simply would not get done any other way.

Ironically, one other area where we're having a big difference of opinion is in college loans. There's some in the Congress who want to severely limit the reach of the so-called direct loan program that we started, which believe it or not, lowers the cost of the loans to the students, cuts the time of paperwork and bureaucracy to the colleges and saves money for the taxpayers because we get around the middle man. So here's one area where we can do more to send people to school for lower cost and actually save money. We've offered millions and millions of young people the opportunity to take these loans out and then pay them back as a percentage of their income.

But I want to emphasize that we've also been more responsible than government was before. When I took office it was costing you as taxpayers, \$2.8 billion a year to pay tax money for defaulted loans. We have cut that \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion; we've cut it by nearly two-thirds, and made more loans available so people can go to college. That's the approach -- (applause) -- we ought to be taking. That is the way to save money on the program. (Applause.)

Now, one last thing in this area that I'm very concerned about -- in the education area. And that is, one of the things in the House list of rescissions to cut is all the money for safe and drug-free schools that would go to 94 percent of the schools in this country. And that's very important to me, personally. I invested a lot of time in fighting the problem of drugs when I was a Governor.

We have worked hard to get more investment to fight drugs in every area, and which we fight it here, since I've been President. And we see disturbing signs that in parts of our population, among young people, drug use is going up again; more casual drug use -- young people thinking, after a decade of it going down, that somehow it's maybe not dangerous anymore; forgetting that

it's illegal. And a lot of our schools are still not safe because of the root problems of drugs and violence. Now this money gives schools the ability to hire police officers, to put up metal detectors, but also to have drug education programs; the programs like the DARE program that so many of you have had in your schools, and others that try and help these kids stay off drugs. I think it would be a mistake to cut this money out.

Let me remind you that this money got into the Crime Bill, which you worked so hard for, because I gave the Congress, for the first time, a plan to cut the size of the federal government by 270,000. So we didn't raise any taxes, we didn't take any money away from anybody. We shrunk the government and gave the money to the communities of this country to fight crime, including the safe and drug-free schools money. We should not eliminate that. (Applause.) We should fight for it, not fight to cut it out. (Applause.)

As we are trying, you and I, to make responsibility a way of life in this country again, to teach young people the value of work, I think that all of us are going to have to say, first of all, without regard to our party, we agree with that.

Now that brings me to one other point I want to make beyond education. When I was a child, my mother used to say, idle hands are the devil's workshop. You're going to have a whole lot more idle hands this summer if we cut out those 600,000 summer jobs -- (applause) -- for our young people. (Applause.) And is it worth it to deny 1,000 young people in Louisville or 1,600 young people in Boston -- I met with a young -- the Mayor's Youth Council up there not very long ago, 2,000 in the San Jose area. Is it worth it to deny them the chance to work, to be around responsible adults, to learn what it's like to sort of show up on time, put a day's work in, how you relate to other people at work? I mean, this goes way beyond the little amount of money you get out of this.

Now, I have proposed -- I will say again -- to consolidate 60 programs that eliminate 4,000 bureaucrats to save money in the Housing and Urban Development Department, for example. I have proposed to do a lot of things like that.

I told you about the Agriculture Department. We're coming with more. Hold on -- every week, there will be more. I am not here to defend the way government has operated in the past in Washington. But we have to make judgments here. We get hired to make judgments and the right decisions, and not to throw out the baby with the bath water. (Applause.)

Take the HUD Department, for example. I'm all for -- I'm consolidating 60 programs. We're getting rid of 4,000 people. We're phasing the department down. But I don't believe in the proposed cut to housing assistance that helps 63,000 families -- women with small children, low-income senior citizens.

What we ought to do is to look at the right kind of cuts. This whole rescission package does some interesting things. We're supposed to be passing responsibility back to you, but not undermining your ability to do your job.

I think it's smarter to streamline programs and cut bureaucrats than to put families on the street, or to leave you to deal with the problem. Many of the people willing to pass you the buck are talking about ending unfair burdens on local government. I do want to say this: I think -- and the Speaker probably said this earlier today -- it looks like we may have an agreement now among all of the conferees and the administration and everybody on this unfunded mandate bill. I am very strongly in favor of that. It is a good thing to do. It's something we should do. (Applause.)

It is long since past time to stop imposing those mandates on you without paying for them. I spent a decade in the Governor's Office in Arkansas, writing checks for decisions other people made. Now, I'm excited about that. That bill just passed the House a few weeks ago, it passed the Senate; it's a good, good thing.

But look at this: The rescission package that's moving through the Congress actually cuts off funds to help you comply with present federal requirements, including safe drinking water, lead paint, and asbestos removal. So that makes them, I guess, not unfunded, but de-funded mandates. (Laughter and applause.)

Now, so we eliminate burdens on the one hand and create new ones on the other. I think that is an error. Let me mention just one final area where we worked closely last year. We passed the Crime Bill after the people who were here before just talked about it for six years, played politics with it, and the rhetoric was so juicy on both sides they could never get around to passing a bill. That's what always happens, you know?

Every one of these issues are tough. If they were easy, somebody would have done them. And you could pick either side and say it in a way that a majority is for you. Right? I mean, you can. Are you for a balanced budget? Yes. Do you want to cut Social Security? No. (Laughter.) See what I mean? So -- both sides win, right? (Applause.)

Meanwhile, you're like the jurors listening to the lawyers' argument. Well, what's going to happen? Who did it? So we've got to work on this. But I want to say this about the Crime Bill. We finally did that.

And what we did largely was what was recommended by law enforcement officials and community leaders around the country. Money for prevention with a lot of flexibility for people at the local level, tougher punishment, but help for states that would adopt tougher punishment, to build more prisons, and, of course, more police -- 100,000 more police on the street.

We did that because of two things. First of all, the law enforcement people said, we need more police. They also said they wanted a prevention fund. Secondly, we did it because of the evidence of what happens when community policing is properly instituted in the cities of our country.

From over about the last 30 years, the number of police in our country had grown by only about 10 percent, while the violent crime rate tripled. Clearly, there is a connection between those two statistics. And yet, still we've seen in place after place, where more police are put on the street in community policing modes, the crime rate will drop. That's why every major law enforcement organization supported that.

Now, the congressional bills and the Crime bill are different from the House and Senate, but I ask you to look at the system we have now and the work it did not only to catch criminals, but to prevent crime. In New York City, the police commissioner implemented an aggressive community policing program that helped to significantly reduce serious crimes last year -- auto thefts down 15 percent, robberies down 16 percent, murder down 19 percent. not just in big cities. The mayor of Odessa, Texas, wrote to tell me that in 1991 and '92, they had a very high crime rate. Then they implemented community policing, and three years later, serious crimes have dropped a total of 43 percent. Union City, Tennessee -- calls for help from the police went down by 30 percent and arrests went up by 35 percent with community policing.

That's why this Crime Bill was a partnership to help communities willing to take the responsibility to invest in their own security be more secure. An opportunity that is buried in red tape can hurt more than it helps. I don't know how many times I've seen little towns in my state have to hire consultants to figure out how to get federal money, and it cut the margin of benefit dramatically.

What we did was to set this police program up so that cities and counties can apply directly to the federal government, using a one-page application with eight questions, awarding police resources directly to you. Now, I think that's a pretty good deal. (Applause.)

I know one of those bills wants to add another layer to that. I don't think that's a very good idea, either. I think that we ought to have an opportunity for communities to apply directly and get the funds directly for law enforcement. (Applause.) My fellow governors may disagree with that, but that's what I think.

Now, in just the last few months since the Crime Bill took effect last fall, half the police departments in America have already received authority to hire almost 17,000 new police officers. We are ahead of schedule, and we're under budget. Some people who criticize our bill said that local governments wouldn't really want it, it was too much of a burden, it's an imposition, they can't afford to pay any match. All I know is, we have already received almost 11,000 applications representing over 60 percent of the police departments in America. Somebody thinks it's a good idea, and I think we ought to stay with it. (Applause.)

Here's the bottom line: The Crime Bill now on the books guarantees 100,000 new police officers. The alternative proposals doesn't guarantee a single one. We do give more flexibility and responsibility to you. Some of their proposals add bureaucracy and cut funds at the same time. So I say to you, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. (Applause.)

We should never, never close the door to writing new laws that will make us more secure in the fight against crime. And it should never be a partisan issue again. I was sick when I got here two years ago and I realized they'd been fooling around with that crime bill for four years because each side could figure out how to gain rhetorical advantage. And small differences obscured large agreements. So I want to continue to work on this problem.

But this police initiative is a better deal for you and a better deal for the American people. And as I have said repeatedly -- (applause) -- if necessary, I will veto any effort to repeal or undermine it. (Applause.)

But let me say this, what we need is not more vetoes. What we need is more action. What we need is for people here to behave the way you have to behave or you couldn't survive. Half of you come from places so small that if you made people declare their party every time they walked through the door to see if they got anything done or not, you'd be run out on a rail within a week. (Laughter.)

So, the veto is a useful device and an important thing on occasion. But what the country really needs is action. We need action. We need to remember these problems have faces, names and life histories. We need to pull together. We're doing it on the unfunded mandates. We can do it on the line-item veto. We can do it on all these other areas if we will exercise simple common sense and recognize what our mission is. We've got to keep the American Dream alive -- middle-class economics, mainstream values, jobs, incomes, work and family. We've got to make sure this country stays strong.

And I'm telling you, it takes action, not just words. You live where the action is. If you don't do anything else while you're here, give us your energy and tell us you want action.

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

END

1:52 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

February 8, 1995

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN ANNOUNCEMENT OF POLICE HIRING GRANTS

Room 450
The Old Executive Office Building

11:40 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you so much, Sheriff Kelly. He spoke so well I hardly want to say anything. (Laughter.) Chief Viverette, thank you very much for your work and for coming here and for what you said. I thank Attorney General Reno and Lee Brown for their outstanding work for our country. I'm very proud that they're a part of our administration. And I thank Chief Brann and John Schmidt for the work they have done on this police program; and, of course, the Vice President for what he said and for what he does, and for clarifying the nature of public spending under the LEAA program. (Laughter.) If they bought me an airplane I'd still be governor. (Laughter.)

I want to thank the members of Congress who are here for what they did on the Crime Bill last year. And I want to thank many who are not here, but I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge Senator Biden, without whom we might never have had this Crime Bill. I thank him especially in his absence. (Applause.)

This is security week at the White House, I think you could say. (Laughter.) We talked about immigration yesterday and the need to protect our borders from illegal immigration. Today we're releasing our Drug Control Strategy and talking about police officers. I'd like to put it briefly in the context of what I have been trying to achieve here.

I ran for this office with a vision that at the end of this century we need to be preserving the American Dream for all of our people and making sure that, as we move into the next century, we're still the strongest country in the world. I think our strategy should be what I have called the New Covenant, creating more opportunity, but insisting on more responsibility; and strengthening our communities at the grass-roots level.

The role of government, and specifically, the role of the federal government at this time, it seems to me, is to do three things: To expand opportunity while shrinking bureaucracy; to empower Americans to make the most of their own lives; and to enhance our security at home and abroad.

In ways that are obvious, the Crime Bill we passed and the drug strategy we pursue furthers all of those objectives. We are working hard to help communities to arm themselves to fight crime and violence. We are working hard to help people to defeat the scourge of drugs both by enforcement, as well as prevention and education and treatment. The Crime Bill makes the most of the resources that we have achieved by shrinking the federal bureaucracy dramatically, to the point where, when we finish, it will be the smallest it's been since President Kennedy was in office.

MORE

Now, that leaves a lot up to you; it's up to all of you to hire and train the police officers. It's up to you to deploy them as you see fit. It's up to every citizen in every community in America to take responsibility to join the fight.

I am all for more flexibility for states and localities. This Crime Bill, particularly as it was changed -- and I want to thank some of the Republicans who are here for your contribution for that -- we said, hey, we ought to give the local communities more flexibility in deciding which prevention programs to fund; they know what works and what doesn't. That was the wisdom of the Congress, but there is a national interest in having 100,000 more police officers. There is a national interest in doing that because we know enough to know that when crime triples -- violent crime -- over 30 years, and the size of our police forces only increase by 10 percent, over 30 years, and more police get off the street and into the cars, that becomes a national problem. And when all the police groups in the country come to us and say, this is in the national interest, then we have to respond to that as well.

Today, we are here to award grants to over 7,000 new police officers in over 6,600 small cities, as the Attorney General said. It's an astonishing thing to me that more than half the communities in our country said, we want to be a part of this. If ever there was evidence that there is a national interest here, that is it.

I wish that violence were a stranger to small towns. I wish that this really could have been a problem for big cities where all the criminals in the country are congregated. But we all know that's not true. Indeed, we all know that most of our big cities have seen a decline in the crime rate in the last couple of years, even though it's still at a horrendously high level. But many of our small communities are dealing with the aftermath. Indeed, I have many law enforcement officers tell me that they are now dealing with the consequences of being near bigger cities that have gotten more effective in combating crime, and some criminals are looking for greener pastures and more poorly armed police forces in smaller communities all across America.

All of you know that I grew up in small towns in my home state. I can still remember when we never locked the car or the house and we never gave any thought to whether we were walking outside in the night or in the daytime. I wish that that were the case for all Americans today, but it isn't. And until it is again, we have to continue to work with you to restore those conditions and to fight the people who are keeping them from occurring.

Police officers on the street are still the best protection we know for not only enforcement, but for prevention; for all the ways that the chief spoke about, and all the ways that all of you know. We also know that police officers on the street need the help of people in their communities. That's why in the State of the Union address, I tried to emphasize the role of citizens.

When I lived at home in Little Rock, we lived in an area that was very mixed in every way -- racially, economically and in terms of the citizens who lived there. And our crime rate went up and down and up and down over the decade I lived in the governor's mansion. And the biggest difference was whether the citizens in our neighborhood were participating in the neighborhood crime watch and helping the police in our neighborhood to do their job.

So we are well aware -- we are well aware -- that we need the help of the citizens. But unless we follow through on our commitment to have 100,000 police officers on the street, the United States government will not be doing its job and exercising its

responsibility to give you the opportunity to make the streets safer. We need 100,000 more badges.

Just before I came out here, someone gave me a police badge from a neighboring state of Arkansas. I save them, along with all the military coins I have from the units I've met. So now I have another one to put back on my desk. I want 100,000 more of these on the street. That's in the national interest, and the Congress and the country should not back away from that. We should stay right with it until we have 100,000. That's what all these people lobbied for and we should stay all the way. (Applause).

I want to thank again all of those, but especially those in the Justice Department who work so hard to create a nonbureaucratic way for these police officers to come out -- and that's been discussed. And I want to say again, I'm working hard to give more flexibility to state and local governments. I'm working hard to turn more authority back to states and local governments, even to the private sector where that's appropriate. I support the changes that were made in the last Crime Bill, to give more flexibility in the area of prevention. But I will oppose any attempt to undermine the capacity of the Crime Bill to produce the 100,000 police officers that we promised the American people, that you came up here and lobbied for, and that you worked so hard for. We must not do that.

You know, one of the things that I've never read in all these biographies or accounts of my career is I actually once participated in the LEAA programs -- I taught law enforcement officers. I taught constitutional law and criminal procedure. I was proud to do it and it was a good program. But it didn't obscure the fact that we also have problems in the LEAA, as the Vice President outlined. And more importantly, it doesn't obscure the fact that we have a national interest, and now a national solemn responsibility to take the money we save by reducing the federal work force to go forward with 100,000 police.

I also want to emphasize - I saw a lot of you nodding your head out there when Lee Brown was up here talking -- our Crime Bill and our national Drug Control Strategy are intimately related. With the help of the Crime Bill, this year's drug control's budget is the largest in the history of the federal government. Last year, for the first time in 25 years, I submitted to Congress a budget -- and Congress largely adopted it -- which reduced both domestic and defense spending in an attempt to get control of this terrible deficit. For the first time in 25 years. The only things that went up were interest on the debt and the medical costs of the government and the cost of living for Social Security. The aggregate spending, otherwise, went down. And I am proud of that. This year I have submitted to Congress a budget with another \$140 billion in spending cuts.

But remember our objectives here. The federal government's job is to increase the ability of people to make the most of their own lives and to enhance security. So we're spending more on education and training and children and their future in our budget. We're also spending more on security, not only abroad, but at home. More -- more to fight the drug war; more to fight crime; more to do things that will make people more secure in their homes in their schools, on their streets, in their workplaces. That's why this Drug Control Strategy is important. And it's also important to note that it, too, is funded in the Crime Bill. A big part of the prevention section of the Crime Bill is an antidrug strategy, to take this country's commitment to fighting drugs to new heights.

I thank Lee Brown for his leadership, and I am going to do everything I can to implement the 1995 Drug Control Strategy. That has four steps: We propose to work more closely with foreign

governments to cut drugs off at the source. We propose to boost community efforts to educate young people about the dangers and penalties of drug use, something that is very important. We see fresh and disturbing efforts -- evidence -- that a lot of young people are no longer afraid that they will get sick, that they can die, that they can become addicted if they have casual drug use. We will work to break the cycle of crime and drugs by providing treatment to hardcore drug users, who consume most of the drugs and cause much of the crime and health problems. And we will punish people who break the law more severely.

This strategy gives your communities more resources to fight drugs as well, and more flexibility, as I said, in the use of those resources.

I want to work with the new Congress to build on this Crime Bill, but we should not move backwards. We shouldn't undermine our ability to implement the Drug Control Strategy; we shouldn't walk away from our commitment to provide 100,000 police officers. And we shouldn't let this become a partisan, political issue. The Crime Bill passed with bipartisan support; it should be maintained with bipartisan support.

I have no idea what political party the law enforcement officers standing up on this platform belong to, and I don't care. It's enough for me that they're all willing to put on a uniform and put their lives on the line to make the people of this country safer and give the kids of this country a better chance.

We should listen to the experts in law enforcement and do what is right and keep this above politics. Above all, we must keep it above partisan politics. Let us listen to the evidence and do what is right for America. That should be our only test.
(Applause.)

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

11:55 A.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

February 8, 1995

BRIEFING BY
ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL JOHN SCHMIDT AND
DIRECTOR OF COPS PROGRAM, CHIEF JOE BRANN

The Briefing Room

12:36 P.M. EST

ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL SCHMIDT: Good afternoon. I think you all know that the President and the Attorney General have just announced grants to about 6,600 communities around this country to enable them to hire over 7,100 new police officers. This brings us to a total of close to 17,000 additional police officers for which funding has now been awarded under the 1994 crime law. That is a substantial step, although we still have a long way to go, toward the 100,000 additional police officers that we are committed to hire under that bill.

We have reached this stage of the process only a little less than five months from the signing into law of this bill in September, and I think that is a fairly amazing result. It is a tribute to a lot of hard work by Chief Brann and others in our COPS Program office. But it is also primarily a result of the really incredible level of demand around the country for what this program is offering, and that is funding to enable communities to hire additional police officers.

We saw that demand initially a year ago when the Justice Department went forward with what was called the Police Hiring Supplement Program. That was a \$150-million program that was able to make grants to about 250 communities around the country on the same terms as are now being offered. At that point over 10 times that number of communities, about 2,700, applied. So we began to get some sense of the level of demand for this type of funding.

When the Crime Bill was enacted we went forward, as we were authorized to do, made an initial round of \$200 million in grants to the failed applicants under the prior Police Hiring Supplement Program. We then went forward in October, and put together two initial programs: one of them called Cops Ahead was for jurisdictions of 50,000 and over; and the other, called Cops Fast, which is the program under which announcements have been made today, was for jurisdictions of 50,000 or less. The reason for that distinction was in the statute, which allowed us to set up a special, expedited, simplified application process for the smaller jurisdictions.

We announced both of those programs back in October. Under Cops Ahead, there was a November 30th deadline date, and we committed to make announcements in the middle of December, which we did. We set that up initially as a \$225-million program, with a maximum of three percent of each jurisdiction's police force. We ended up increasing it by \$100 million, to \$325 million. And even then, we had to cut back and limit jurisdictions to 2.5 percent of their police forces. But on that basis, we went forward in December and announced grants for close to 5,000 additional officers.

At the same time, in October, we announced the Cops Fast program, which had a deadline date of December 31st. We tried to make this program as simple, as non-bureaucratic as we possibly could because we're trying to reach smaller towns and villages around this

MORE

country. We told all of these communities that if they applied by December 31st, we would try to make decisions and would make announcements by about February 1st. And we are a week or so late, but I think that we are doing a good job of trying to keep to our schedule and to meet the deadlines that we've set for ourselves.

The demand for the Cops Fast program is even more remarkable than the demand that we saw in the case of Cops Ahead. And I think to give you some of the specifics on Cops Fast, I will turn it over to Chief Brann, who is now the Director of our COPS Program.

Chief Brann.

Q Can we ask you a question?

ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL SCHMIDT: Sure.

Q Are these funds endangered in any way by this movement on the Hill to repeal the legislation, the Crime Bill?

ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL SCHMIDT: The actual funding that we announced today is not endangered because these awards are made out of this year's appropriation. But down the road, our ability to get to the 39,000 that communities have already requested and then go beyond that and get to the 100,000 is totally endangered, because what is proposed in bills that are now before the House of Representatives is to divert this funding away from a COPS Program --

Q Well, what are you going to do about it?

ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL SCHMIDT: Well, what we're going to do is convince people that this is a program that makes sense; it's working; it's putting additional cops into communities all over this country. There is a tremendous demand for the funding to do that. And it makes no sense at all to take a program that is working, that is putting additional cops into communities around this country and divert that into something where the money would be spent for anything that a locality determines to be in the interest of public safety or crime prevention. As a practical matter, there will be nothing to show at the end of the six-year period if that money is not directed toward a specific and tangible and concrete goal.

So I think what we're going to do about it do what we're doing today -- show that this program works, explain why it works, I hope enlist the support of a lot of people, including people who are here at the announcement today in the law enforcement community who believe in this program, and, the President said, worked very hard to maintain bipartisan support for a program that's working.

Q One follow-up. Just who is against this?

ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL SCHMIDT: You know, that's an interesting question. Nobody, as far as I know, is against the COPS Program on the merits. I have not heard anyone say that this program isn't working better than anyone who passed it and worked for it expected when it passed. If you had said back in September that in February we would have reached 16,000 or 17,000 additional officers being put into communities, I think people would have been surprised. No one, to my knowledge, has criticized the operation of this program.

The only questions -- the answer is, on the merits, I don't think anyone is making a case or even trying to make a case that it is not a good thing to be working effectively to put 100,000 new cops into communities around this country.

MS. TERZANO: Let's have Mr. Brann speak and then we'll take questions.

Q So what is the problem?

CHIEF BRANN: Good afternoon. First of all, let me give you a brief introduction about myself. Again, the name is Joe Brann; I'm the director the COPS office. My background is 26 years in local law enforcement, five years of which was served as a police chief in the city of Hayward, California. Prior to that, the first 21 years of my career was spent with Santa Ana, California.

I think it's very important for us, when we're talking about these grants -- Cops Fast, Cops Ahead, Cops Phase One -- the various rounds of funding that we have already gone through, to acknowledge that this is more than a matter of hiring 100,000 cops -- we're going to do that. I think if there was any doubt in anybody's mind, it should have been laid to rest today with the announcement that we made. There were critics who said that they did not believe that we would fund more than 20,000 police officers with these monies under the Crime Bill, and I expect that we will meet that in our first full year.

It's also important to acknowledge what we're trying to do -- it's to get those officers out there engaged in policing at the street level in cities, towns, communities across this country. In so doing, their efforts are going to be directed at community policing. And that's very critical in all of this. Community policing is not a buzzword, it's not a fad, it's not a gimmick. It's something that is very strong and directly deals with crime in this country and the kinds of demands that are placed upon police organizations and the kinds of expectations that stem from the public's needs.

Community policing is all about a philosophy -- not a program, but a philosophy -- of policing in which police agencies, their personnel, work very closely in strong partnership with community members, with community organizations, with other arms, other elements of local government, to address crime problems and social disorder in communities. It has a lot to do with being more effective.

I think for many years we have been highly efficient in police work, probably best represented by the use of the 911 systems -- "call a cop, get a cop" is what I like to refer to it as. We are very efficient in getting there. The question for us for many years has been how effective are we being, and that's what community policing is all about -- it's increased effectiveness, it's increased responsiveness. Bringing that back to this office, that's what we're trying to encourage; an efficient, an effective policing strategy at the local level. For us to do that, we also have to be efficient and effective. And I think if you paid heed to the comments today from the President, the Vice President and the Attorney General, what you saw in the way of these Cops Fast announcements is a strong indication of our commitment to do just that.

If I could, I'm going to turn to this Cops Fast application form. We have, in fact, reinvented the whole notion of the grant making process in the federal system. We've changed this considerably. What we're doing is getting away from some of the bureaucracy and some of the red tape that has long been in the way for local police agencies.

I can tell you that there's nothing more frustrating as a police chief or as a cop when you're trying to seek federal funding, there's nothing more frustrating than to go through the time consuming processes, the immense bureaucracy, the layers of bureaucracy that you have to go through to even get your application

submitted in the first place, much less to hear months or years after the fact, that once you've submitted that, that you're not going to get funded. And we decided, that up front, we're going to make this very simple and straightforward for the law enforcement organizations across the country.

This Cops Fast announcement, it's a one page announcement -- one page application form. What we're trying to do is make that simple, work with the local agencies, ensure that they are notified in a timely way whether or not they're going to get the funding. And what you saw today is a strong indication of that, because we're funding about 6,600 agencies across the country with better than 7,100 officers being provided just under this phase. Thus far, we've funded about 17,000 -- just under 17,000 police officers across the country.

Now, we're at various stages of the implementation of that. The local jurisdictions still have to go through their hiring processes, the training processes, what have you, but they're moving along in a very timely way as well. We're meeting our end of the bargain at the federal level. We're being responsive. It's going to be done timely, and it's going to be done in a simple way.

There are various other phases or stages of funding we've talked about. There's more to come, specifically a Cops More program that we will be announcing shortly. The agencies are already starting to apply for that. That is a very flexible kind of approach, and it's intended to allow agencies to provide monies for technology and overtime and other areas where they can free up existing officers to put them out in the field engaged in community policing. We can talk more about those kinds of strategies and approaches later.

I would sense that what you're all interested in is getting your questions answered, and that's what John and I are here to do today. So why don't we jump into that.

Q Do either of you know how many cops from the -- I guess, the 100,000 in the Crime Bill have gone to the Washington, DC, Police Department?

ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL SCHMIDT: The answer is we haven't made an award to Washington, D.C. yet. We have talked to Washington, D.C. At one point they had talked about applying and then backed away from it. As you know, this is not 100 percent funding, it provides no more than 75 percent of the cost. And I think they had a question whether in their current financial situation they were able to go forward. So we have talked to Washington, D.C., but there is no funding. There's funding for a lot of communities in the Washington area, but there's --

Q Have they not applied then?

ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL SCHMIDT: They've never formally applied, to my knowledge.

Q Do you think they withdrew because they would have to put up 25 percent?

ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL SCHMIDT: I think they just decided that they weren't in a position to go forward and increase their police force. They also, as you may remember, did increase their police force fairly substantially in recent years, so I think that may also be an element. There are, as I say, lots of grants to other communities in the Washington area and all those specifics are available to you.

Q Dr. Schmidt or Mr. Brann, to follow up on some of Helen's questions about, to some extent, the politics of this program -- when it was announced there was a lot of support, naturally, from mayors and local police chiefs. Now, to some extent, the Republicans are dangling perhaps a more attractive prospect in front of them, which is money for police work or other related law enforcement without all the strings attached, without saying that it has to be spent on police personnel, without saying that it has to be spent on community-based policing, which is a concept that's being dictated from the federal government rather than necessarily responsive to local needs. Are you worried that when this thing comes up for reauthorization on the Hill that the mayors and the chiefs will bail out on you and go for the Republican approach of money that's less restricted?

ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL SCHMIDT: Well, the law enforcement community was there in force at the announcement that we just made, including representatives of virtually all the major law enforcement groups. I think that they, universally, would tell you that this is a program which is meeting their needs at this point. And I think they're supportive of it.

I think that when you refer to federal dictates in the area of community policing, the fact is that we're not in a position of having to dictate community policing to anybody. Joe can tell you, community policing has become the Gospel for the law enforcement professionals all over this country. And everywhere I go, police departments talk about how they're doing it better than other police departments. But there is no element here of our having to force anybody into a recognition that the best way to use new police officers is to put them out into the street.

But I think the best thing we can do in response to any concern of that kind is to continue to show the law enforcement community that we, in fact, are meeting our commitments to them and this is a program that anybody can rely on. So whatever anybody dangles in their eyes, they will look at this and say, this is a program which is working and it's something we should support.

Q But what if a local Chief decides he needs more technology, more cruisers, more jail space, or something, rather than more cops on the street? Are you cutting off the federal funding for those kinds of programs in order to pay for this?

CHIEF BRANN: I think not, because, first of all, there is flexibility built into this. It's what I was alluding to when I was referring to the Cops More strategy. That allows agencies to make application for that pot of monies in ways that it will ultimately free up and make more efficient their use of resources.

One thing I would state, too -- there may be an assumption that there is a need for more in the way of equipment and technology, and what have you; yes, it does exist out there, but I think that ultimately what we're trying to do in policing in this country is to make better use of our resources altogether on all different fronts. What I would say is, I have yet, in 26 years in policing, to meet a chief, sheriff or a cop who will not state to you unequivocally, we need more police. And that's what this is all about -- that's what ultimately our response, that 100,000 figure, is based upon.

That need is out there, it's -- again, just take a look at the numbers that we're talking about here. In the early stages of this game, we got requests for almost 40,000 cops, and we haven't even scratched the surface, literally. I mean, we're four months into this. One hundred thousand cops is a very realistic goal; we can meet it with these monies. And I think we need to keep that kind of a focus there. It's also commitment that was made to the American public and to the law enforcement community.

Q Let me ask one more question, one more way, which is probably even stupider than the first one, but if the federal government gave me, as a local mayor or police chief, the choice between fully funding 75 new officers and partially funding 100 new officers, even if it's 75 percent, I'd take the fully-funded 75 percent. Now, isn't that what the Republicans are offering, a slightly smaller pot of money, but no strings attached, you can use it however you want?

ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL SCHMIDT: The Republican alternative that is in the House bill doesn't limit the funding at all to hiring of police officers. It would allow the local jurisdiction to use that money for anything which is deemed to be in the interest of public safety or crime prevention. So if you're a police chief and what you care about is your police department and your ability to hire additional officers, it's not particularly tempting or necessarily tempting to you to have a program which provides the money to the local jurisdiction in such a way that it doesn't provide any assurance that it will be used even for police purposes, let alone for police hiring.

I think that -- of course, if you ask the question in the abstract, would somebody rather have the money with no strings attached to be able to spend it for anything they want, I suppose you're going to find people who will say yes. The question is whether, from the standpoint of the federal government and the use of federal tax dollars, that's a sensible thing to do. One of the reasons that there is the requirement that we not go beyond 75 percent of the cost is because the local jurisdiction ought to have to make a judgment itself that it is committed to this and wants to do it.

In addition, unless you're going to provide funding forever -- and nobody wants to do that -- the local jurisdiction also has to be prepared to recognize that at the end of the three-year period it is going to have to pick up the funding.

So I think, from that perspective, this is a well-designed program. There were people who said there wouldn't be jurisdictions around the country would want the money on those terms. They would not want less than 75 percent of the funding knowing that they would have to pick up the cost at the end of the three years. That has turned out to be totally wrong. I mean, right now, with two programs that have been in operation for two months, we have communities asking for almost 40,000 police officers on terms where there are no waivers of any of those conditions.

There's another point that at least I think the more politically sophisticated police chiefs and mayors understand. If you really think that funding is going to be there down the road -- two years, three years, four years, five years from now -- for this kind of program, it seems to me you have to recognize the need for some visible, tangible, measurable achievement. And a program that is putting additional police officers into communities around the country will accomplish that. A program which allows money to be spent for anything that a local jurisdiction decides is in the interest of public safety or crime prevention is not going to accomplish that. And I think, therefore, people who are realistic about what will be sustained over a period of time aren't necessarily tempted by what somebody may dangle in their eyes for the sake of some immediate partisan or other advantage in an initial year. So I think you have that element also in the thinking of people around the country.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

12:58 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

February 11, 1995

RADIO ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT
TO THE NATION

The Oval Office

10:06 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. Today I've asked Attorney General Reno and Drug Control Director Lee Brown to join me here at the White House. I want to discuss the crime and drugs that plague almost every community in our country.

I ran for President because I believe it's the responsibility of our generation to work together to preserve the American Dream for all Americans and to ensure that we move into the next century still the strongest country on Earth. The best way for us to do that is by building a new partnership in our country between Americans and their government, and especially between Americans and each other. I call that partnership the New Covenant.

Essentially that means the government's responsibility is to expand opportunity while shrinking bureaucracy; to empower people to make the most of their own lives; and to enhance our security not just abroad, but here at home, too. At the same time, it means we must demand more responsibility from every citizen in return -- responsibility for our country, for communities, for our families and ourselves.

Part of our job here in Washington is to help arm the American people to fight crime and violence. During the presidential campaign I promised the American people that I would cut 100,000 federal bureaucrats in Washington and use those savings to put 100,000 new police officers on America's streets. Last year Democrats and Republicans joined together to pass the crime bill to keep that promise. We've been working ever since to put that crime bill into effect.

It's been only four months since the crime bill became law, but already we've awarded over 16,000 new officers to half the police departments in America. We're under budget, we're ahead of schedule.

Police departments all around the country are putting this effort to work, hiring, training, and deploying officers as fast as we can give a go-ahead. The last thing your local police department needs is congressmen in Washington playing politics with their safety and yours. But the astonishing thing is, despite the urgent need for more police on our streets, despite our success in getting them there, some Republicans in Congress actually want to repeal this effort. They want to replace an initiative guaranteed to put 100,000 police on the street with a block grant program that has no guarantees at all.

The block grant is basically a blank check that can far too easily be used for things besides police officers. That's why the law enforcement steering committee, representing over 450,000 police officers, is absolutely opposed to this block grant approach, or to any other change that weakens our commitment to put 100,000 police on the streets.

Undermining this commitment to law enforcement is not acceptable. I didn't fight to cut 100,000 federal bureaucrats so we could trade them in for an old-fashioned pork barrel program. I fought to trade 100,000 bureaucrats for 100,000 police officers. Last year Republicans and Democrats passed the 100,000 cops bill, and I signed it. I made a commitment, a promise to put 100,000 more police on our streets, because there is simply no better crime fighting tool to be found. And I intend to keep that promise. Anyone on Capitol Hill who wants to play partisan politics with police officers for America should listen carefully: I will veto any effort to repeal or undermine the 100,000 police commitment, period.

Of course, as crucial as these 100,000 police officers are, they can't do the job alone. Every citizen in America has to help in this fight, because no amount of police officers can replace people taking responsibility for their own lives and for their communities.

This week, I announced our administration's 1995 Drug Control Strategy. It involves cutting off drugs at the source, stiffer punishment for drug dealers, more education and prevention, and more treatment. But perhaps the most important part of this strategy will be to boost efforts to educate our young people about the dangers and penalties of drug use. Our children need a constant drumbeat reminding them that drugs are not safe, drugs are illegal, drugs can put you in jail, and drugs may cost you your life.

Community-based education programs work. I saw them work in school when my daughter was younger. This morning I've been joined by some police officers who participate in community education programs, and especially in the national drug abuse education and resistance program that you probably know as DARE. Every American should follow their example and accept the responsibility to join the fight against drugs and crime and violence.

Parents must teach their children right from wrong. They must teach that drugs are bad and dangerous. And make no mistake about it, parents must set a good example for their children. Young people must have the courage to do what's right and stand up for what's right. That means not using drugs, staying out of gangs, studying hard, avoiding violence. It also means telling friends that drugs and gangs and guns aren't cool, and children that are involved in those things aren't going to be your real friends.

That's what the New Covenant is all about -- more opportunity, more responsibility. We've got to do our part here. But each and every one of you must take responsibility to join us. We can only win this fight together.

Thanks for listening.

END

10:11 A.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 4, 1995

RADIO ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE NATION

The Oval Office

10:06 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. I always like to hear from young people across our country. After all, they're at the heart of our efforts to build America up, to face the demands and the challenges of the 21st century. The responsibility of my generation is to leave those young people a better world, and to make sure that they're prepared to succeed in that world.

I was especially touched by a letter I recently received from a 15-year-old girl named Melissa, who lives in a small town in the Midwest. Even though she's only 15 and she lives in America's heartland, she's a recovering drug addict. She's been drug-free for two years now, but she still sees other children going down the road to drug abuse, and she's very worried.

This is what she wrote to me: "It seems there's just not enough help, and when there is help, there's not enough money to do what needs to be done. Let's help this problem so it's not so big for the next generation." We ought to listen to Melissa. From our smallest towns to our biggest cities, millions of our children face the temptation of illegal drugs everyday in their schools. Surveys show that unfortunately more and more of our adolescents are using illegal drugs. Kids today are somehow not getting the message. They are beginning once again to think that it's all right to use drugs, that they're not really dangerous. But they're wrong. Too often, they're dead wrong.

Now, think about what this means for our communities and for our country, for all the rest of us. Illegal drugs go hand in hand with violence. They foster fear. School children stay home by the thousands every day because they are afraid. And in this kind of environment, even the best-behaved young people have a tough time learning. That means our standards of education are being undermined by drugs and violence. And that hurts our ability as a nation to compete and win. So we all pay a price.

The first line of defense, of course, has to be in our communities -- with our parents and teachers and our neighbors, other role models in law enforcement and the religious community -- telling our young people in no uncertain terms that drugs and violence are wrong, and helping them to stay away or to get off. I know that.

But we here in Washington have a responsibility, too. All of you know there's a big debate going on in Washington now about what the role of the government ought to be. The Republican Contract says we should cut just about everything to pay for big tax cuts that go mostly to upper income people. Well, I think we should cut government. We have. There are over 150,000 fewer people working here than there were when I took office. I think we ought to reduce the burden of unnecessary regulation, and we are.

But I think we need a government that's lean and not mean, one that offers opportunity and challenges people to be more

MORE

responsible; one that's a partner in increasing opportunity, empowering people to make the most of their own lives, and providing more security for our people. The fight against drugs and the fight for safe schools does all of that.

After all, leaders of both parties have seen this as a problem that can't be ignored in Washington. President Reagan and President Bush invested in initiatives for drug-free schools. And last year, working with members of Congress of both parties, our administration expanded the Safe and Drug-free Schools Program to include violence prevention and security. We passed legislation that sends \$482 million to the states -- enough for efforts in over 90 percent of our school districts.

Communities are using this money in a lot of different ways. They are using it to pay for police officers and metal detectors to keep our schools safer, to train teachers, staff and students on how to resolve conflicts without violence, to help guide young people in fighting peer pressure to use drugs, to help instruct parents on the warning signs of drug use. All of this is a very good and sound investment for our future. It's Washington being a good partner with people building their communities at the grass-roots level.

The schools taking part wouldn't give up these safeguards. If anything, they want more help. But now, some Republicans in Congress want to completely eliminate our safe schools and anti-drug efforts. Right now, Congress is considering a rescission bill that cuts out the money we passed last year for all these programs.

I am concerned that the Republicans are willing to sacrifice our children's safety and our ability to learn in secure environments to pay for these tax cuts for upper income Americans. That's not a good deal for America's children, for America's future -- it's not a good deal for upper income Americans. It's not putting people first. It won't help to restore the American Dream, to advance the economic interests of the middle class to support mainstream values. They're trying to cut other things that I don't support, either. They're trying to cut the crime bill we passed last year to provide 100,000 police on our streets and to cut other education programs.

Now, I know we've got to reduce the deficit. We've already brought it down by over \$600 billion under the tough plan we passed last year and the year before. And I've given Congress a budget that has another \$140 billion of spending cuts. I'll work with them to find more, but not in education or jobs or the safety of our children. We need to be expanding opportunity up here, not restricting it. We need to be giving our people the tools they need to make the most of their own lives, not taking them away. We need to enhance our security, not undermine it.

And where our children are concerned, we've got to give them the best chance we can to develop their God-given abilities so they can do the rest. They've got to stay in school, stay out of trouble, stay off drugs and off the streets. But young people, given a chance, can overcome great obstacles.

Look at young Melissa. Now she's gotten herself a second chance to become a first-class citizen. We need more young people like her for their strength, their intelligence their humanity. We don't have a one to waste. And our young people need us to have the vision and the strength to do what's best for their futures today.

Thanks for listening.

END

10:12 A.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

February 8, 1995

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN ANNOUNCEMENT OF POLICE HIRING GRANTS

Room 450
The Old Executive Office Building

11:40 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you so much, Sheriff Kelly. He spoke so well I hardly want to say anything. (Laughter.) Chief Viverette, thank you very much for your work and for coming here and for what you said. I thank Attorney General Reno and Lee Brown for their outstanding work for our country. I'm very proud that they're a part of our administration. And I thank Chief Brann and John Schmidt for the work they have done on this police program; and, of course, the Vice President for what he said and for what he does, and for clarifying the nature of public spending under the LEAA program. (Laughter.) If they bought me an airplane I'd still be governor. (Laughter.)

I want to thank the members of Congress who are here for what they did on the Crime Bill last year. And I want to thank many who are not here, but I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge Senator Biden, without whom we might never have had this Crime Bill. I thank him especially in his absence. (Applause.)

This is security week at the White House, I think you could say. (Laughter.) We talked about immigration yesterday and the need to protect our borders from illegal immigration. Today we're releasing our Drug Control Strategy and talking about police officers. I'd like to put it briefly in the context of what I have been trying to achieve here.

I ran for this office with a vision that at the end of this century we need to be preserving the American Dream for all of our people and making sure that, as we move into the next century, we're still the strongest country in the world. I think our strategy should be what I have called the New Covenant, creating more opportunity, but insisting on more responsibility; and strengthening our communities at the grass-roots level.

The role of government, and specifically, the role of the federal government at this time, it seems to me, is to do three

things: To expand opportunity while shrinking bureaucracy; to empower Americans to make the most of their own lives; and to enhance our security at home and abroad.

In ways that are obvious, the Crime Bill we passed and the drug strategy we pursue furthers all of those objectives. We are working hard to help communities to arm themselves to fight crime and violence. We are working hard to help people to defeat the scourge of drugs both by enforcement, as well as prevention and education and treatment. The Crime Bill makes the most of the resources that we have achieved by shrinking the federal bureaucracy dramatically, to the point where, when we finish, it will be the smallest it's been since President Kennedy was in office.

Now, that leaves a lot up to you; it's up to all of you to hire and train the police officers. It's up to you to deploy them as you see fit. It's up to every citizen in every community in America to take responsibility to join the fight.

I am all for more flexibility for states and localities. This Crime Bill, particularly as it was changed -- and I want to thank some of the Republicans who are here for your contribution for that -- we said, hey, we ought to give the local communities more flexibility in deciding which prevention programs to fund; they know what works and what doesn't. That was the wisdom of the Congress, but there is a national interest in having 100,000 more police officers. There is a national interest in doing that because we know enough to know that when crime triples -- violent crime -- over 30 years, and the size of our police forces only increase by 10 percent, over 30 years, and more police get off the street and into the cars, that becomes a national problem. And when all the police groups in the country come to us and say, this is in the national interest, then we have to respond to that as well.

Today, we are here to award grants to over 7,000 new police officers in over 6,600 small cities, as the Attorney General said. It's an astonishing thing to me that more than half the communities in our country said, we want to be a part of this. If ever there was evidence that there is a national interest here, that is it.

I wish that violence were a stranger to small towns. I wish that this really could have been a problem for big cities where all the criminals in the country are congregated. But we all know that's not true. Indeed, we all know that most of our big cities have seen a decline in the crime rate in the last couple of years, even though it's still at a horrendously high level. But many of our small communities are dealing with the aftermath. Indeed, I have many law enforcement officers tell me that they are now dealing with the consequences of being near bigger cities that have gotten more effective in combating crime, and some criminals are looking for greener pastures and more poorly armed police forces in smaller communities all across America.

All of you know that I grew up in small towns in my home state. I can still remember when we never locked the car or the house and we never gave any thought to whether we were walking outside in the night or in the daytime. I wish that that were the case for all Americans today, but it isn't. And until it is again, we have to continue to work with you to restore those conditions and to fight the people who are keeping them from occurring.

Police officers on the street are still the best protection we know for not only enforcement, but for prevention; for all the ways that the chief spoke about, and all the ways that all of you know. We also know that police officers on the street need the help of people in their communities. That's why in the State of the Union address, I tried to emphasize the role of citizens.

When I lived at home in Little Rock, we lived in an area that was very mixed in every way -- racially, economically and in terms of the citizens who lived there. And our crime rate went up and down and up and down over the decade I lived in the governor's mansion. And the biggest difference was whether the citizens in our neighborhood were participating in the neighborhood crime watch and helping the police in our neighborhood to do their job.

So we are well aware -- we are well aware -- that we need the help of the citizens. But unless we follow through on our commitment to have 100,000 police officers on the street, the United States government will not be doing its job and exercising its responsibility to give you the opportunity to make the streets safer. We need 100,000 more badges.

Just before I came out here, someone gave me a police badge from a neighboring state of Arkansas. I save them, along with all the military coins I have from the units I've met. So now I have another one to put back on my desk. I want 100,000 more of these on the street. That's in the national interest, and the Congress and the country should not back away from that. We should stay right with it until we have 100,000. That's what all these people lobbied for and we should stay all the way. (Applause).

I want to thank again all of those, but especially those in the Justice Department who work so hard to create a nonbureaucratic way for these police officers to come out -- and that's been discussed. And I want to say again, I'm working hard to give more flexibility to state and local governments. I'm working hard to turn more authority back to states and local governments, even to the private sector where that's appropriate. I support the changes that were made in the last Crime Bill, to give more flexibility in the area of prevention. But I will oppose any attempt to undermine the capacity of the Crime Bill to produce the 100,000 police officers that we promised the American people, that you came up here and lobbied for, and that you worked so hard for. We must not do that.

You know, one of the things that I've never read in all these biographies or accounts of my career is I actually once participated in the LEAA programs -- I taught law enforcement officers. I taught constitutional law and criminal procedure. I was proud to do it and it was a good program. But it didn't obscure the fact that we also have problems in the LEAA, as the Vice President outlined. And more importantly, it doesn't obscure the fact that we have a national interest, and now a national solemn responsibility to take the money we save by reducing the federal work force to go forward with 100,000 police.

I also want to emphasize - I saw a lot of you nodding your head out there when Lee Brown was up here talking -- our Crime Bill and our national Drug Control Strategy are intimately related. With the help of the Crime Bill, this year's drug control's budget is the largest in the history of the federal government. Last year, for the first time in 25 years, I submitted to Congress a budget -- and Congress largely adopted it -- which reduced both domestic and defense spending in an attempt to get control of this terrible deficit. For the first time in 25 years. The only things that went up were interest on the debt and the medical costs of the government and the cost of living for Social Security. The aggregate spending, otherwise, went down. And I am proud of that. This year I have submitted to Congress a budget with another \$140 billion in spending cuts.

But remember our objectives here. The federal government's job is to increase the ability of people to make the most of their own lives and to enhance security. So we're spending more on education and training and children and their future in our budget. We're also spending more on security, not only abroad, but at home. More -- more to fight the drug war; more to fight crime; more to do things that will make people more secure in their homes in their schools, on their streets, in their workplaces. That's why this Drug Control Strategy is important. And it's also important to note that it, too, is funded in the Crime Bill. A big part of the prevention section of the Crime Bill is an antidrug strategy, to take this country's commitment to fighting drugs to new heights.

I thank Lee Brown for his leadership, and I am going to do everything I can to implement the 1995 Drug Control Strategy. That has four steps: We propose to work more closely with foreign governments to cut drugs off at the source. We propose to boost community efforts to educate young people about the dangers and penalties of drug use, something that is very important. We see fresh and disturbing efforts -- evidence -- that a lot of young people are no longer afraid that they will get sick, that they can die, that they can become addicted if they have casual drug use. We will work to break the cycle of crime and drugs by providing treatment to hardcore drug users, who consume most of the drugs and cause much of the crime and health problems. And we will punish people who break the law more severely.

This strategy gives your communities more resources to fight drugs as well, and more flexibility, as I said, in the use of those resources.

I want to work with the new Congress to build on this Crime Bill, but we should not move backwards. We shouldn't undermine our ability to implement the Drug Control Strategy; we shouldn't walk away from our commitment to provide 100,000 police officers. And we shouldn't let this become a partisan, political issue. The Crime Bill passed with bipartisan support; it should be maintained with bipartisan support.

I have no idea what political party the law enforcement officers standing up on this platform belong to, and I don't care. It's enough for me that they're all willing to put on a uniform and put their lives on the line to make the people of this country safer and give the kids of this country a better chance.

We should listen to the experts in law enforcement and do what is right and keep this above politics. Above all, we must keep it above partisan politics. Let us listen to the evidence and do what is right for America. That should be our only test.
(Applause.)

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

11:55 A.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 11, 1994

PRESS CONFERENCE BY THE PRESIDENT

The Briefing Room

6:15 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Ladies and gentlemen, under any circumstances I would be disappointed if the House of Representatives turned its back on the toughest and largest attack on crime in the history of our country, at a time when the American people say it is the most important issue to them.

But it is especially disheartening to see 225 members of the House participate in a procedural trick orchestrated by the National Rifle Association, then heavily, heavily pushed by the Republican leadership in the House, and designed with only one thing in mind -- to put the protection of particular interests over the protection of ordinary Americans.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I believe the American people will not like viewing this as some sort of political circus up here. I'm on their side, and I

think we better see who's on what side. That is the only thing that matters, what happens to the American people.

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

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

Thank you.

END

6:20 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(San Bernardino, California)

For Immediate Release

February 14, 1995

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO STUDENTS AND FAMILIES OF THE
SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY COLLEGE COMMUNITY

San Bernardino Valley College
San Bernardino, California

5:45 P.M. PST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you for that wonderful, wonderful welcome. (Applause.) Thank you, Dr. Singer, for your introduction. I know the Secretary of Education, Secretary Riley, has already spoken; I'm glad to be here with him. And I thank the Mayor for being here, and Dr. Bundy. And let's give the Etiwanda High School Band a hand. Didn't they do a great job? (Applause.) Great job. Thank you. (Applause.) When I heard them playing Hail To The Chief outside I thought they'd transported the Marine Band from the White House here, they were so great. They were great. (Applause.)

I'd also like to recognize a couple of other groups that are here. First of all, I want to thank the members of our national service program, AmeriCorps, who are here. They're over there. (Applause.)

And I want to thank a representative group of incredible people who just spent about an hour with me, talking to me about this institution, how it has affected their lives and your community and the remarkable partnerships that are being made, and the dreams that are being made to come true. I'd like for all the people who were just in the little roundtable discussion with me to be recognized. They're over here somewhere. Where are they? There they are. (Applause.) Thank you. They were great. (Applause.) I feel that I know a lot more about you now because I listened to all of them. And, believe me, they put you all in a very good light.

I want to talk to you today about the importance of this community college and education in general not only to your future, but to the future of our country -- what it means and what we should be doing about it. I met a lot of folks already here today that represent what I think America is all about --

MORE

people who are coming together around the idea of education without regard to their race, their income, their background, what country they were born in, what situation they're in now just because they want to make the most of their own lives and make a contribution, live up to the fullest of their God-given abilities. And I really think that's what we ought to be supporting.

The reason I worked so hard for the national service program that you see all these young people in is because I believe that we ought to be helping young people to find ways to earn money for education and contribute to the strength of their communities at the same time. (Applause.)

I ran for President because I was worried, as we come to the close of this great century, that we wouldn't be able to guarantee the American Dream for all people moving into the 21st century, and we wouldn't be able to make sure America was the strongest country in the world; and I believe those are the two jobs the President has to do. And I believe the way we should do that is what I have called the New Covenant. We should create more opportunity; we should insist on more responsibility from all of us; and we should work to build our communities at the grass-roots level, where the real strength of America is. (Applause.)

Now, there's been a lot of debate in our country now in two separate elections -- in 1992 and 1994 -- about what the role of government is and whether government is bad or good inherently. My answer to you is that we need a different kind of government for the 21st century, and that your national government has three major jobs.

One is, we should expand opportunity while shrinking the federal bureaucracy and the burden it imposes. (Applause.) Two, we should recognize that the government can't support everybody, but it should work to empower people to make the most of their own lives. (Applause.) And three, we should work to enhance the security Americans feel not only in terms of what goes on beyond our borders, but here at home as well. More opportunity, more empowerment, more security -- that is what we should be about in the national government. (Applause.)

Now, if you look at what this national service project does -- they're working in the San Bernardino forest; people who are helping to clean up the forest, maintain it, strengthen it, keep it there for our children and our grandchildren, make sure it's an important resource. Last year there were 89 young people in this program in South Texas who immunized 102,000 infants to help them live. (Applause.) And all of them earned money on their education -- 16 of these young people work at Berkeley, helping 750 of their classmates to tutor

MORE

middle-school students. These are the kinds of things that are going on all over America, and I think it emphasizes what I'm saying. For a small amount of federal money we have increased opportunity with no bureaucracy. This is all done at the grass-roots level. (Applause.)

We have certainly empowered these young people to make more of their own lives, and we are clearly going to be a stronger country because we have more people getting an education and more people preserving the environment, making our kids healthier, making our country stronger at the grass-roots level. That is what I am trying to do. And I want to talk to you today about what that means for education in general, and especially for community colleges like this one, which are the key to the future of the American economy and the ability to preserve the American Dream for all people. (Applause.)

Let me give you an example of what we're trying to do in another area on security, and then I'll come back to education, because I want to make sure that you understand exactly how I'm thinking about this. I welcome the call of the new Republicans in the Congress to cut the government, but I -- now, wait a minute, you all don't get into a partisan fight already; wait until the end of the speech. (Laughter.) For the last two years, we've been doing it without any help. I'd like some help. (Applause.) I'd like some help. But what is the purpose of this? That's what I want you to think about.

Now, there are now over 100,000 fewer people working for the federal government than there were the day I took office. We have shrunk the federal government. If they don't pass a single law this year, we will reduce the size of the federal government by over a quarter of a million because of the budgets adopted in the first two years of my term, and we'll make the federal government the smallest it's been since John Kennedy was President. (Applause.)

Now, what do we do with the money? What are we doing with the money? We cut, already, over \$600 billion from the deficit, and we're going to cut more. I've just sent a budget to the Congress that cuts more spending from the deficit. What are we doing with the money? We propose, first, to reduce the deficit, and secondly, to increase investments in the areas that I mentioned -- to increase investments that would create more opportunities, jobs; that would empower people more, education; and that would enhance security.

Things like the crime bill. If you just take the crime bill, for example, I said when I ran for president -- I came to California and campaigned -- vote for me and I will reduce the size of the federal bureaucracy by 100,000 and we'll put another 100,000 police officers on the street. And that's

MORE

exactly what we've done, except we reduced the size of the federal government by 270,000, and used it to pay for police officers, prisons and prevention. We passed that crime bill last year with a bipartisan majority. After six years of partisan haggling and scrapping around and people throwing words at each other, we actually passed a bill. And since October, we have put -- (laughter) -- well, I only was there a year and a half, you understand -- (laughter) -- but since October, we've put 16,000 police officers out -- 16,000. (Applause.)

And we've got 17 right here in San Bernardino, new police officers. (Applause.) Listen to this -- we did it with a one-page form, eight questions that could be faxed in; nobody had to hire consultants and of all the communities in America with police officers, every size, including those with just one -- one-half of all the communities in America have already applied for help under this program because it's a good program, it works and there's no hassle in it. That's the kind of government we ought to have -- a leaner, not a meaner government that makes sense and makes people more secure. We're under budget, ahead of schedule, moving forward.. (Applause.)

It took six years to pass the bill. I started working on it when I got elected; we got it done. In only six weeks of this new Congress, the new majority in the House of Representatives is trying to wipe out the crime bill and pass two block grants; to cut back on the money that goes to police and to prevention; to put it all in one package, send it to the states and say, you all do whatever you want to with it; and to put more money into the prison system. Now, here's the interesting thing -- wait a minute, don't get into a partisan fight, just listen to me make my piece. (Laughter.) Every police organization in the country, including those that are overwhelmingly Republican, has endorsed our position to leave it alone and let it work. (Applause.) This is not a partisan issue.

So the people in the House said, I don't care what the police said; I don't care what the people working in the community said; I don't care what the evidence shows; this is what we're going to do; we're determined not to spend any money on prevention; if the states want to do it and not put police on the streets, that's their business; and here's the money, build the prisons, or else. Now, what I believe is that we still have a chance to keep this a bipartisan issue. And I'm going to do my best to go into the Senate and to work with people who understand law enforcement, who will listen to people who are out here on the streets every day trying to save these kids and save our communities and save our streets and keep this Bill intact so we can put the police on the street and have the prevention programs. (Applause.)

MORE

But I will not -- I will reiterate what I said Saturday -- if I have to, I will veto any bill that attempts to undermine the commitment that we made last year after six years. (Applause.) But it need not be a partisan issue; it ought to be an American issue. (Applause.) And that's what I say to you about education. What are we going to do in this day and time? What is our job in Washington that affects you way out here in the Inland Empire when it comes to education? What is our job when it comes to helping to raise middle-class incomes and let people in the underclass work themselves into the middle class? What is our job and what is the problem?

You know, if anybody told me two years ago that we would be able, in the space of two years, to bring the deficit down over \$600 billion and have a hand in creating almost six million new jobs, I would have been very happy to hear that. In 1994, we had the best year for economic growth in a decade and the first year in a long time when all 50 states, including California that's been through so much, had economic growth. What is the problem?

The problem is, a whole lot of people have jobs but their incomes aren't going up; they don't feel secure at work; they're afraid they can't keep their health insurance or they don't have it now. We had 8.5 million people worried about their retirement until we passed a reform of the retirement guaranty system late last year. So in this global economy the good news is, there are more people in America becoming millionaires than ever before; that's good news. The good new is, there are more people with an education doing exciting things than ever before. The bad news is, if you don't have the skills you need, you can work harder and harder and harder for less and less and less, right? (Applause.)

So when you have a good news-bad news story, you have two choices: you can tell a joke about it, but if you're President, that doesn't seem to be a particularly good option. (Laughter.) The other choice you have is to try to make more good news and less bad news. And the only way to do that, I would argue to you, is to make sure we give all of our people access to the education and training they need to compete and win in this global economy, so when they work harder, they'll be rewarded and not punished for it. That is what we have to do. (Applause.)

Now, I want you to focus with me just for a minute, therefore, on two big issues -- what we ought to do in this year and what we should not do. I think we ought to give some tax relief to hardworking middle-class people who haven't felt the benefit of the recovery. (Applause.) But the question is, what kind and will we pay for it? I do not think we should increase the federal deficit. That's been a big problem. We've gotten it down; we ought to keep bringing it down, not exploding it.

MORE

Secondly, I think that the best tax relief is embodied in what I call the Middle Class Bill of Rights because it rewards work and family. It gives tax relief for people raising young children, and it gives tax relief for the cost of all education after high school, which I think is important. (Applause.)

You think about it -- you can deduct the cost of interest on your home if you have a home. But in the information age, if you don't have an education, you may never get to a home. So why shouldn't we let people deduct their education costs? It's a good investment. We also propose to let more people get an IRA and withdraw from it tax-free for the cost of education. I think that's what we ought to be doing. (Applause.)

And finally, I had a lot of questions earlier about unemployment -- one gentleman talked about his father being unemployed. We have scores of different federal training programs that you have to wonder, are you really qualified for or not. And what we propose to do is to create a GI Bill for America's workers by taking 70 of these programs, putting them in one big pot and saying, if you're unemployed or if you're working for a really low wage and you're eligible for federal help, instead of having to figure out how to enroll in one of these programs, qualify; we'll send you a voucher; show up at this community college; we'll send them a check. That's the way it ought to be done. (Applause.)

We're also taking the savings from cutting out all of these programs. In the Education Department alone, Secretary Riley has abolished 13 programs, reduced 38 others, and consolidated 70 more -- in the Education Department. We took the savings and put it into more funds for Head Start, more funds for apprenticeship programs for people who don't go on to four-year colleges.

I met a young woman today and a police officer who is working with her, who is one of these programs that we now see people desperately trying to set up all over the country, training young people in high school, giving them work experience, letting them see what it's like, giving them a chance to look forward to a job in the workplace. (Applause.)

You know, not everybody has to go to a four-year college, but everybody needs to get out of high school and have access to at least two years of further education, and one way to do it is to abolish the artificial distinction between learning and work by bringing the workplace into the school, the education into the workplace, and doing it everywhere in America, so we've put some more money into that. (Applause.)

The other thing we have sought to do is to make available college loans on better repayment terms and lower costs

MORE

to more people, through the so-called direct loan program.
(Applause.)

This is an amazing thing. I want you all to -- this is an amazing thing. When I became President, I discovered that we were spending about \$3 billion a year in your money because of people defaulting on their college loans. I discovered we were spending a fortune because the college loan program was a guarantee program. So you'd go to a bank, and if you qualified, the bank would give you a note and if you didn't pay it back, we'd give them the money.

So they didn't have much incentive to see that you paid it back, because we were going to give them the money. And we discovered if we started loaning the money to people directly, these good things would happen, if it could be properly managed. We discovered we could loan the money sometimes at lower interest rates and always at lower fees, we discovered that we could give people a lot of options about how they repaid it so that when you get out of school if you take a job that doesn't pay much money and you've got a lot of loans, you could pay it off as a percentage of your income instead of having to pay an amount you couldn't afford to pay. (Applause.) We discovered we could cut the bureaucratic paperwork and hassle for the colleges by more than half, and we discovered, miracle of miracles, if we didn't have to pay a middleman and we started collecting on these student loans, we could actually lower the cost to the taxpayers.

It almost doesn't make sense -- lower costs to students, lower costs to taxpayers. But this plan has already saved in the budget about \$5 billion, and if we can send it to all colleges and universities in the country, it can lower the deficit by \$12 billion and lower the cost of loans to every student in America with a student loan. That's one of the most important things we have done, and we need to do it. (Applause.)

Now, here's the political problem that you need to be a part of. We're having a big debate up there -- everybody wants to cut the size of government; everybody wants to reduce the deficit; and everybody has got a different idea for a tax cut. But some people in the new Congress believe that one of the ways they can reduce the deficit is by increasing the cost of student loans to people who don't have to pay interest on the loan while they're in school now. You know about the loan subsidy -- a lot of you are probably eligible for that. That will add 20 percent to the cost of student loans.

I'm against it. That is not the way to cut the budget. That is not the way to pay for a tax cut, to increase the cost of going to college to people. We need more people going to college at lower costs, not fewer people going to college at higher costs. (Applause.) And I hope you will support that. (Applause.)

The other idea -- this is unbelievable to me -- is we got this program working to lower the deficit, lower the cost

of student loans, and there are some people in the Congress who want to limit the number of students in this country who can get these direct loans to 40 percent of the colleges in America. Why? Because the people who are in the middle who get the money don't like losing it. I mean, it's not a bad deal -- I loan you money; you don't pay me back; I get a check from the government. But it didn't work very well.

Secretary Riley, since he's been there as Secretary of Education, has cut the cost to the taxpayers of college loan defaults from \$2.8 billion a year to \$1 billion a year. We're collecting the loans. We're doing it right, and we ought to keep going. (Applause.)

So what I want to ask you to do is, without regard to your party, and maybe -- especially if you have never voted before -- I want to tell you something: You've got a big stake in this debate that's going on in Washington. And it is a good and healthy debate in some ways. We do need a less bureaucratic, more creative, more entrepreneurial, more flexible government in Washington as we move into the 21st century. We do need more responsibility put down to the state and local levels. What's the best institution you know? The community college. Nobody from Washington is telling you what programs to have, what to do, who to sign up for. Nobody -- you're doing this. It's a community-created institution. We do need to change the nature of the federal government. We do have to keep cutting federal spending.

But the key to our future is whether we educate everybody so we don't need to cut investment in education and we do need to do things -- I will say again -- that enhance security, empower people to make the most of their own lives, and expand opportunity. That is education, education, education. We should not turn back on it. (Applause.)

Thank you very much. God bless you. We need your help. Please support it. (Applause.) Thank you. (Applause.)

END

6:15 P.M. PST

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

January 27, 1995

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN MEETING WITH U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

Old Executive Office Building

4:36 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. I'm delighted to be here. I see that half the Cabinet is here. I guess they've already answered all your questions -- (laughter) -- solved all your problems. Now they can come solve ours. (Laughter.)

Mayor Ashe and distinguished members of the organization, I'm delighted to see all of you. Is Mayor Grant from East Providence here? Your wife told me this was your birthday. (Laughter.) Happy birthday. Happy birthday. (Laughter and applause.) Just wanted you to know I was checking up on you. (Laughter.)

Let me begin by saying congratulations to all of you on the overwhelming passage of the unfunded mandate legislation by the Senate, 86 to 10 the bill passed. (Applause.) I have not had a chance to look at the final version of the Senate bill. It just passed a little while ago. But I know some very good amendments were added, and I want to congratulate Senator Glenn and Senator Kempthorne. We worked very hard on this bill last year, and I was sorry we didn't pass it then. Both of them did very, very good work. And I believe the bill is a very strong one as it goes to the House. But I have not seen its final form, but I heard it was in good shape. And I must have been pretty good if it passed 86 to 10. And I think that should be reassuring to you; it certainly is to me.

I want to thank you for the resolution you passed on the baseball strike, and the action we are taking. We will work very hard on that. I know how important that is to you. I sometimes think that the full economic implications of this whole thing have not been evaluated not just for the cities that have major league teams, but also for the cities that host spring training. This is a big deal; and we're working on it.

I want to thank your international committee for the vote you took on the Mexican stabilization package that we have offered. As you know, this is not the most popular issue in America today, but it's important. And I thank you for your support. It's in the interest of our working people and our economy. And it's not a gift; it's not foreign aid; it's not even a loan. It's cosigning a note with good collateral. So it's in our interests, and I thank you for that.

When I came here two years ago with a mission to restore the American Dream for all of the people of this country and to make sure we moved to the next century still the strongest force in the world for freedom and democracy and peace and prosperity, I said then and had said all during my campaign that I wanted a new partnership for the American people. I called it a New Covenant of more opportunity and more responsibility, recognizing that unless we had more of both, we could not hope to do the things that have to be done.

I have sought to essentially focus on three things that I think are critical to making sure we succeed in this new economy --

MORE

empowering our people to make the most of their own lives, expanding opportunity but shrinking the federal government bureaucracy, giving more authority to state and local governments and to the private sector. And I have sought to enhance the security of our people at home and abroad. And all those things you have been very helpful and supportive, both of the specific initiatives of this administration and of your own efforts which fit so well into that framework.

As all of you know, in the last two years we've had a lot of successes. We now have the figures in on 1994's growth rate. We know it was the best economic year our country had since 1984. We know that the combined rates of unemployment and inflation are the lowest they have been in 30 years. We know that we have inflation at a 30-year low. We know that, among other things, the African-American unemployment rate went into single digits for the first time in 20 years. (Applause.)

So there is a lot -- (applause) -- we've tried to expand more authority to our states and to our cities, and we're bringing the federal government down in size and reach where it's appropriate. We already have 100,000 fewer people working for the national government than we did when I became President. And if nothing else is done, it will shrink by another 170,000. And, of course, in terms of security, the most important things we did were to pass the Brady Bill and the crime bill, which you were active in and supportive of, and I thank you for all that. (Applause.)

As we look ahead in this year, which promises to be somewhat unpredictable but exciting, and I think could be very productive for our country. And I must say this passage of this bill today and the reasonable deliberation in the Senate and the way the amendments were debated in good faith is quite encouraging to me.

There are some things that I think we have to do. In terms of empowering our people to meet the challenges of this age, we have to realize our job is still to expand the middle class and to shrink the underclass. And the two main initiatives our administration has this year are the Middle Class Bill of Rights and raising the minimum wage.

We want to pass this Middle Class Bill of Rights, not only to give tax relief to middle class people who have been working harder for lower wages or for at least no wage increases, but to do it in a way that will raise incomes in the short-term and in the long-term. That's why the focus is on tax deduction for all educational expenses after high school and an IRA with tax-free withdrawal for education expenses, or for health care expenses, or for the care of a parent, or purchasing a first-time home.

And while we seek to consolidate the 70 various training programs into one huge block and let people get directly a voucher that they can use if they're unemployed or if they have a low-wage job and they're eligible for training, to take to the local community college, or wherever else they wish to take it to get the education and training of their choice.

I think it's important to raise the minimum wage, because if we don't next year the buying power of the minimum wage will be at a 40-year low. And the evidence is clear that if you raise the minimum wage a modest amount, it doesn't cause increased unemployment and indeed may bring people back into the job market who otherwise are not willing to come in and go to work. So I would hope you would support both of those things.

In the area of expanding opportunity and shrinking the bureaucracy, we're coming back with a second round of reinventing government proposals -- and perhaps Secretary Cisneros has already

talked to you about what we're proposing for HUD -- to collapse the 60 programs into 3.

I want to emphasize that we're doing this to strengthen the mission of HUD and to strengthen the partnership that we have with the cities of this country, not to gut the department's partnership or its capacity to help you do your job.

And so I hope that you will help us as we debate this on both parts, say that you want to support a reduction in the size of the federal bureaucracy, but you do not want to see the mission of HUD as carried out by the mayors of this country undermined and weakened because you have a job to do. (Applause.)

And finally, let me say some things about the crime bill. I very much hope that we will be able to work through, in this session of Congress, a good faith carrying forward of the crime bill that was passed last year. It became unfortunately embroiled in politics -- you know that better than I do. And I think you also know that the prevention programs that were passed were programs that were recommended to us in the strongest possible terms not only by mayors, not only by community leaders, but by the leaders of the law enforcement community; and that a lot of those prevention programs that were later labeled as pork were cosponsored, the first time they came up, by people who later said they were pork.

Well, all that's behind us now, and the only thing that matters now is, what is the best thing for the people of this country? What will keep our streets safer? What will reduce the crime rate more? What is the most likely approach to actually make the American people feel more secure? We must enhance our security at home. At the end of the Cold War, I think it's fair to say that most Americans put their children to bed at night more worried about their security concerns at home than abroad.

So what we should seek to do without regard to party or region of the country is that which is most likely to make us most safe and to lower the crime rate. Many of you -- I'll bet even a majority of you here -- have recorded declines in the crime rate in the last year or so because of the strategies that mayors are adopting with community policing, with prevention programs, with using citizens to work with law enforcement to do things that will reach people in ways that will prevent crime as well as catch criminals more quickly. We have to take these lessons into account.

So as we enter into a second round of debate about the crime bill, I would say there are two or three things that we ought to keep in mind. First, as I said in my State of the Union Address, we should not repeal the assault weapons ban. We should not do that. (Applause.)

This issue, as you can hear from the response, is not a Republican-Democratic issue, it is not a liberal-conservative issue, it is overwhelmingly an urban-nonurban issue. And what we have to do is to convince all the people I grew up with -- (laughter) -- that we don't -- we don't want to fool with anybody's hunting rifles. We don't want to stop anybody from going to shooting contests. We don't want to interfere with anybody's legitimate pursuit of happiness in the exercise of their right to keep and bear arms. But there is nothing in the Constitution that prevents us from exercising common sense. And people who live in urban settings know that the mortality rate in the emergency rooms of urban hospitals from gunshot wounds has gone up dramatically in the last 15 years because the average body has more bullets in it when it's wheeled into the emergency room. You do not have to be a genius to figure out what's happening.

And so I hope that we can put an end to this war. This is a phony war among the American people. And those of us that

respect people's right to hunt and to engage in other appropriate conduct, those of us that enjoy it ourselves, we ought to be able to ask each other again: What's best for America? And what good is it to pretend that it's a matter of principle to maintain the right of a bunch of teenagers to have uzis on the streets of our cities.

So I hope you will talk about this in a nonpartisan, nonpolitical way and realize this is one of those cultural problems that's gripping America. We got too many of them. They're keeping us apart. But we need to say to the nonurban folks in our society, this is something that -- we've got to work this out. This is a fair deal. This is a balanced bill. There are 650 weapons enumerated in this bill that cannot be infringed on by the government in any way, shape or form. And so let's let this alone and go on about the business of the country.

I also think we ought to emphasize that at least the Attorney General is doing her dead-level best to make sure that the administration of the Crime Bill that passed is non-bureaucratic, nonpolitical and efficient. If you look at what's happened so far, in October, not even two weeks into the new fiscal year, we had already funded 392 policing grants that went unfunded last year. Last month, at your recommendation, we gave 631 larger cities the go-ahead to begin recruiting and training more than 4,600 officers. So they know the money will be there when their applications are handed in.

For the smaller cities, we've streamlined the application process, allowing them to apply more quickly for police with a simple one-page application. I don't know how many one-page applications we've got in the government now, but I know you can ask for an SBA loan or a policeman with one page. You ought to be able to do more things with one page.

This cops program has now helped more than 1,000 communities to put more than 10,000 more police officers on the street in all 50 states. Within a week, when the announcement is made of the winners of the COPS FAST program, that total will be close to 15,000 -- well on the way to the 100,000 goal of the crime bill. That would be a 20 percent increase of the strength on the streets.

Now, the crime bills now being considered in Congress have some things that I think may be superficially appealing, but need to be thought through. If you scrap the \$8.8 billion cops initiative, as some suggest, and replace it with a \$10 billion block grant which also has to include prevention programs, the good news is, you'll have a block grant. The bad news is there'll be a lot less money in it than was provided for.

And keep in mind -- to all those who say it wasn't funded, we did not raise one red cent in taxes to pay for the crime bill. We did not take one red cent away from any other program. We simply dedicated all the savings to be gained from reducing the size of the federal bureaucracy to giving it back to local communities to use to fund the crime bill. That's what was done.

Now, to make matters worse, some have suggested that the \$10 billion block grant to fund police and prevention could only be funded if we first fund \$10 billion in new prisons. So that's a decision that some would make against the unanimous advice of every police officer in the country who has testified. So that -- if we make that decision, that would be like people saying, we don't care what lowers crime; we don't care what makes people safer; we don't care what people in law enforcement who vote Republican and Democrat say; this is what we're going to do. It will make us feel better and we can claim that it was the best thing to do.

We should not do that. This ought not to become a political issue. That crime bill had a balance of police and prevention and prisons. We shouldn't take all the prevention money away through the back door and put it into prisons. And we shouldn't say that the prisons are more important than the police and the prevention. I had no objection to getting into the business of helping states with their prison construction, even though it was totally unprecedented, but there is no evidence that that is the way to lower the crime rate. The American people want to be safer at night; they want their kids to be safer on the streets and at school. And we ought to be driven by what is best for the American people. (Applause.)

I would also say, just parenthetically, that even last year I was concerned when the crime bill passed that the conditions on getting that federal money for prison construction were so restrictive and required such a large state match that a lot of that money might never be used. We cannot permit a cruel hoax to then be written into the law saying, well, you can get this block grant for police and prevention, but only after the prison money is spent and then have conditions on spending the prison money so strict that it will never be spent in the first place.

So I urge you to just go up there without regard to your party or region and say, look, let's do what will lower the crime rate; let's do what will keep people safer. The American people will figure that out. They will trust their local leaders; they will trust their local law enforcement people; they will trust them. We can share responsibility now. There need be no characterization that is negative when this process is over. There need be no name-calling. There needs to be no anything. We just need to do what is right to lower the crime rate. And all of us have worked so hard on this.

Again, I would say this is like the assault weapons issue. We've got big issues to deal with. This unfunded mandates is one. Welfare reform is another. How we're going to lower the deficit and provide tax relief is another. There are major positive issues that we're going to have to face. We don't need to reopen an issue and make it worse. So I ask you to help us on that.

Now, let me say one final thing about the baseball strike, if I might. I asked Bill Usery, the federal mediator, to get the sides back together and report to me by February the 6th. Anybody know what February the 6th is? It's Babe Ruth's 100th birthday. So it struck me as a good day to settle the baseball strike. (Applause.)

I identify with Babe Ruth. He's a little overweight. (Laughter.) And he struck out a lot -- (laughter) -- but he hit a lot of home runs -- (applause) -- because he went to bat. You are the people in this country who go to bat. You have to deal directly with people. You have to be accountable, not only for the rhetoric of your speeches, but the reality of your actions.

And so I ask you to take this opportunity to join with us and let's make the decision the American people made last November, a good decision by making it one of shared responsibility. Let's move what we can back to the state and local level. Let's work to empower people. Let's reduce the burden of government and increase the opportunity it creates. We can do these things, but it is very important that we not fix what ain't broke, and that we not become diverted by issues that can only divide us when there is so much we can do that will bring us together.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

4:55 P.M. EST



**Sarah Brady and
Coalition of Prosecutors for Clinton/Gore Endorsement
Remarks Governor Bill Clinton
Romulus, MI
October 17, 1992**

Thank you very, very much. Thank you. Thank you very much. I want to thank my long time friend, Frank Kelley, with whom I served as attorney general, and who was elected attorney general of Michigan when I was 16 years old. Never let it be said that there's no job security in politics.

I always say that the attorney general was the best job I ever had. Unlike being governor or president, you don't have to hire or fire much, or tax or cut. And when you do something that's really unpopular, you can always blame it on the Constitution.

I want to thank the former attorneys general who are here, as well as the remarkable representation of attorneys general who are here. I want to thank Norm Early for his eloquent statement, and for the statement on behalf of the prosecutors around America, more than 200 of them now.

I want to thank Bob Scully again for the support that he has given me, and the work that he's done on behalf of our law enforcement officials.

I'd like to say a special word of thanks to the delegation from my state. I see at least three of them. My attorney general Winston Bryant, my friend of many years, prosecutor Mark Stodola who worked in my first campaign for Congress in 1974. I've still never asked him to fix a speeding ticket.

And Karen Curry, the coordinator of our prosecutors at home. But most of all, like most of you, I want to thank Cathy and Lindsey and Chris Gould and Sarah Brady for their presence here today. For they remind us of what this election is really all about.

I could hardly bear to listen to the eloquent statement of Cathy Gould. This is a complicated issue. Those of us who have dealt with it for a long time know that

when our children's children are here in this country, there will still be crime. There has always been violence in America. We know that crime is somehow related to the deterioration of the economy and the combined deterioration of the economy and the social structures that affect so many millions of our people, what has happened to our communities and to our families.

But we know that somehow it is raging out of control now in ways that no civilized society should accept. Surely our country does not have to be the most violent on earth, with the largest percentage of its people behind bars of any nation on earth. And when you hear people like Cathy Gould and Sarah Brady talk, you ask yourself, "have we done all we can", and if we haven't, how can we sleep tonight.

You know, my exposure to the issue they discussed, it's interesting, it goes back to a personal experience I had with someone who was on the other side of the issue presented by the Brady Bill. I had a friend many years ago who ran a little hardware store in a little town in North Arkansas, and he sold guns. And a man he hadn't seen in ten years came in his store and said, I want to buy a handgun. I want to go out and do a little practicing. He, like most of the people in our state, you know, were gun owners and skeptical of all this, and the '68 gun control law is all we have. And so he pulled out this form. He said, now, have you ever committed a crime, have you ever been in a mental institution. Of course, no, no. And he put it right back in the folder and went on, sold the guy the gun. Within eighteen hours six people were dead. The man had escaped from our own Veterans' Mental Hospital. Six days before he'd lost his mind as a result of his experience in Vietnam.

It was in some days almost no one's fault, except a system that wasn't smart enough not to put guns into the hands of people who are mentally unstable. And yet, my friend who just did what thousands of other people in his position do every day in this country, almost never got over it, and was plagued for years by the thought that somehow he was responsible for what had happened.

So I say to you today, I do not promise miracles in the fight on crime. But I understand what it's like, having been an attorney general, having been someone who's worked for victims of crime for years, having tried to be a real friend to the prosecutors and law enforcement people in my state.

What I promise you is a partnership, not rhetoric, not hot speeches, not cheap 30 second television ads, but a genuine partnership to make the people of this country safer, and to make our policies saner, and to bring us closer to the kind of country we ought to have by supporting law enforcement, and doing things we know will work.

The Brady Bill ought to pass, and there ought to be a waiting period in this country until there is an automatic, absolutely verifiable way of using computer technology to check on people's records in a more rapid way. It ought to pass. And

I'll do my best to put it through.

We ought not to have assault weapons whose only purpose is to kill in the hands of people on the street, when the police don't have a fighting chance. It's wrong.

And for those who seriously claim that we ought to allow untrammelled ownership of those weapons because of sporting and target practice, come on down to Arkansas at any duck, turkey or quail season, we'll show them any number of other weapons options they can have. That is an absurd argument. It is a ridiculous argument. And it's time we took the side of people in law enforcement.

We ought to have 100,000 more police officers on the street. Thirty years ago there were three police officers in this country for every serious crime. Today there are three serious crimes for every police officer. And yet we are organized in such a way that over 50 percent of all the rest are made by police officers in their first three years on the beat. It is time for America to make a serious commitment to community policing, to having people back on the beat, working the same neighborhoods, making relationships with people in ways that prevent crime as well as expedite the handling of criminal cases. It cannot be done without greater resources. With greater resources it can be done.

I have seen crime rates go down in certain neighborhoods in New York City for the first time in 36 years after community policing. I have seen it in Philadelphia. I've seen a fifteen percent drop in the crime rate in the city of Houston, after over 650 new police officers were added to the beat through prevention.

But it cannot work unless the resources are there. How will the federal government provide 100,000 more police officers? First of all, by getting the crime bill passed, instead of killing it, that has funds for people at the local level.

Secondly, by embracing the suggestion of Senator Sam Nunn, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, that as we downscale the military we give properly trained and certified men and women coming out of the military the opportunity to continue to earn their military retirement by doing law enforcement work here at home.

Thirdly, by embracing and expanding the concept of the national police corps, giving people the opportunity to work off their college loans if they are properly certified police officers, and work for two years at reduced pay, let them wipe out a four year college loan.

I think those three things could help us to prevent crime, and make our streets safer without in any way undermining the quality of law enforcement in America.

The third thing I think we ought to do, again echoing what Norm Early said, is to raise the interest, the legitimate interest of victims in this country. I will put an advocate for the victims of the United States in that office for victims rights. That's something I agree with Norm. That's something Ronald Reagan did that I like, and we ought to do it again.

The fourth thing we should do is to give people a sense that we have a commitment to balance in fairness in the enforcement of criminal laws. There's widespread support for severe punishment for the most severe white collar criminal offenses. This administration pulled down new sentencing guidelines in the white collar crime area, promised us 27 regional savings and loan task forces to deal with the savings and loan rip offs that have cost this country more than any taxpayer abuse in history. And to date only two of the 27 have been set up, and only one percent of the money that was ripped off from the American people has been recovered by the federal criminal justice system. And I can tell you, we are going to do better than that. We can, and we must do better than that.

The next thing I'd like to do is to say just a few words about drugs. Again this is a complicated issue. It is very easy for a politician to talk about the drug war and to spout rhetoric, and I have gone out of my way to avoid saying things that sound like just somebody else screaming on the street corner. Because I have a brother of whom I'm proud who is a recovering drug addict, I know a little more about the complexities of this than a lot of people who run for office. But I can tell you here again, we can do better. We can do better on interdiction. We can use the resources of this country much better on interdiction. It can become an important part of our foreign policy. We can say we want to nourish the growing democracies in Latin America, but if people want to do business with us, they're going to have to let us help them get their farmers into growing something besides things that will wind up killing the children of America. We must do it.

We can do what every serious federal prosecutor who's ever dealt in any detail with these drug cases has told me, and that is if you really want to get the big criminals, we can focus more on the money laundering aspects of their operations, and use the federal authorities to deal with the financial transactions that cross state lines that deal with federally insured institutions, that deal with those things that the states will never be competent to deal with because we will never have the resources. That is what the federal government ought to focus on in the law enforcement area. Go after the money, and we can get the big people.

I think we ought to do more for the communities that are hardest hit, and that's not only big communities, but smaller communities--some in my state would qualify. But we ought to help to organize extra efforts with extra help to bring together citizens' task forces, tenant management projects in the

public housing facilities, school education programs, and other things that will be more intensely focused on the areas where drugs are in greatest use and where, therefore, violence and the threat to children is greatest.

And finally, I want the federal government to begin to help with the safe schools initiative. Years ago, the federal government's main involvement with local law enforcement was equipment, radios or other equipment. Now what we need is more metal detectors in our schools, and more security forces there, and a common effort to get uniform policies on searches and things of that kind, and federal matching funds to help to bring mentors and others into the schools to try to deal with these problems.

If no other part of a dangerous neighborhood in a dangerous city can be safe, the schools ought to be safe, and drug free. They ought to be havens. And we ought to leave them (inaudible).

I will say again, I care a lot about these issues. I care because I know personally about the scourge of drugs, I care because I had a friend who thinks he made a terrible mistake he never would have made if the Brady Bill had been law, I care because I have been moved beyond words by the courageous and heroic efforts of Sarah and Jim Brady over these last several years, and because there are people like Cathy Gould all over this country. And their and their spouses service to our nation deserved to be honored by our making our best efforts.

This can be an exciting part of our new partnership. This is not tax and spend government. The things I talked about are non-bureaucratic, grass roots, and common sense. And it's time we got about the business of doing them.

Thank you very much.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 11, 1993

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN ANTI-CRIME INITIATIVE ANNOUNCEMENT

The Rose Garden

9:43 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Mr. Vice President and Attorney General, distinguished members of the Congress and law enforcement community and concerned American citizens. I'm glad to have all of you here in the Rose Garden today for this important announcement. I want to say a special word of appreciation to Senator Biden and to Chairman Brooks who have worked for a long time to try to get a good crime bill through the United States Congress. I hope today is the beginning of that.

I'm proud to be here with representatives of the nation's police and prosecutors and states attorneys general with whom we have worked closely to fashion this bill. And it gives me particular pleasure to be here with some of the brave men and women who risk their lives every day to protect the people of this country and to preserve the law.

The first duty of any government is to try to keep its citizens safe, but clearly too many Americans are not safe today. We no longer have the freedom from fear for all our citizens that is essential to security and to prosperity. The past four years have seen 90,000 murders in this country. Last month in this city, our nation's capital, in one week 24 murders were committed. When our children must pass through metal detectors to go to school, or worry that they'll be the victim of random drive-by shootings when they're playing in the swimming pool in the summertime, when parents are imprisoned in their own apartments behind locked doors, when we can't walk the streets of our cities without fear, we have lost an essential element of our civilization.

Many of you have heard me tell many times over the last year and a half or so of the immigrant worker in the New York hotel who said if I became President he just wanted me to make his son free. And when I asked him what he meant, he meant that his son couldn't walk to school two blocks without his walking with him, he son couldn't play in the park across the street from their apartment house without his father being there. He said his son was not free.

It's time we put aside the divisions of party and philosophy and put our best efforts to work on a crime plan that will help all the American people and go beyond the cynicism of mere speeches to clear action.

Today I'm proud to be here with the chairs of the House and the Senate Judiciary Committees to announce this plan. The plan

is not -- it's tough, it is fair. It will put police on the street and criminals in jail. It expands the federal death penalty to let criminals know that if they are guilty, they will be punished. It lets law abiding citizens know that we are working to give them the safety they deserve. It is the beginning -- just the beginning, but a major beginning of a long-term strategy to make America a more law abiding, peaceful place, and to make Americans more secure, and to give our young people, wherever they live, a better chance to grow up, to learn, to function, to work, and to have a decent life.

This bill first addresses the most pressing need in the fight against crime. There simply are not enough police officers on the beat. The plan is designed to make the major downpayment on the pledge that I made in the campaign to put 100,000 police officers on the street. Thirty years ago there were three police officers for every violent crime. Today the ratio is reversed -- three crimes for every police officer.

Like so many of the best ideas, community policing was spawned in the laboratories of experimentation on the streets of our cities and towns. Then Commissioner Lee Brown of New York, now my drug director, sent some 3,000 additional police officers onto the streets of New York City, launching community policing in every precinct. Then, shortly thereafter for the first time in 36 years, crime rates went down in every major category. It's worked from Boston to St. Louis, to Los Angeles.

The crime bill that will be introduced next month will include \$3.4 billion to fund up to 50,000 new police officers to walk the beat. It will also create a police corps to give young people money for college, train them in community policing, and ask them to return to their communities to serve as police officers in return for their education. This will add to the numerous community policing initiatives we have already undertaken.

For example, earlier this year I signed a jobs bill that will make \$150 million available right away to hire or rehire police officers. And I'm happy to report that the Labor Department will allocate \$10 million to retrain newly discharged troops from the United States Armed Forces to become police officers. After defending our freedom abroad, they'll be given a chance to do so at home.

Second, we must end the insanity of being able to buy or sell a handgun more easily than obtaining a driver's license. The Brady bill, which requires a waiting period before the purchase of a handgun, is simply common sense. I have said so before Congress and before the American people. It is long past time to pass it. If the Congress will pass it, I will sign it. I believe now that Congress will pass it. There is no conceivable excuse to delay this action one more day. (Applause.)

The effort to keep handguns out of the hands of criminals cannot and should not wait for the passage of this legislation. Today I will sign two presidential directives that fight gun violence. I am ordering that the rules governing gun dealers be reviewed to make sure that only legitimate gun dealers are in the business of selling guns. And I am ordering the Treasury Department to take the necessary action to suspend the importation of foreign-made assault pistols, which have become the weapons of choice for many gangs and drug dealers. Too many weapons of war are making their way onto our streets and turning our streets into war zones.

Let me also say that this effort against crime will not be complete if we do not eliminate assault weapons from our street. No other nation would tolerate roving gangs stalking the streets better armed than the police officers of a country. Why do we do it? We shouldn't and we ought to stop it. (Applause.)

Finally, if we are to take back the streets of America from the gangs and the drug dealers, we must do what has not been done before. We must actually enact a crime bill. This legislation will be introduced by Chairman Biden and Brooks, and it will build upon a lot of good ideas from around the country, including one I worked hard on when I was governor, community boot camps for young offenders. Boot camps which give young people the discipline, the training, the treatment they need for a second chance to build a good life.

When it comes to hardened, violent criminals, society has the right to impose the most severe penalties but I believe we should give young people a chance to make it. As I said during the campaign and as I said during my tenure as a governor, I support capital punishment. This legislation will reform procedures by limiting death-row inmates to a single habeas corpus appeal within a six-month time limit but also guaranteeing them a higher standard of legal representation than many have had in the past. Both elements are important if this is to be genuine reform. And it will provide the death penalty for some federal offenses including killing a federal law enforcement officer. (Applause.)

As I said, this is just the beginning of our efforts to restore the rule of law on our streets. To do this we must work with thousands of law enforcement officials around the country who risk their lives every day. We must work with the mayors, with the governors, we must work with the people who deal with children before they become criminals. We must have a broadbased assault on the terrible things that are rending the fabric of life for millions of Americans.

We in Washington must work together, too. For too long crime has been used as a way to divide Americans with rhetoric. It is time, and I thank the Republican members of Congress who are here today, it is time to use crime as a way to unite Americans through action.

I call on the Democrats and the Republicans together to work with us and with the law enforcement community to craft the best possible crime legislation. Last week we began to break the gridlock with a new budget and an economic plan. Now we can do so again in ways that unite us as Americans. And I pledge to you my best and strongest efforts to pass this bill at the earliest possible time. There are good things in it. It will make our people safer. It will shore up our police officers, it will move America in the right direction.

May I now introduce the person who has done a great deal to do all those things just in the last few months, our distinguished Attorney General Janet Reno. (Applause.)

* * * * *

Q -- with the Pope tomorrow, what you anticipate from it?

THE PRESIDENT: -- I'm really very, very excited, I'm looking forward to the visit and I'm honored that he's come to the United States.

Q Mr. President, there are all sorts of attempts to water down the Brady bill. Are you one of those purists that Chairman Brooks talked about or would you consider amendments to water it down?

THE PRESIDENT: That bill shouldn't be amended. It's a modest bill, and I think it ought to be passed like it is. We would like to see the Senate go on and do it.

I feel very strongly about it. I think -- I also associate myself with the other remarks of the Attorney General. I think it's the beginning. It's not the end of the process by any means.

Q What would you like to see on handguns?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think extending the ban on imported handguns is important, which I will do today. Then Congress is debating this whole issue of assault weapons generally, broad definition -- and we'll see what we can come out with. But you know there's a bill in the House, there's a bill in the Senate and I'd like the crime bill to pass and then I'd like for that to be debated.

Q Would you do the Brady bill separate?

Q Yes, would you do the Brady bill separately or as part of the crime --

THE PRESIDENT: It's fine with me, whatever -- done. I would prefer to get it as quickly as possible but I think the important thing is that it be passed in a strong and clear and unambiguous form.

END

10:50 A.M. EDT



"MAKING OUR STREETS SAFE"
GOVERNOR BILL CLINTON
CITY HALL
JULY 23, 1992
HOUSTON, TEXAS

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, I am so honored to be here today, grateful to all these men and women in uniform who have agreed to come here and stand here with me, overwhelmed by this crowd of Texans who came out to see your neighbor.

I want to thank all these police officers for the work they do, and for the support they give to you. I want to thank your mayor for lowering the crime rate in Houston while it's going up everywhere else.

I want to tell you that I come here today with a vision for America. Hey, calm down, everybody. It's raining, we're going to have to listen up or go in. I'll stay if you will. I'm willing to get wet to turn this country around, and I hope you are too. We've got to do it.

Al Gore and I have a plan to put the people of this country back to work, to give us world-class education, to provide affordable health care to all Americans, and to challenge all of us to make this country what it was meant to be. And I want you to be a part of it.

One of the things that we have to do as Americans is to do a better job in making our streets safer, and our cities safer, and our people safer. That's what we're here today to talk about.

I've heard all this rhetoric from this administration for years and years and years, but the fact is we're number one in the world in the percentage of people we've got behind bars, and we're only thirteenth in wages. I want to reverse those numbers, and get this country going in the right direction.

The people in this country who suffer most are the people who are out here today, the people who can't afford their own security guards and their own private systems. I want to help you to have safer streets, and your children to have safer schools, and all of us to have brighter tomorrows. We cannot take our country back until we take our neighborhoods back.

Four years ago, this crime issue was used to divide Americans. I want to use it to unite Americans. I want to be tough on crime and good for civil rights. You can't have civil justice without order and safety. We can go forward together, and that's exactly what we're going to do in a Clinton/Gore administration.

I want to start by, clearly and unequivocally in the state of Texas, endorsing the Brady Bill, something even Ronald Reagan supports, to make our streets safer. I don't see how a President can ask men and women to put on uniforms and risk their lives to keep the rest of us safe, if he won't risk a little political capital and take a little heat to ask people to wait five or six days while somebody checks their criminal records and their mental health histories before they get a gun which can kill a policeman.

I want to make something else clear. I come from your neighboring state, where over half the people have hunting and fishing licenses. I support the right to keep and bear arms. I support the right of men and women to be sportspeople. But I think most law abiding Americans would also like to think that we are helping police to be safe in their work, kids to be safe in their schools, and people to be safe on their streets. And it is crazy to believe that we shouldn't at least try to give our police officers a fair fight in the fight to keep our streets safe. That's why I believe we ought to be for the Brady Bill, and we ought to take the AK-47's and the Uzis off the streets in America.

And I want to make one other point before we all drown. This President used crime to beat the Democrats in 1988. And then he turned around and tried to take a hundred million dollars away from state and local law enforcement. I've got a plan to cut federal employment by a hundred thousand, and put another hundred thousand police officers on the street, keeping the streets safer by community policing.

It's not just Houston, folks. In New York, the crime rate has gone down because they've gone back to community policing, neighbors working with their police. I've seen housing projects which have gone from drug dens in Chicago to havens of safety for children, because the community and the police worked together. I've walked on streets in Pittsburgh which were dominated by crackhouses, where kids couldn't stand in the park, where now they play basketball free everyday. This is an issue of personal freedom, and that's what those hundred thousand police officers will provide.

Let me tell you how we're going to do it. We're going to take the servicemen and women who will be reduced out of the military because of the Cold War, and give them a chance to win wars here at home. We will make it possible for them to be re-trained as police officers, and then let them earn credit on their military retirement, if they'll come back to Houston, or Dallas, or El Paso, or San Antonio, and help to keep the people safe, and so they can raise their children in safety.

We're going to open the doors of college education to all Americans, and let any American, any American who borrows the money to go to college pay it back with two years of public service. And one of the things they'll be able to do is to work for two years as police officers, or teachers, or nurses, or work with kids to keep them out of gangs and off drugs.

If you want a President who knows the difference between talk and action, who will not use crime to divide us, but use safety to unite us, then vote for Bill Clinton and we will turn this country around.

My fellow Americans, we have a great decision before us, a choice that will require some courage on your part. In the next one hundred days, we will have a debate on the future of America. And you will be asked once again to stay with the same old path, to stay in the grip of a failed economic idea called trickle-down economics.

An idea that has produced ten million unemployed and made most of our people work harder today for less money than they were making ten years ago, including most people here today. An idea that has led us to be ridiculed in the face of the world, that led the Japanese Prime Minister to say he felt "sympathy" for the United States. I don't want sympathy. I want respect from the rest of the world. We'll be number one again, if you give us the chance.

You will be asked to vote again on the same old politics of fear, and division, and distraction. I ask you again to take a look at this crime issue. Use it, not as a way to divide the American people, but a way to unite the American people. Every child needs to be safe.

It is the poor, it is the minorities, it is those who have been forgotten and left out, who are most at risk to violent crime in America today. They will be healed and helped if their people could put on these uniforms and walk their streets and protect their children. And that is what I want to do.

No more use of crime to divide, let's lift the American people up together. We're going up or down together, and we better start acting like it.

So I say to you, before we all drown, if you want a government that works for all the people, that puts the American people first, that believes we can compete and win again, that changes the way government operates in Washington, the way your great governor, Ann Richards, is trying to change the way government operates here, if you want a government that really works for you and really works, then you support Bill Clinton and Al Gore.

I will never forget this vast crowd here today, and the fact that you all stayed when it rained. You're all going to have to stay through some other rain. We didn't get into this mess overnight. We're not going to get out of it overnight. It's not going to be easy, it's not going to be quick. And we'll all have to accept the challenge to change. But we must try some new directions.

Let me say one final thing about this issue I came here to talk to you about. Most of the people behind bars are under-educated, with an alcohol or drug abuse problem. If you want to fix it, we've got to find new ways to deal with our young people--drug education, drug treatment, work for them in the summertime, opportunities for them to have something to say yes to.

And one final thing, we need an early intervention program, so that when these kids get in trouble the first time, instead of being ignored or sent to prison where they can learn how to be first-class criminals, there should be one shot to stay in a community punishment program--community boot camps that give you discipline, education, treatment, and work, that give people a chance to get connected to the future we want them to live.

I can tell you that in my state, we have a repeater rate of only about thirteen percent for those that graduate from the boot camp program, only about twelve percent for those that get their high school diplomas when they're in prison. We've got to empower people to take their lives back. Punish, when punishment is appropriate, but liberate, too, from the scourge of ignorance and addiction, so that we can go forward together. We need both.

What I have said to you today comes from my heart. You can see I couldn't read my notes. These are things I've been working on for years, folks. And that's the last thing I want to say.

People are trying to hope again in America. They're trying to believe again in America. And they always say to me, "Well, why should I believe you?" All I can tell you is, folks, I am living proof that the American dream works, if you get a real shot to grab it.

I was born thirty-five miles from the Texas line, nearly forty-six years ago, into a family of, to put it mildly, modest means. But the system worked for me. And I got into this race for President because I did not want to see the system fail you. Because I did not want to see my daughter grow up to be part of the first generation of Americans to do worse than their parents. Because I could not bear the thought that in this great land, which has been the home of the free and the brave, we would literally lead the world in the percentage of people we put in jail, and fall from first to thirteenth in the world in wages in twelve short years.

I do not want this to be a country that is a wasteland to live in, instead of the land of hope and opportunity for all Americans. And that's why I got into this race for President.

And I think we have to keep score, not just on what we say, but on what we do. This is a race, not just between the past and the future, it's the difference between action and inaction. Anybody can talk a good game. Al Gore and Bill Clinton have a plan, a vision, something you can act on, something you can sink your teeth into, something people have analyzed and said will move America forward. We need your help. Will you help us?

Do you think I did a good job in selecting a Vice-Presidential nominee? Do you agree with him, that it's time for them to go? Thank you. Do you believe that these fine men and women in uniform deserve more support in keeping your streets safer, and lifting your children up? Do you want a President who doesn't just talk the talk, but who walks the walk?

My fellow Americans, more than anything else, I want us to be making progress again. I want tomorrow to be better than today. I want us to be coming together again across the lines of race and region and income. I believe we can win again, and that's what this campaign is about.

If you want to win again, and you want your country to be one again, if you want America to be associated with people who have a spring in their step and a song in their heart, you'll help Al Gore and Bill Clinton for the next hundred days, and we will lift this nation up.

Thank you, and God bless you.



**Remarks by Governor Bill Clinton
National Bar Association Dinner
St. Louis, MO
July 31, 1992**

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Well, I don't know if she succeeded in making that introduction nonpartisan, but it certainly was intimidating. I thought you were going to charge me a fee just to sit here and talk.

I want to say that I appreciate that very eloquent introduction. It will pass any standard your network has placed. And if they don't like it, I'll give you a job when I'm elected.

I have to tell you, I promised I wouldn't do that. That's the only job I've offered. And I'm a lawyer. I've always got an escape-hatch that's contingent.

I want to say to President McFale, who has been my friend for some years now, and to President elect, Allen Webster, and to all of you, how delighted I am to be back with the National Bar Association.

Four years ago, when I was in a very different position in life, you invited me to come before your convention in Washington, D.C. Many of you were there, I think. That was a wonderful night for me.

After the banquet was over, I stayed around. I had been there for two or three hours just shaking hands and talking to people. And I hope that some of you who were there then, whom I met, will make your way up here before I leave so that we can at least say hello again. And then I had the pleasure of hosting this organization's Board of Governors at the Governor's Mansion in 1989. Many of you were there then. I've already seen a lot of the folks who were there. That was a wonderful night for me.

So I am no stranger to this group. You may know too, that many members of my

Administration are members of this group: Rodney Slater, Cassandra Wilkins, who's out here, Carol Willis, Judge Richard Mays, whom I appointed to the Arkansas Supreme Court in 1980, who's here with me. And many others from my state of Arkansas are here. I haven't appointed them all but I tried. And I'm very proud of all of them and their presence here.

I know too, that a lot of your former presidents and leaders of this organization are at least natives of my state. I can't help but mention one of your former members, Jackie [Scropshire], who passed away this year, who was the first African American to graduate from the law school at the University at Arkansas. We named Law Day after him this year, by Governor's Proclamation. And I would like to note his passing here because he was a very important part of our legal history.

I'd also like to compliment you this year on making a coalition with the National Hispanic Bar Association, The Asian Pacific Bar Association, The Native American Bar Association, The National Association of Women Lawyers. And I want to thank you for giving awards to Judge Keat and Ben Hooks. I wish I could have listened to them speak all night long.

I'm glad Judge [Keat] introduced my law classmate, Eric [Clay]. At least one of us is still making an honest living. I want to say a special word of thanks to Benjamin Hooks for the life that he's lived and the example that he's set--not just for African Americans, but for all Americans who believe in the cause of justice and freedom. He has been an inspiration to me for as long as I have known about him. And I thank him for that.

I promised that when I came here I wouldn't tell any lawyer jokes. And I won't. I can tell you this: Law school changed my life. It taught me what was really important. It taught me what to look up to. That's when I met Hillary.

And I can also tell you something you already know which is that there are real choices to be made and real consequences to be had from the outcome of this election.

I have tried to stake out a positive plan for America's future, from the very beginning.

Last October, when I entered this race, I said it was not enough to merely criticize the opposition. You had to offer an alternative vision for the future and a plan.

Last year--not this year--last year, I gave three major addresses at my Alma Mater, Georgetown University, outlining what I would do if I was given the opportunity to serve as president.

I put out a plan in New Hampshire and modified it a few weeks ago. I tried to give

the American people something they could sink their teeth into.

It is highly unusual, I think, for a challenger to be more detailed about the future than the incumbent who has access to more information. But I have been governor a long time. I've been through a lot of elections. And I know if you want to get something done, it's best to talk about it during the election, so you can later tell the legislative branch that's what you got elected to do. And that's what I have tried to do.

I also think the American people are crying for an honest debate. And so tonight, let me lay out some of the issues that I think are most pertinent to you as members of this organization and as Americans.

First, if Bill Clinton and Al Gore are elected in November, I can and I will pledge you a federal judiciary that looks like America, feels like America, and that understands the pain and promise of America.

You all heard or saw, surely, the comments of Judge [Higginbotham] to the effect that of the last 115 Americans appointed to the federal appellate bench, only two of them were African Americans. I need hardly remind you that President Jimmy Carter appointed more African-Americans to the federal bench than all the presidents of the United States combined, before and since. And that is the legacy of the New South that I would like to top.

I want to consult with you on the appointments of federal judges. I want to consult with you and the organizations who are here in coalition with you on the appointments of federal judges--Hispanics, Asian Americans, Native Americans, women lawyers. And I want to tell you this: I will be uncompromising in my commitment to excellence in these appointments. I don't want anybody conducting any hearings on my appointments wondering if they're really qualified to be federal judges or appellate judges or Supreme Court judges. But I have news for this administration. There are really qualified African Americans, Hispanic-Americans, Native-Americans, Asian-Americans who can serve in any position in the land.

We need an administration that will heal and unify this country and that will establish conditions through which we can move forward. And in the great resolutions of the issues of today, the federal bench should feel like America.

We can and we will give you an administration that enforces the Voting Rights Act, believes in equal opportunity and acts like it, and works to make opportunity a reality for all Americans. I would sign--not veto--the Motor Voter Bill because I think we ought to make it easy to vote and let an American have his or her say.

I can and I will support a plan to invest in this country. To invest in our communities, our cities, our suburbs, our rural areas. To invest to create jobs. To give the private

sector more incentives to invest if they're creating jobs but fewer incentives to cut short term deals and move jobs overseas.

I will promote an administration grounded in the principles of community and respect and not division and blame. We have had quite enough of that.

Just think. The other day, this administration's chief budget officer went up to Capitol Hill and was asked his analysis of why we were having the worst three years of economic performance in the last 50 years--coming at the end of more than a decade in which the American people have been working harder for less money and he said, "Well, it's the fault of the bankers. They don't lend enough money. And the fault of the Federal Reserve. They didn't bring interest rates down quickly enough. And the fault of Saddam Hussein. He invaded Kuwait." We got somebody else to pay for that. I don't what that has to do with our economy. But he said that. "And the fault of the Congress. They won't do what the President wants."

And the Chairman of the House Budget Committee said, "Do you accept any responsibility for this country? Just any? How about 5 percent? Or would you believe 4 or 3-1/2? No. They would not.

Where would this country be if Harry Truman had a sign on his desk that said the buck stops somewhere else? That's what we're living through today, folks.

Let me tell you this. I don't promise you miracles. I don't have the answer to all the problems. But I know trickle-down economics and special interest politics and blinding ourselves to the reality of the global economy competition we face are not getting us where we need to go. So, if I become your president, I will assume responsibility--what works and all; the good and the bad. And do my best not to work miracles but to make progress. And that is what I think you expect of your elected officials.

But I cannot do it alone. The presidency is a bully pulpit, as Theodore Roosevelt said. And much of the presidency, as Harry Truman once said, consists of trying to talk other people into doing what they ought to be doing anyway. But the preacher can't save no souls if there's nobody in the church helping.

And so tonight I come here asking you for some help.

Many of you will remember that President Kennedy once called upon a gathering of America's lawyers to form a network of attorneys to work on behalf of plaintiffs in civil rights cases throughout the country. Many responded and made dramatic contributions in the struggle for equal justice.

Now America needs to restore that old spirit of partnership; of optimism; of renewed

dedication to common efforts.

We need an army of devoted visionaries--healing leaders throughout this nation who are willing to work in their communities to end the long years of denial and neglect and divisiveness and blame--to give the American people their country back.

And so I want to ask each of you as lawyers and as community leaders, people who have already shown your concern for the condition of all our citizens, to reach out as Americans to help us to build a common future.

In too many elections we are asked to make choices which one American political writer has labeled as false. Many of us don't vote. Many of us become cynical because we think we have to make choices that seem to be foolish.

I want an America where you can be pro-business and pro-labor because we treat working people decently and make money doing it. I want an America where you can have both excellence and opportunity in education. I want an America where we can preserve the environment and promote economic growth. And I know it can be done if we were just a little more farsighted than we are now. I want an America where you can be for civil rights and for civil justice. An America in which communities and citizens are safe from crime and safe for the Rodney Kings of America too. That is the kind of America that I think we all want.

In my plan, I support a lot of the initiatives this organization has historically advocated, initiatives that will not only create opportunities by investing in new jobs for the 21st century, but by also giving all people access to training--apprenticeship training of two years after high school for every high school graduate who doesn't go on to college, to restore the dignity to blue collar work. We need to ensure access to a college education for all Americans.

I have recommended that we take the best of two great American ideas, the GI Bill after World War II and the Peace Corps under President Kennedy, to create a great National Trust Fund. Let any American borrow the money to go to college and pay it back either as a small percentage of their income after they go to work. Or even better, by giving two years of service here at home in a Domestic Peace Corps. Just think of it--if every American college graduate did that--if every American college graduate went home to Detroit or St. Louis; to Chicago or Little Rock; to Los Angeles or Atlanta or some small place and said, "For two years I will be trained and I will serve as a teacher, as a police officer, as a nurse, working with troubled children; working to rebuild the cities and help kids to stay out of trouble and to build a better life, and to connect themselves to the future we want them to be a part of."

We could revolutionize our approach to the problems of America by dealing with the problems of America as they always have to be dealt with--through people. It would

be the best money we ever spent.

Our plan calls for making that available through the National Service Corps and through servicemen and women who will be mustered out of the service as defense spending is cut. Those people will be given the opportunity to earn military retirement by serving for a few years in the police forces here at home.

We want to give 100,000 more police officers of all races and both genders back to the cities of this country so that every city can have a community policing program where friends and neighbors and police officers work together to prevent crime from happening--not just to catch criminals and not just to deal in alien neighborhoods with situations that lead you to the kind of thing that happened to Rodney King. Community policing is the answer. You know that--and we should be supporting it.

We ought to have initiatives that focus on prevention in every way---health care prevention. We've got to stop being the only major country in the world that doesn't provide a basic package of affordable health care to all people, and control health care costs.

But in order to be able to afford this we must focus on prevention. Health education in the schools, including education to prevent unwanted pregnancies and to keep kids safe from AIDS and other diseases--aggressive programs--clinics in the cities and in the rural areas to provide basic primary and preventive care.

Most people get health care in this country today even when they don't have health insurance. When do they get it? When it's too late; too expensive; at the emergency room. They're lying on cots, in the hallways--many of them. Tonight as we speak, it is costing this country a fortune and undermining the health care of America. Prevention. Focus on that.

And the same thing should be done in the area of crime. How many young people get into trouble with the law once or twice and nothing happens to them? They are assigned to some poor probation officer who has 300 or 400 cases and can't pay them any attention. And finally they get in trouble and get sent to the penitentiary where they cost you \$30,000 a year and learn how to be first class criminals.

How much better off we would be if we had a community oriented system of punishment that included discipline and community service work and drug treatment and education, all in one place in the community so that we can connect people before they are too far gone; before they cost society and when they can still contribute to society and have the life God meant for them to have. Prevention. That is the sort of thing we ought to be working on.

And you say, "What does all of this have to do with the economic recovery?" Plenty.

All those billions of dollars we're spending on imprisonment could be spent on education and job development. We are 13th in the world in wages and No. 1 in the world in the percentage of adults behind bars. Wouldn't you like to reverse the number in the next eight years? I would.

When you spend 30% more on health care than any other country in the world, most of it going to insurance companies and administrative bureaucracies--that's money you're not spending to send kids to college or to train workers to work or to invest in new jobs. It's one of the reasons we lose manufacturing jobs. That's got plenty to do with it.

When you don't educate children or you don't do the kind of work that keeps them healthy and strong and safe, then they wind up costing money when they could be making money. Everybody in this country, whether we like it or not, is tied to everybody else--and it's time we started acting like it.

One thing is abundantly clear. The governing idea of this administration is that we should only have a national government that keeps taxes as low as possible on the wealthiest Americans and on the largest corporations and raises taxes on the middle class and on small business, explodes the deficit and gets out of the way.

They think everything will be fine. Well, everything is not fine. What works in the world we're living in?

Look at the countries where the job growth is higher; where the wages are higher; where the poverty is lower. They don't work harder than we do. We're working harder than we did twenty years ago, as a people.

They are better educated, better organized and better led. They do not accept these divisions that we take for granted in our society. They have government, education, business and labor all on the same side working to create opportunity for everyone. We had better that lesson in this global economy or we will never get out of the fix we're in. That is the fundamental choice before you and all Americans in this election this year.

It is a choice that you feel all the more keenly because you know that racial minorities in this country are more likely to be poor, more likely to be unemployed, and, more tragically, more likely to be working and still poor.

At the beginning of this decade, 12% of the work force in America was living in poverty. At the end of the last decade, 18% of the working people in America were living in poverty--because we do not have a high-wage, high-growth strategy to

develop the capacities of all our people and to help them to win in this global economy. I'm telling you that is what we have to do.

We have to have the future opening up for our children, not closing in on us. You're always going to have more racial tensions and divisions in society when people think they are divided and competing for a shrinking pie.

If every one of us in this room were the same color and the doors were locked and there wasn't any more food coming in here, next week we would all be fighting over what was left. Wouldn't we? That is a big part of the problem in this country. We have no strategy to make tomorrow better than today.

The other thing of course, is what you stood up for in the beginning. Even after all these years and all the civil rights fights and all the battles that led Judge Keat to the Court of Appeals and led Ben Hooks to head the NAACP, there are still people in America who think there is more in it for them if they divide us by race than if they unite us by humanity. They are wrong but they think that.

In the city of Los Angeles, in Los Angeles County alone where the riots occurred, there are members of 146 different racial and ethnic groups in that county. Not just blacks and Hispanics and Koreans and whites that you saw; but 146 different racial and ethnic groups.

We are moving into a global economy. Your children and grandchildren may never have to worry as I did, growing up, about a bomb exploding and taking the world away.

Our problems now are inside us--in our spirits, in our country, in our organization and in our education. And one of the big decisions we have to make is whether or not this diversity, which you celebrated here tonight, in which Judge Keat urged you never to forget--is going to be a source of our strength or the instrument of our undoing.

Are we stronger and better because we are different? Are we going to be foolish and preoccupied and determined to aggravate those differences in a way that permits no one to live up to the fullest of his or her God-given capacities?

So I say to you tonight. I can be president with your help. But you still have to be Americans--in every community and in every way, no matter who is president. There has to be somebody there who believes in these things we talked about--who believes you can have excellence and equity in the schools--who believes you can be pro-business and pro-labor--who believes that you can find a way to have civil order and civil justice--who understands the necessity to always be changing this country--to try new things, like community policing and community-based punishment, and

apprenticeships for the kids who don't go to college.

This country has been around for 200 years because we've always had a shining set of ideas and a big vision--and because when we had to we could always recreate ourselves.

Thomas Jefferson wrote that blistering Declaration of Independence knowing that we weren't living by its ideas. He said, "I tremble to think that God is just when I think of slavery." Jefferson said that.

Abraham Lincoln went into the Civil War, issued the Emancipation Proclamation and gave the Gettysburg Address in an attempt to rewrite the Constitution to set forth a vision of equality.

Franklin Roosevelt lifted a nation, from the confines of his wheelchair, to believe that together we could come out of a Great Depression and win a great war. Whenever we had to do it, we recreated ourselves. This country has remained forever young.

Today we stand on the threshold of a new creation. If we fail to do it, our country will continue to sink in economic decline and social disorder.

If we say we're going to rebuild America and reunite America, we're going to take a different direction. Then I believe that the children of this nation will have the brightest life any generation of Americans has ever known. It is for us to make that decision.

In the next 95 days the American people will come to grips with their responsibilities. But if we prevail in this election, I will still need every one of you in every way that you can to use everything that you have learned--to bring your wisdom and your compassion and caring to bear on the human problems of America--so that together we can lift this country to the destiny it was meant to have. Thank you.

Bill Clinton
FOR PRESIDENT COMMITTEE

"Let Us Rise to the Challenge"

**Governor Bill Clinton
Palace Theater
Los Angeles, California
May 18, 1992**

Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you very much my longtime friend David Mixner -- he's been making speeches in his mind for thirty years, he's about to get good at it -- for that wonderful statement. Thank you Roberta Achtenberg for your statement and for your friendship. Thank you Scott and Diane and Roberta and Bob, all the rest of you who were co-chairs and active in this event.

And I want to say a special word of thanks to ANGLE for their work on my behalf over the last several months. I want to thank John Garamendi, my state chair, for being here and all the others who are here in support of this event.

You know, I have said many times that a campaign for president has two purposes. One is for the country to get to know the candidate, and the other is for the candidate to get to know the country. If the candidate does not grow and deepen in understanding and compassion and feeling, then the race itself is already half lost.

There are people in this room today to whom I owe a great debt of gratitude, for you have helped me to get to know my country better than I did when I began.

We just finished the worst urban riots in our history in Los Angeles. And as the people here begin to pick up the pieces, I think it might be well for us to note where we are at this moment in our history as a nation. Not just here in Los Angeles, and not just in the cities of our great land, but all of us, all across America.

We should be dancing in the streets with joy today because the Cold War is over. If three years ago anyone had told any of you that within three years the Berlin Wall would fall, all of the governments in Eastern Europe would fade away, the Soviet Union itself would collapse and cut its defense budget by 50% in a year, and the threat of nuclear annihilation would begin to fall into the distance of history, no one would have believed it.

If anybody had told you that would happen and we would still be deeply divided and anxiety-ridden at election time, it would be difficult to believe. But we are. And we are because as we celebrate the triumph of our values around the world, we see them lying in tatters here at home.

A country defeated in so many ways economically...a country in the grip of political paralysis...a country under immense social strain practicing denial instead of responsibility, division instead of unity.

Today I have made three stops in which I have been able to now talk about three things that I care about a great deal. This morning I met with 4,000 workers at a shipyard in San Diego -- the only place in America where people, Americans, are still making ships. An employee-owned company with seven unions and management working together, against all of the odds, to make the leap from a defense to a domestic economy. And I talked to them about my vision to bring real job growth back to a peacetime America.

And then I went to the University of Oregon in Eugene where there were thousands -- I don't know how many, but at least 4,000 students. And I talked to them about the future that they have -- so much more ahead of them than I do -- and what I hoped it would be, and what role education should play in that.

Tonight, I want to talk to you about how we can be one people again -- without regard to race or gender or sexual orientation or age or region or income, how we can be one again.

This country has so often been divided, especially at election time. The pollsters and the political consultants tell people all the time how to cut the electorate up in just "this little slice and that little slice" so that we cannot be one again. And yet, it is against all our natures, against our basic values, against the statements of all our basic laws, and still we do it, over and over again.

This election is almost about the paradigm of Willie Horton on the one hand, and what Roberta Achtenberg and I went through on Mother's Day at the Glide Memorial Church in San Francisco on the other. All kinds of Americans, hundreds of them homeless, holding hands, worshipping, reaching out for their better selves.

And we're going to have to decide in this election, all of us, what kind of people we are and where we want to go. The American people are plainly going to be divided if this administration has its way, by gender over the choice issue.

Some of us are old enough to remember what it was like before there was a Roe v. Wade. I am. I am. I remember when I was a boy seeing someone who was running an abortion mill put into a police car and taken off to the jail and asking who that person was and why he was being arrested. And I tell you, it may be good politics at election time, but it would be a terrible mistake for this country to change the fundamental law of the land and repeal the right to privacy and the right to chose.

If we want to be...if we want to be pro-child and pro-family, let us embrace the cause of life. Let us aggressively seek to reduce unwanted pregnancies and thereby reduce the number of abortions. Let us give people the health care they need and birth and the

pre-school their children need. And let's provide for child-care and family leave and meaningful child support enforcement and supports that people need to raise their children. But don't criminalize a decision that belongs in the private recesses of a person's soul.

Let us not be divided again by race. I was so sad when Michael Woo and I were walking amid the ruins and when Maxine Waters took me through her district to see the tensions still there between African American and Hispanic and white and Korean communities and people looking at each other with great suspicions thinking that some of this that has happened was due to the color of their skins.

I grew up in the segregated South. But I lived long enough to see my daughter in a public school where she is in the racial minority, but where she learns every day intellectually, where she thrives and where she learns how to be a person in a multi-racial society and where she has the emotional space and freedom to do what Martin Luther King said he wanted for his children: to judge people, not by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character.

And the great passion of my life has been education and telling people we don't have a person to waste. The great heartbreak is seeing people wasted. Three years ago before it was fashionable, I was in south-central Los Angeles meeting with community groups, before I was a candidate for president. And I met with a dozen sixth graders in a public school -- all of them minorities, Hispanic and black -- who told me their greatest fear was being shot going to and from school. I had never heard such a thing before.

I later went to Houston and found eleven elementary schools where the children were walking through metal detectors every day so the guns and knives could be taken from the eight and nine-year-olds. And I wonder about those children now they're ninth graders. And when this riot occurred, my wife and I asked ourselves how many are in gangs now, who stayed home because their parents asked them to and who looted and whether they are all alive. We don't have a person to waste. *

And those of you who are here tonight, you represent a community of our nation's gifted people whom we have been willing to squander. We can't afford to waste the capacities, the contributions, the hearts, the souls, the minds of the gay and lesbian Americans either.

For every day that we discriminate, that we hate, that we refuse to avail ourselves of the potential of any group of Americans, we are all less than we ought to be. You heard Roberta give my speech for me tonight better than I could have.

As soon as the Pentagon issued a study -- ironically by a spokesperson who himself was said to be gay -- which said that there was no basis in national security for discriminating based on the sexual orientation of Americans who wish to serve in the military, I said I would act on the study. It seemed to me elemental that if a person, a man or a woman, wanted to serve their country, they ought to be able to do it. The presumption should be in favor of doing it unless there is some reason not to.

The Pentagon had a study which said there was no reason not to. The Secretary of Defense, himself, obviously personally very uncomfortable at not changing the rules, said it was a "quaint little rule." Well, my fellow Americans, we have too much to do to endure "quaint little rules."

I want people like David Mixner and Roberta Achtenberg, Dr. Scott, some of you in this audience, to be a part of a Clinton Administration, not because of or in spite of your sexual orientation, but because America needs you. And if I become the President of the United States, I owe it to my country to find the best and most gifted and most knowledgeable people in the United States of America to solve the problems and embrace the challenges of this time.

We cannot afford to do otherwise. I want to crack down on those who do want to do otherwise, who now practice hate crimes that the Justice Department should move against. And perhaps more importantly than anything right now, I'd like, for a change, for there to be a real war on AIDS.

When children are shot going to and from school, are shot in their own schools as those two children were in Thomas Jefferson High School in Brooklyn not very long ago, a place where I spoke a month before the shooting, we can say, they are all our children, and we cry. But well over 100,000 Americans have died of AIDS, and they are all our children too.

Over a million people, over a million Americans are now HIV positive. And yet, the administration is still curiously silent until the famous fall. Until, like Magic Johnson, they come forward, or like Arthur Ashe, someone takes advantage of their privacy. Then someone says something appropriately touching.

But this administration ignores its own commission reports, underfunds research and treatment, leaves red tape binding science and drug trials and research, and says behavior modification is the issue. But then, unlike Dr. Koop, refuses to embrace the cause of sex education in our schools which would give our children the chance to save their lives.

When it comes to AIDS, there should be a Manhattan Project. One person should be in charge. One person who can cut across all the departments and agencies, who has the President's ear and the President's arm. One person who can make sure that we begin by implementing all those recommendations and those two commission reports now gathering dust in Washington, D.C.

One person who will launch a real national education campaign with someone just as forthright as Dr. Koop was, telling the American people -- starting with our children -- the hard truth and giving them a fair chance to save their lives and other people's lives as well. Someone who will see that women and people of color are included in the research and in the drug trials.

And, I might add, for women especially, that is a problem for general application, not just as it relates to AIDS, but as it relates to breast cancer and any other health problem. We have got to improve our approach to women's health. Someone who will fund the Ryan White Act fully, someone who will approach this problem with compassion and teach the American people what he has learned. That is what I will try to do.

There are two things that I would like to mention again to make sure you know I am serious. The first is that I want to make a major speech on AIDS to a non-traditional group of Americans, who may not cheer at every word but who need to hear the message.

The second is, that I have pledged to see that someone who is HIV positive, but also has a positive attitude, come before the American people at the Democratic National Convention to speak about this issue.

And now, before I leave, I want to say something which is not part of a political program. I just want to thank the gay and lesbian community for your courage and your commitment and your service in the face of the terror of AIDS. When no one was offering a helping hand, and when it was dark and lonely, you did not withdraw, but instead you reached out to others.

And this whole nation has benefited already in ways most people cannot even imagine from the courage and commitment and the sense of community which you practice.

It was your community who created the first AIDS service organization, who did the first important work in pioneering AIDS drugs, who sounded the alarm and created the first education program, who stood strong in the face of all the governmental opposition and discrimination and killing silence.

This nation owes you thanks for that, and I want to give you my thanks and my respect for that struggle today.

Finally, let me say again, this is not an election, or it should not be, about race or gender or being gay or straight or religion or age or region or income. What kills the country is not the problems it faces. There will be problems even until the end of time. What kills the country is to proceed day in and day out with no vision, with no sense that tomorrow can be better than today, with no sense of shared community.

What I came here today to tell you in simple terms is I have a vision and you are a part of it. I believe tomorrow will be better than today if we act. And we are all a part of the same community, and we'd better start behaving as if we are.

If I could, if I could wave my arm for those of you that are HIV positive and make it go away tomorrow, I would do it, so help me God I would. If I gave up my race for the White House and everything else, I would do that.

Let us never forget, there are things we can and cannot do. But the beginning of wisdom is pulling together and learning from one another and being determined to do better. And this country is being killed by people who try to break us down and tear us up and make us be little when we have to be big.

This is a big time. Let us rise to the challenge.

Thank you and God bless you all.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Albuquerque, New Mexico)

For Immediate Release

October 17, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
CHIEFS OF POLICE

Albuquerque Convention Center
Albuquerque, New Mexico

11:38 A.M. MDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Chief Daughtry, Chief Whetsel, ladies and gentlemen of the IACP, I am honored to be here. I love the jacket -- (laughter) -- and I love what it stands for. I thank you more than I can say for your help and support in passing the Brady Bill and the Crime Bill.

I'd like to acknowledge in this audience today the presence of some very important people here in the State of New Mexico and throughout our nation. First of all, behind me, the Governor of the state of New Mexico, Governor Bruce King. (Applause.) Bruce and I are the only -- two of the only three people serving in America who were governors in the '70s, the '80s and the '90s. I don't know what that means anymore. (Laughter.) I can barely remember them.

I'm delighted to be here with the two senators from the state of New Mexico, Senator Domenici and Senator Bingaman who are out there. (Applause.) Congressman Steve Schiff, congressman from this district, is here. Thank you, sir. (Applause.) My good friend, Congressman Bill Richardson, who was very active in passing the Crime Bill. Where's Congressman Richardson -- he's here somewhere. Thank you. (Applause.) And, of course, the mayor, Mayor Marty Chavez, who is one of my jogging partners, is here. (Laughter and applause.)

I want to also say that, you know, I think I have more administration members who have been active in this outfit than previous presidents. (Laughter.) Your ex-president, Lee Brown, is now our Drug Czar. Your ex-vice president, Tom Constantine, is now our DEA Administrator. (Applause.) The head of the U.S. Marshal Service, Eduardo Gonzalez, was Tampa Bay Chief and once active in this organization. So I feel at home here.

I think our FBI Director is here -- I want to tell a story on him. Is Louis Freeh here somewhere? Tomorrow -- he's coming tomorrow? It's the first time I've been ahead of him in a long time. (Laughter.)

I want to tell you a story about the -- since this is an international organization, one of the things that I have really tried to do as President is to build international cooperation in law enforcement. It's important in dealing with drugs, it's important in dealing with terrorism, it's important in dealing with organized crime.

Lee Brown and Tom Constantine, both of them, as you know, have major responsibilities that go beyond our nation's borders, as you would expect, in dealing with the drug problems. But the FBI Director, Mr. Freeh, also took a very popular trip to Europe and to Russia not very long ago, and slightly after that

MORE

when I was following him, instead of the other way around, I went to Riga, Latvia to celebrate the withdrawal of Russian forces from Eastern Europe for the first time since World War II, and from the Baltic States. And we had this meeting with the heads of the government of Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia; and, so help me, the first thing the President of Latvia said is, can we have an FBI office in Riga? (Laughter.)

Now, it's funny and it's flattering, but it's also serious. Why? Because as these countries convert from totalitarian societies to free societies, as they become much more open, they become much more vulnerable to organized crime, because they haven't developed their banking system and their trading rules and their business rules. And that relates to whether they, themselves, then become more vulnerable to drug-trafficking and to terrorism, and to trafficking in weapons of mass destruction or stolen nuclear materials, or any of that sort of thing.

So I say to you -- I'll make you a prediction: For the next 10 years when you meet, more and more and more, your concentration will have to be on the international aspects of the crime problem which affects what you do on the streets in your cities and towns throughout the United States.

I'd like to talk a little today about the Crime Bill and what it means against the background of the crime problem in America. And the state of play, as you know, is very troubling, because the good news is that in many of our cities, the crime rate is actually going down. The Mayor of Odessa, Texas was in town the other day when we handed out the first wave of grants, police grants, under the new Crime Bill only two weeks after the bill was signed, and she said they'd had a drop in the crime rate in excess of 15 percent for three years running because of community policing, because of what law enforcement officers have done. The Mayor of Houston was reelected with 91 percent of the vote after they had over a 20-percent drop in crime in only one year there.

This is happening in many cities and towns throughout the country. On the other hand, we know that a lot of small towns and suburban areas having rising crime because as cities clamp down on crime, a lot of times the criminals just move their base of operation, and they're not as well equipped to deal with it.

We also know that even as overall crime rates drop, the rate of random violence among young people, people under the age of 18, is going up dramatically in sickening ways that we have all seen again in recent days.

The point I want to make about all this is that this is a manifestation of trends that have been developing in our country for quite a long while now. We have had, really, 30 years -- a whole generation and more -- of these trends that have been developing in a lot of the high-crime areas in America -- the breakdown of families and community organizations and neighborhood organizations; the loss of economic opportunity, creating huge social vacuums into which have moved gangs and guns and drugs and crime and violence.

I wanted this Crime Bill to pass very badly because I believed that the national government had a responsibility to help you deal with it. But we have to look at what we can do together within the Crime Bill and then what we have to do beyond the Crime Bill, because we're going to have to change this country from the grass roots up. We're going to have to change the culture that a lot of these kids live in. And you can do it; I can do it; parents can do it; but we're all going to have to do it. And there is clearly something for everybody to do.

The first job I ever had as an elected official was as Attorney General of my state. And I began to work with law enforcement on a regular basis. Then I was governor for a dozen years -- the years when crime was exploding in America. I built prison cells. I devised work programs. I put in education programs and drug education programs and boot camps for first offenders. I enforced the capital punishment laws and tried to find ways to rehabilitate people who were getting out. I went to funerals of police officers who were friends and family members of friends of mine who died in the line of duty.

Dealing with all this has made an indelible impression on me. And when I became President, I guess I had in that sense more personal experience with the human cost and the human side of crime and law enforcement than a lot of people who have had this job. I was determined to bring an end to six years of political debate in Washington and to pass the Brady Bill, which had been there for seven years, to pass a crime bill, which had been debated for six years -- because I knew that we had some things that we had to do. I am doing my best where I live and where I work to get this country together and to move our country forward again.

I think my mission as President is to keep the American Dream alive and to help make sure Americans can compete and win as we move into this exciting 21st century by making government work for ordinary people and by bringing this economy back, by making us more secure and more prosperous in our relations with the rest of the world.

After 21 months, I can tell you I think that we've made a good start. America's in better shape than it was two years ago. We've got more jobs, low inflation, a much lower deficit. Over 70 percent of the new jobs coming into our economy this year, according to a report just published today, are higher wage jobs; we're moving away from the time when all of our new jobs were low-wage jobs.

We've got a smaller federal government by more than 70,000 already that's doing more for ordinary citizens. The Congress just passed, and I signed a procurement bill which changes the way we spend your money when we buy things, and it'll put an end to the \$500 hammers and the \$50 ash trays. The Vice President kind of has mixed feelings about that; he'll never get to go on David Letterman again now because of that, but it was the right thing to do. (Laughter.)

Russian missiles are no longer pointed at the United States. We've got big increases in trade that are fueling these high-wage jobs, and now America is leading the way to peace and security and democracy, as you've seen in the last few days in the Middle East and Northern Ireland and Eastern Europe and, of course, in Haiti.

But all of us know, I think, that no matter how much economic progress we made, no matter how much progress we make in dealing with trouble spots around the world, there will be a gnawing feeling that all is not right in America until our children feel safe in their schools and on their streets, and Americans feel secure in their homes and at their work.

We have to do things that will go beyond talking, that will actually reduce the rates of crime and violence in the United States, that will actually make sure that more of our children do say "no" to drugs and gangs and guns, and "yes" to books and to Boys and Girls Clubs and to games. That's what the Brady Bill was all about; that's what the Crime Bill was all about. It was the national government's contribution to a national effort to really change the way Americans are living, to change the way they feel inside. And it is terribly important.

I was in Detroit the other day doing an editorial board meeting, and The Detroit Free Press had done a program with children in the area and had taken letters from children. And a little girl named Porsha, nine years old, wrote me a letter and said, I just want you to make me feel safer. I don't feel safe.

Many of you saw the reports that I gave when we were debating the crime bill about that nine-year-old boy in New Orleans who wrote me a letter saying, can't you make me feel safe? And we was killed on the street in a random shooting just a few days after he wrote me. A 10-year-old son of a member of my administration, a young man brought up in a well-to-do home, goes to good schools, and lives in a beautiful neighborhood, wrote me a wonderful letter the day after the Crime Bill passed -- a 10-year-old boy saying, I know you think that I wouldn't be afraid of this, but every time my friends and I go downtown to a movie, I am afraid I will be shot before I get home. And I feel so much better now that this Crime Bill has passed.

These are the voices of the children of America across racial and income and regional lines, telling us that we have to do better. That is what this is about. Well, we are doing better, but there's more to be done. The Brady Bill has made a difference -- all of you know it. There are thousands of people who have already been denied weapons who were not entitled to them, who had a criminal background, who would have gotten them if it hadn't been for the Brady Bill. (Applause.)

And the Crime Bill will make a difference. We have evidence of that. Before the Crime Bill passed last year, I asked Congress to make a down payment on our commitment to put 100,000 more police officers on the street. And the Congress funded another 2,000 police officers. Last week when we gave out the first police grants under the Crime Bill, Chief David Massey from Ocean City, Maryland came with the police officers he'd hired under the first grant. One of them was an ex-linebacker at the University of Maryland -- the sort of person that you just see and you want to ask permission. (Laughter.)

This young man was in a community policing program riding a bicycle in Ocean City. And very soon after he went to work, he caught a serial rapist -- he did, as a community police officer. Now, all the victims that will never be preyed upon by that rapist will never know what they owe to that one young man who is a community police officer. And now we're going to be able to multiply that by 100,000 in every state in this country. (Applause.)

Something else I think that really needs to be pounded home over and over again is that this Crime Bill was fashioned largely by law enforcement officers -- from the punishment programs, to the policing programs, to the prevention programs, it was the law enforcement officers who shaped what was in it. You said we ought to have three strikes and you're out because there were some violent criminals who kept getting paroled because they were lucky enough not to have severe consequences to the victims of their crimes. But what they tried to do was terrible. That's what the purpose of three strikes and you're out was.

You said that too many people were getting out too quick because there wasn't enough prison space, so there's provision for 100,000 more prison cells in this bill. Never been done before. The federal government had never before helped to build prison space for states. You said that we ought to have capital punishment if someone kills a police officer and it's in the bill. (Applause.)

You said it ought to be against the law for a minor to carry a handgun except when supervised by an adult. It's in the bill. You said we should do more for victims of crime. You

said we should make a serious assault on the problems faced by women and children -- the problems of domestic violence and neighborhood violence. You said we should do more to make schools safer. You said we should do more to give our kids some prevention programs, some things they could say "yes" to -- places to go, things to do, good things to do. Maybe most important, good people to look up to when they can't find that at home.

When the NRA tried to take the assault weapons ban out of the Crime Bill, you stood firmly in favor of leaving it in -- not because you were against the rights of hunters and sportsmen, but because you knew that there were 650 weapons in the bill specifically protected from any government interference. And to those of you who come from small town and rural areas, you can go home and tell your sportsmen that we are not going to allow the federal government to interfere with the legitimate interest of hunters and sportsmen, but we do not support leaving weapons in the hands of kids, its only purpose is to kill as many people as quickly as they can. (Applause.)

And you said that we ought to have 100,000 more police. Indeed, we probably ought to have more, but that's all we could figure out how to pay for.

For the American now, that's a number that doesn't mean a lot. That's why last week was so important when we had 400 communities coming up and little towns getting one police officer and bigger places getting 25 or 30, because people began to visualize what that means. There are 550,000 police officers in this country. If you add 100,000 and they all go into beat work, if they actually go into working to prevent crime and to catch criminals, it'll be about a 20-percent increase in the presence of police on the street. It will work. It will work. We've had only a 10 percent increase in police officers in the last 30 years, while we've had a 300 percent increase in violent crime. This was a critical component of the Crime Bill.

And today I want to announce two important steps to get those officers on the streets as quickly as possible. And you will have the release from the Justice Department here today supporting that.

First of all, we're going to make it possible for cities with at least 50,000 people to begin hiring officers immediately, by setting aside some money even before the grants are awarded so that you can know what you're going to get and you can start hiring and training now. And the grants will be there when you put the people on the payroll full-time. (Applause.)

Secondly, for cities and towns of fewer than 50,000 people who don't have a lot of people in clerical departments to help you deal with the federal government, we're going to do for you what we did for small businesspeople applying for SBA loans. We're going to give you a one-page application with about eight questions on it, and you can start filling out them out right now, so that nothing will come between America and the new police officers. (Applause.)

I'd like to end today by asking you to reflect on three things. One is a tribute to how the Congress funded this bill. This is a big bill. It was funded not by raising taxes, not by increasing the deficit, but by reducing the size of the federal government by 270,000 over six years, and giving all the money back to local communities to fight crime. That's how it was funded. (Applause.)

I consider that to be a solemn trust with America that we must not breach. And you will have to work every year for the next six years to make sure that we keep that trust.

The second point I want to make is that for most of its life, this Crime Bill enjoyed broad bipartisan support which dissipated at the end of the debate, as all of you know. It became a political football -- first, because there were some who were honestly willing to sacrifice everything in the Crime Bill to beat the assault weapons ban: to give up the police, to give up the prison cells, to give up the capital punishment provisions, to give up the prevention programs, to give up the violence against women section, to give up the victims against crime section -- to give it all up.

Second, there were some who just thought it was important to kill the bill for political reasons. That's all in the past now; it passed. What I want to say to you is, we have got to make this Crime Bill work -- every provision of it -- work. We have got to demonstrate to our people that the money is being well-spent. And we have to find a way to reach out at the grass-roots level across political lines. We have to stop this.

We can't tell the American people they've got to change their behavior to change this country if crime is a partisan political issue. The victims of crime are Republicans, Democrats and Independents. The people who put on uniforms every day are Democrats, Republicans and Independents. This is about America and our future. We must never again permit crime to be divisive in a partisan political way, and you can stop it and I want you to do it. (Applause.)

And I have to tell you -- the only thing that I really worry about now in that regard is that in this election season, there are many who are campaigning on a contract with America which cost \$1 trillion -- to balance the budget, to increase defense, to revitalize Star Wars, to give huge tax cuts. And there is no clear notion of how this is going to be paid for. But the only option to pay for it is the way it was paid for before: higher deficits and cuts in everything else -- from Medicare to veterans' benefits, to this Crime Bill.

So I ask you: Start today. Say we've fought too hard for this bill, we won it fair and square, let's not take it away indirectly by adopting a commitment to a budgetary process that will make it utterly impossible to fund the Crime Bill. The lives and the future of the American people, and especially our children, are too important. This must not become a political football. The bill is long, the trust is there, we must fund this Crime Bill. We cannot back away, and you must see that it is done. (Applause.)

The third thing I want to say -- and probably one of the most important things -- is that we have now done a major thing with this Crime Bill, and you will do major things with it. But the people of this country have a job to do here, too. We're not here giving things out to the American people, we're here challenging the American people to take their streets and their schools and their neighborhoods and, indeed, their homes back.

And if all of us go out here and say the right things and do the right things, and we get no help from the rest of America, we'll be back here next year and the year after, and the year after that, bemoaning the same problems. And you know that as well as I do.

You now have the tools to deal with this problem. But you've got a whole country out there full of people who have to help. Parents have to recognize that the real war on crime begins at home. If the first responsibility of government is to provide law and order, the first responsibility of parents is to teach right from wrong. (Applause.)

We've got to have more folks turning off the TV and knowing where their kids are, and spending time reading and doing homework, and accepting personal responsibility. And we've got

to have more folks helping them, like those wonderful police officers in the D.A.R.E. programs all across America. (Applause.)

Kids are going to look up to somebody, and it's up to the adults in this country to decide who they're going to look up to. What do you think about those two kids, 10 and 11 in Chicago that threw that five-year-old boy out the window? A five-year-old kid, who knew right from wrong, lost his life at the age of five because he wouldn't steal candy, because he knew right from wrong -- and his brother, only three years older, knew right from wrong and he wouldn't steal candy, either -- trying desperately to save his little brother's life.

Who did the other two kids look up to? Who did they come in contact with who could have taught them right from wrong and didn't? Who did they come in contact with who taught them wrong? What about that little kid that was set on fire? Burned over 85 percent of his body; 3 years old, not even big enough to do anything wrong. Who taught those children right from wrong?

You know, we see all these stories about these kids doing these things, and then we see that they apparently feel no remorse. At that age in their development, it is a question of where they got the message. Where did it occur to them to hang somebody out of a window in a high rise? How do they learn to pick up a gun? Where do they know that a fast buck today is better than 10 years or 12 years or 16 years of hard work and school to make something of yourself? These kids are looking up to somebody. Who are they going to look up to? How are they going to learn this? We can hire 5 million police officers, and if we keep losing the battle for what these kids think is right and wrong, we're going to be in a lot of trouble. (Applause.)

I know we grown-ups sometimes -- we're too negative sometimes -- we're too cynical sometimes. A good Catholic friend of mine and I the other day were having a theological discussion and he said, you can never get discouraged, Bill, because the only truly unforgivable sin is despair. That's why I preach hope all the time.

I am telling you: this country is coming back economically. This country has resources and character and richness and diversity that will open unparalleled opportunities to us in the 21st century. This is a good country. (Applause.)

When the delegation came back from Haiti yesterday, they said that all the Haitian people had these little signs in Creole, painted, and the most popular one said simply, "Thank you, America." They looked at those young men and women we sent down there in uniform and, just by walking around, these young people -- our kids -- they make a statement about what's right and what's wrong; what's good and what's bad; what kind of a person it's worth being -- just by being there and being who they are. And it is thrilling to other people to see the best of this country.

And we need not be worried about that if we just roll up our sleeves and face our challenges and go on. But what we must be worried about is wave upon wave upon wave of these little children, who don't have somebody both good and strong to look up to. Who are so vulnerable that their hearts can be turned to stone by the time they're 10 or 11 years old. And when there is a good one -- a 5-year-old kid in difficult circumstances, blooming like a flower in the desert, knowing that it's wrong to steal candy. He actually has his life at risk.

That's why all of you wanted these prevention programs. But I am telling you, you've got to go home and you've got to say, okay, I'll wear my DARE uniform, I'll do my part, but every last citizen in this country has got to do more than look at you and demand that you do something about crime. We have got to teach our children and lift them up. (Applause.)

Thank you, and God bless you all.

END

12:10 P.M. MDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

July 22, 1994

Statement by the President

For over a year, Congress and others have worked to pass a tough, smart crime bill. I am very grateful to Chairmen Jack Brooks and Joe Biden for their leadership throughout the crime bill debate, and I am heartened to know that the House-Senate Conference will convene next Tuesday to begin its final work on the proposal.

We have put together a tough and serious legislative remedy to reduce violence and prevent crime. But until a bill is passed by Congress and signed into law, our work is not finished. I am confident that committee members will act quickly on the conference and that we will see a final bill passed.

The American people have asked us to help in our nation's fight to curb the problem of violence and crime. We can meet this common goal by putting aside differences and partisanship. By working together, we will enact an historic crime law before the end of this legislative session. The American people demand and deserve no less.

-30-30-30-

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Embargoed For Release
Until Saturday, July 30, 1994
at 10:06 A.M. EDT

July 29, 1994

RADIO ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE NATION

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

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

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

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

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

In the last 18 months, we've begun the work of renewing the American Dream. Our national economic strategy -- with \$255 billion of budget cuts, tax breaks for small business and 15 million working American families, new investments in education and training and expansion of trade, and a reduction in the federal bureaucracy to its smallest level in 30 years -- has produced three years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President; 3.8 million new jobs in our economy; the largest number of new businesses formed in any year since World War II; and a 1.5 percent drop in the unemployment rate. We're moving in the right direction.

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

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

This crime bill will put 100,000 more police on our street -- a 20 percent increase. It will ban assault weapons. It will prohibit possession of handguns by minors. It will put violent career criminals behind bars by making "three strikes and you're out"

MORE

the law of the land. And it answers the calls of hundreds of thousands of police officers who want big increases in crime prevention programs to give our young people something to say yes to, as well as something to say no to.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Some in Congress are trying to kill health care reform all together. If we don't act this year, 3 million more working Americans will lose their health coverage next year; 5 million more Americans are uninsured now than were insured five years ago. The American people don't need more hemming and hawing. They need health care they can count on so they can get on with building their lives.

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

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

END

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 11, 1994

PRESS CONFERENCE BY THE PRESIDENT

The Briefing Room

5:15 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Ladies and gentlemen, under any circumstances I would be disappointed if the House of Representatives turned its back on the toughest and largest attack on crime in the history of our country, at a time when the American people say it is the most important issue to them.

But it is especially disheartening to see 225 members of the House participate in a procedural trick orchestrated by the National Rifle Association, then heavily, heavily pushed by the Republican leadership in the House, and designed with only one thing in mind -- to put the protection of particular interests over the protection of ordinary Americans.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I believe the American people will not like viewing this as some sort of political circus up here. I'm on their side, and I

think we better see who's on what side. That is the only thing that matters, what happens to the American people.

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

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

Thank you.

END

6:20 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

December 20, 1993

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN CONFERENCE CALL WITH MAYORS

From The Oval Office

11:00 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: It's nice to hear all of you. I'm here with the Vice President and Attorney General Reno and our Drug Director, Lee Brown, to congratulate all of you for working so hard to help make your community and, of course, our country safer again. Today I'm proud to announce that the six of you on this phone, along with the leaders of 68 other cities and towns all across the country, will receive the first grants to put more police on the street and expand community policing.

The Justice Department received applications from more than 1,000 communities across our nation, and the proposals we got for community policing from your police departments were truly outstanding. I know these grants are simply a down payment on our pledge to put 100,000 new police officers on the streets. It's just the beginning. As soon as Congress comes back in 1994 I want them to send me a crime bill that finishes that job and puts 100,000 more police on the street, expands boot camps and drug courts like the one the Attorney General started in Miami, gets handguns out of the hands of minors, and bans assault weapons.

Earlier this month, as all of you know, I signed the Brady Bill which broke seven years of gridlock on this issue. And we just can't afford to wait any longer for the crime bill. In the meanwhile I'm excited about what you're doing because we know community policing works. It worked for our Drug Director, Lee Brown, in Houston and New York, and it's working all across the country.

So I want to just thank all of you very much and say that I wish I could be there with you today. I wish I could see your police officers, and I hope you'll tell them all that help is on the way and we'll do our best to be there for you, to be good partners with you. And I know I'm speaking for the Vice President, the Attorney General and Lee Brown in saying we'll stay after this until the job is done.

Mayor Riordan, would you like to say anything?

MAYOR RIORDAN: Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, General Reno, Dr. Brown, and fellow mayors, welcome from sunny Los Angeles. (Laughter.)

Thank you very much, Mr. President and General Reno, for including us in on the present appropriations. Fifty-four police

officers are a great beginning, but they're merely a down payment, as the President mentioned, on the 100,000 police officers that are included in the crime bill of next year.

All of us in Los Angeles -- Chief Williams, members of Congress who are with me today, City Council members -- we are all rowing in the same direction. We realize that safety is the number one issue in big cities, and that if we're to turn L.A. around and other big cities around, get jobs back, to get tourists back, to stop young families from leaving, we have to make the cities safe. As L.A. and other big cities go, so goes the United States.

So, Mr. President, again from the City of Angels, we thank you very much, and we look forward to working with you in the years to come.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.

Mayor Griffin.

MAYOR GRIFFIN: Mr. President, thank you very, very much for including the City of Buffalo, the City of Good Neighbors, in the grant program. Congressman LaFalce is here with me, along with our Commissioner of Police Rich Donovan and the two people that worked on the grant, Ed Hepling and Barbara Oakley -- or Maureen Oakley.

And this is going to be great for Buffalo. It will put 27 policemen and policewomen on the street, into the neighborhoods, around schools and talking to different groups. It's just one cog in the wheel that we need to get this crime off our streets. We've had quite a few murders these last years in Buffalo because of the drug problem, but we're winning the battle.

And thanks to you and the Brady Bill and the bills that will be coming from Washington, we're going to beat this thing. We need others. We've got to get monies into our cities for jobs and for training and retraining. And I know that's in your plan as well. But this is a start and it's in the right direction. And the people of the City of Buffalo want to thank you, Mr. President, for thinking of the cities. This is where life is and this is where our hope is and this is where our future is.

And God bless you, and I want to wish you and your family a very merry Christmas.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.

Mayor Tauer, all of us were thinking about you last week, and we're very sorry about what you've been through.

MAYOR TAUER: Thank you very much, Mr. President. It was a very trying time, but we're helping the community heal and get over it and that's the important thing. But on behalf of the city council and our staff and our citizens, I want to thank you and all those who were responsible for us being selected for this grant. It's extremely important to us.

We feel we've been in the forefront of the issue of community policing and youth violence for several years, but our resources are stretched to the limit. And a big concern of our citizens has been neighborhood representation of the police department so that they can work more closely with them. And this

grant is certainly going to help us be able to do that and increase our community policing response. And that's extremely imperative.

I want to thank you for your leadership on this issue and look forward to other things that will be done, and hope we will be able to support you on getting the crime bill through the Congress. So thank you very much.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.

Mayor James.

MAYOR JAMES: Mr. President, Attorney General, Vice President and Mr. Brown, we'd like to thank you for your commendable leadership. Thank you for caring about our cities and towns and, more important, this is the best Christmas gift that the city of Newark could ever receive. Our renaissance and our struggle must be more than mortar and bricks. And since public safety's our number one issue, this gift from your leadership will certainly help us to ensure that public safety remains our number one priority.

We'd like to commend you for your leadership in passing the Brady Bill. It's a foot in the door. We plan to work with you to ban all assault weapons and also the question of licensing and registration for those who carry a firearm. And finally, we pledge our wholehearted support to join with you in seeking passage of the crime bill.

But more important today, we want to thank you for making Newark, New Jersey, have a merry Christmas. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mayor.

Mayor Loster.

MAYOR LOSTER: Mr. President, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank you on behalf of the 70,000-plus citizens of the city of Saginaw. We have a number of representatives from the Senate as well as the Congress, police department, prosecutor's office and Saginaw City Council here this morning. I, too, want to echo the sentiments of my colleagues and be among the first to thank you for the 13 new police officers which will come to our community. We're certainly proud to be able to participate in the process.

And let me just say this, Mr. President, we want to extend to you, as the smallest city, an invitation to come back to the city of Saginaw and to look at our efficient utilization of the 13 police officers that you've given to us. We wholeheartedly support the anticrime initiatives, and certainly we feel confident that we will succeed in the battle against crime.

We were early one of the participants to support the Brady Bill, and we're proud of that. I will say to you: We give you our wholehearted support in terms of supporting the anticrime initiatives and look forward to seeing much, much more from the White House.

Thank you very much again. And to you and the First Lady, merry Christmas and a happy new year.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much.

Mayor Wolff?

MAYOR WOLFF: Mr. President, let me first say thank you for being the first administration to address crime as a number-one priority. The 40 police that we will receive will be added to 73 new positions that we have put in for the police department. They will emphasize community policing initiatives as outlined by Captain Philippos in the grant proposal.

In San Antonio, we see crime going down; but as we see overall crime going down, we see violence going up, particularly youth. And that is our number-one concern. We've taken many local initiatives -- the coalition, the Education Partnership, Project Quest which are recreational, education and job-training programs to address youth. We've created a violent crime task force, headed by Captain Sandoval, and a gang intervention unit headed by Sergeant Richie, who are with me today. And Councilman Lyle Larson heads up a citizens crime prevention task force that just recently recommended three initiatives dealing with graffiti, daytime curfews, and possession of firearms by youth which we passed last Thursday.

The crime bill that's before Congress, we support you 100 percent on it. It could have a major impact on crime in this nation. One aspect I would like to comment on. We must stop the firepower getting into the hands of youth, criminals and mentally unstable people. Resident Agent in Charge, ATF, Bill Lewis, is with me today. We support banning assault weapons and controlling handguns. We say that licensed dealers should only be those that have a place of business, that it should be illegal for anyone to sell guns to youth, licensed dealers or not. And we do need more ATF agents -- we only have 14 in San Antonio. And let me add by saying that a criminal must believe he's going to get caught, convicted and serve hard time.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mayor.

I want to ask the Attorney General now to say a word, because the Justice Department, as you know, managed the process by which your cities were selected. I think they did a very good job. And so I'd like to call on her and let her say a few words.

ATTORNEY GENERAL RENO: Mayors, I just want to thank you. Your applications were so impressive. They indicate just what can be done with community policing, how it can both prevent crime and identify the real bad guys who need to be put away. And this is the first round -- they're more to come. And we look forward to working with you in a real, true partnership.

Merry Christmas.

THE PRESIDENT: I'm going to let Lee Brown say a word to you now. He started a community policing program in New York City. And I don't know if you saw it, but last week there was a wonderful cover story in The New York Times Sunday Magazine about a police officer named Kevin Jett who works eight square blocks in one of the toughest neighborhoods in New York. And the story pointed out that he not only arrests criminals, but he also prevents a lot of crimes from occurring in the first place. And I think that's the emphasis we ought to have here. This is not simply a question of catching people who break the law in a violent fashion, it's preventing crime.

So I want Lee to say a word.

MR. BROWN: Let me congratulate the mayors and certainly the police chiefs for being selected. I've experienced community policing in Houston and New York -- New York, for example, after one year we saw crime go down in every major category for the first time in 36 years. I see it as not only a better, but a smarter and certainly more cost-effective way of using police resources.

So congratulations to all of you, and Merry Christmas.

THE PRESIDENT: In closing, let me say, I know that from New York to Michigan -- and we've got members of Congress -- I mean, from Los Angeles to Michigan -- we've members of Congress who are actually there today, as well as in Buffalo and perhaps in some other places. And I really thank all of you for your support. Somebody told me that Mayor Riordan had the whole southern California delegation there, and if he does, I bet he's talking about more than law enforcement. (Laughter.)

I hear all of the movement in the background. I wish you all a happy holiday. And I thank you. When you're taking these kind of affirmative actions, the President can't do it alone, we've got to have the support of Congress. And I really appreciate their presence there. And thank you all so much. And congratulations to you and to the 68 other cities and towns who are in the vanguard of this move to bring community policing to our entire nation.

Thank you very much.

Q Do you think you're going to get that bill through?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, I do, yes.

Q The atmosphere has changed, hasn't it?

THE PRESIDENT: It has changed. You know, there may be some differences between us and the House on the amount of the bill or exactly how it should be spent. But I think there is now a clear bipartisan commitment in both Houses for the 100,000 police officers on the street, for the drug courts and for some of the other innovations. And so we're very, very hopeful that we can do it.

I think having the mayors, again, out there in small towns as well as the big cities, the Democrats and the Republicans marching arm in arm, it's changed the dynamic of this issue in America in a way that I think will be very good in helping us to make our people safer --

Q Do you think Congress is getting the message at home while they're at home?

THE PRESIDENT: Big time. That's our sense, that they're really hearing from the people that they just have to have more security on the streets, in their schools and communities.

Q Mr. President, are you taking too much credit for the growth of the economy? There have been stories suggesting that it may not be all your doing.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I saw those stories. I got

tickled this morning -- I took a poll around the staff -- we just had a two-hour meeting on the budget, and I said if the economy were bad who do you think would be blamed? (Laughter.)

I'm not so concerned about who gets the credit really. The American people get the credit -- if they go back to work, if they're becoming more competitive, if they're investing their money.

I do know this: that from -- even going back after the election, from the time we announced our deficit reduction plan to the time it was presented, to the time it was enacted, to the present day, the steady, disciplined drop in interest rates has played a major, major role in helping millions of people to refinance their homes and businesses -- last year we had a 19-year low in delinquencies in home mortgages -- and getting all this investment for new jobs.

So I believe our economic policies are stabilizing this country and contributing to this recovery. I think a lot of Americans have been working for years and years and years to be competitive in the global economy, and I think that is to their credit. I mean, we have a private sector economy. No person in public life can take credit for it.

But if we hadn't done what we have done on the economic plan to spur both -- to drive interest rates down and to spur reinvestment, I don't think we'd be where we are on the economy.

Q But every day we read about thousands being laid off.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it's still a terrible problem. That's why I always say we've got a lot more to do.

The problem that all rich countries are facing now is that productivity, which has always been a good thing in the economy; that is, fewer people produce more goods and services increases their ability to earn more income -- that's a problem unless you can sell all the goods and services you're producing. If you don't, it keeps unemployment higher than it should be and it depresses wages.

So that will be our challenge next year. That's why I wanted to get NAFTA this year; that's why I wanted to get that GATT trade agreement this year; that's why I wanted to try to start a new relationship with Japan and the Far East this year -- so we would have more customers for our goods and services, so we can grow this economy.

Q Are you going to have the flexibility to deal with the job-training issues and retraining, given the budget situation?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that's what -- I've already spent two hours on that today and I expect I'll spend a couple more hours on it. I certainly --

Q Can you wrap it up now the budget's over?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we're not done yet, but we worked hard on that today. We're going to keep working. We have a few more days. But the retraining issue is important because there have been a lot of news stories lately -- many of you perhaps have run them -- showing that people that either have high skill levels or are capable

of getting them in a hurry have much shorter periods of unemployment and are much more likely to get good-paying jobs.

We still don't have the kind of retraining system we need. So that's going to be a big part of next year's initiative.

Q Prime Minister Malval is criticizing President Aristide openly for being an obstacle to some sort of reconciliation. Are you on board with Prime Minister Malval or President Aristide? Where are you trying to throw your support?

THE PRESIDENT: I wouldn't say it's an either-or thing. Let me say, we have been working with this Friends of Haiti group, with our friends in Canada and France and Venezuela, to try to come up with a new approach that would restore democracy, would create the conditions where President Aristide could return, and would meet the fundamental objective we tried to meet in the Governors Island Accord -- to be to guarantee the security and the human rights and safety of all the parties in the previous disputes.

So we're going to take another run at it and see if we can do something on it. And it's going to require some flexibility on all sides. It just is. And we'll just have to see if we can get there. We're going to try -- hard.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very much.

END

11:40 A.M. EST

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
SATURDAY RADIO ADDRESS
PRE-RECORDED TODAY (August 12, 1993)

Good morning. Today, I wanted to talk with you about the progress we have made, and the plans we are making, to return prosperity and security to the people of the United States.

This week, I signed into law my plan for economic growth and job creation, containing the largest deficit reduction measure in our history. The plan contains \$255 billion in spending cuts, including substantial reductions in more than 200 specific spending programs. It cuts taxes for small businesses to spur job creation, and provides new incentives for the working poor to stay at work and stay off public assistance as a downpayment on welfare reform.

With this plan in place, private analysts believe the economy will produce more than 8 million jobs over the next four years. Already, it has brought interest rates to historic lows and the stock market to historic highs. It will help us restore the national economy and revive the American dream.

But we cannot enjoy the benefits of a healthy economy, unless we protect our neighborhoods and communities from the ravages of crime. Our country has seen 90,000 murders in the last four years, and a startling upsurge in gang activity, drive-by shootings, bloody carjackings, and outright terror in the hearts of our people. With a virtual war being conducted on our streets, crime has a national security issue for the people of the United States.

PLAN This week, when I announced my administration's anti-crime ~~legislation~~, at the White House this week, two respected law enforcement officials put this grave problem into perspective.

William O'Malley, a District Attorney from Plymouth County Massachusetts, said the murder rate in his area has nearly doubled, and the age of the defendants in court is going down and down. Police Commissioner Bill Bratton of Boston spoke of the fear gripping his city where homicides have gone up 60 percent this year due to gang violence and domestic violence. These statistics could have come from any law enforcement official from virtually any community in America. They and the people they represent put their lives on the line for us; we must give them the resources they need to seize back control of our streets. That is precisely what I am determined to do.

Our new crime initiative goes back to basics: toughening our criminal laws; putting more cops on the streets; disarming criminals; protecting students in their schools, and restoring order to our streets.

When it comes to hardened, violent criminals, society has

the right to impose the most severe penalties on the people who commit the most heinous crimes. I support capital punishment, especially against those who kill our police officers. So this legislation expands the federal death penalty, and limits the time available to criminals to appeal their sentences before their punishment is imposed.

Our plan also cracks down on the easy availability of guns. I am eager to sign the Brady bill, which requires a waiting period before the purchase of a handgun. I have signed a directive ordering the Treasury Department to suspend the importation of foreign made assault pistols which have become the weapons of choice for many gangs and drug dealers. And I am ordering a review of licensing procedures so that only legitimate gun dealers in the business of selling guns. These measures will fight the roving gangs who stalk the streets better armed than our police.

Our crime bill will fund the hiring or rehiring of up to 50,000 new police officers to walk the beat. It will also create a police corps to give young people money for college, train them, ~~in community policing~~, and ask them to return to their communities to serve as police officers in return for their education.

We expand the Cop-On-the-Beat legislation; we fund an initiative that will enable educators to hire more security guards to keep our schools safe; we beef up patrols in areas with public housing, and in communities where small businesses are vulnerable to crime; and we ask for new federal bootcamps ~~converted from outdated military installations~~ to provide wayward young people the discipline, education, and training they need for a better chance to avoid lifetimes of crime.

We will put these and other tools in the hands of the toughest and most talented trio of crime fighters ever assembled at the federal level -- Attorney General Janet Reno, a seasoned prosecutor from Miami, who runs our Department of Justice; FBI Director Louis Freeh, a street-wise former prosecutor and tough Federal judge who racked up an impressive record of crime-fighting; and, Lee Brown, the father of community policing, who serves as America's Director of Drug Control Policy.

But these esteemed and experienced leaders of America's law enforcement community cannot wage this war alone.

There is so much that people can do -- beyond what government can do -- to make our country more safe and more secure. * In America, the power of individual people is stronger than we usually believe, and it is a power we must turn to, if we are going to turn this crime problem around.

Too many people exhibit a coarseness and a callousness toward good values like decency, order, civil behavior, and

* WE IN GOVERNMENT CAN START BY ENSURING THAT THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM REFLECTS OUR VALUES AND RESTORES PEOPLE'S CONFIDENCE IN THE GOVERNMENT'S ABILITY TO PREVENT AND PUNISH CRIME. BUT

TO HELP PAY TO PUT MORE POLICE ON THE STREET.

respect for the rule of law. Often, it is within our ability to yank people back to what is right and what is true. We need to provide more role models for the young people need not lose to the meanness of the streets.

We can take simple but effective actions, like taking the car keys out of the hands of teenagers and otherwise responsible adults before they get behind the wheels of their automobiles and risk great damage and danger to themselves and to others.

We can urge broadcasters and advertisers to tone down the violence we see on television and in the theaters every day, and persuade them there is a market for programs and movies that reflect and reinforce our values.

We can remind people of the opportunities they have for national service, so they can express their citizenship, patriotism and caring by giving something back to the country which gives so much to us.

Working together, working as partners, getting government off our back and on our sides, there is nothing -- nothing -- the American people can't do. And with our economic plan in hand, and a tough crime bill on the way, we can truly say that our country is headed in a new direction and toward brighter, more prosperous and more productive days ahead.

Thanks for listening.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

24-Sep-1993 07:27pm

SUBJECT: President's Remarks to the People of St. Petersburg 9/24/93

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(St. Petersburg Florida)

For Immediate Release

September 24, 1993

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE PEOPLE OF ST. PETERSBURG

Pinellas Marine Institute
St. Petersburg, Florida

10:14 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. We are delighted to be here today, all of us. I'm especially glad that Attorney General Reno came down from Washington with me. When she became the Attorney General, Florida gave the United States a great national resources, and I know you're all proud of the job that she has done. (Applause.)

I also want to thank my longtime friend, Governor Chiles. You know, in his former life Governor Chiles was a member of the United States Senate and was head of the budget committee. He thought arithmetic was functioning better at the state and local level, so he decided to leave Washington. But when he left it made it harder for the rest of us to make arithmetic work in Washington. And I'm glad to be here with him and I especially honor the innovations that he has pushed in health care and in crime.

I want to thank Congressman Bill Young for hosting me in his district and for coming down last night on the plane. I'm also glad to see Congressman Miller here today and Congresswoman Karen Thurman from your neighboring districts.

We had a remarkable health care forum last night, as you probably know, in Tampa, with about 1,000 people there. And there were six or seven members of Congress, roughly evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats who came there with me in our effort to bring this country together around that issue.

I got a little briefing on St. Petersburg Beach from Mayor Horan when I was up here. He told me that we had a wide variety of ages here. I think -- he said -- your grandson is here and he's one year old today. Where -- is the Mayor's grandson here? Hold up the Mayor's grandson. Look at that. (Applause.)

And we have at least one of your distinguished citizens here who is in her 90s. Melita, stand up there. Thank you. (Applause.)

In between, we've got a President, an Attorney General, a Governor, three members of Congress, your state Attorney General, Bob Butterworth, who is here. The Mayor of St. Petersburg, David Fisher, the Chief of Police of St. Petersburg, Darrel Stephens, a number of state representatives and county officials and representatives from community groups, Crime Watch, and other groups.

I say that to make this point: If you look out across this crowd today from that young man celebrating his first birthday, to this fine lady who has seen almost this entire century come and go, you see across this crowd people of different races, different political parties, different walks of life -- all of us part of the family of America, all of us caught up now in a time of sweeping and profound change -- change which opens up to us vistas of opportunity that our forebears could never have imagined, and change which presents us with threats and troubles that our forebears never could have imagined.

I really believe that in a time like this, my job as your President is to try to identify the challenges facing our country, and then to try to offer my best ideas about a solution, and then to try to energize people all across the country to work until we find a solution. Whether it's the one I suggested or some other one, we have to urgently face both the opportunities and the problems before us in a time when we have to change so much.

And that's the first decision we all have to make. Whether it's in education or the economy, we have to be willing to change. When you're confronted with a time of sweeping changes with a bunch of things that are happening that are good that you can be part of and a bunch of things that are happening that are bad that you want to avoid, basically you have two options. You can sort of hunker down and put your arms around yourself and hope it will go away, and about -- that works about one time in a hundred. (Laughter.) And then if you play the odds, 99 percent of the time what you have to do is take a deep breath and stick your chest out and turn right into the change and figure out what you can do.

Now, one of the things that all of us have learned in our lives, that even children learn early is that you are more able to make changes you need to make when you are more secure. The more personally secure you are, the more you feel good about who you are and your connections to other people and your roots in a community, the more you are able to change. It seems almost ironic, but the more rooted you are in the traditionally human ties and the traditionally human values that make life so rich, the more you're able to change so that you can enhance what you value. The more insecure we are, the more difficult it is for us to change because we're too busy just trying to survive.

So, in a funny way, the pursuit that we must have as a people for

security, is tied closely to the pursuit we must have as a people for change. And I believe as strongly as I can say, that that's one of the reasons that makes this campaign for health care reform so important; that it will give our people the security to change. And it's one of the things that makes our efforts to try to reduce the crime rate, and enhance human decency and dignity, and reduce violence and destruction in our country so important because that is the security we need, the bedrock we need to make the economic changes, to make the education and training changes, to make the other changes we need in this country.

Last night, when we had that wonderful town hall meeting people asked dozens and dozens of questions -- I don't know how long we stayed there -- it was way too late. (Laughter.) There are a lot of people in America if they watched that whole show last night are sleepy at work today, I'll tell you that. But what you saw there is people yearning for security.

Here in this area, the principles I announced in health care reform are very much related to the principles of this anticrime effort our administration is undertaking: Security, health care that you've always got that can't be taken away. Simplify the system. It's a nightmare for the doctors and the nurses and the people who are getting health care. Achieve savings because the system is too wasteful -- you can't justify putting more money in a broken machine until you've fixed it. Maintain choice for consumers and have quality.

One of the things that matters so much about in Florida is the idea that people on Medicare as well as people on Medicaid will be able to get prescription drugs now under this program. Very important for older people to maintain their quality of life. And finally, to have more responsibility in the system. And that relates directly to the crime issue because one of the reasons American health care is so expensive is that our hospitals and our emergency rooms are full of people who are cut up and shot. If you look at the amount of money the American taxpayers pay in health care for violence, it is staggering. And the more we do that, the less we have to stand on other things that make us all well and more secure.

Now, one of the things that our health care reform package and the crime initiatives that the Attorney General is leading have in common is a focus on prevention. I got a great hand the other night talking to Congress, and I said, you know how your mother said an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure; well, your mother was right? Well, that's the truth. For the first time, if we pass this health care reform program, everybody will have in their health care package preventive services. We will save money and enhance the quality of life, enhance security if you give every child an immunization plan; if you have well-baby visits; if you have Pap smears and mammograms and cholesterol tests and the kinds of things that keep people well as well as help them to get well if they get sick.

The same thing is true in crime. We know from experience after experience after experience that the kind of violence that has unfortunately gripped the headlines in Florida in the last several days and grieved so many of us as Americans when people who come to our shores are hurt or killed when they want to see our country and they want to get to know the best about it, that is far from a problem of Florida alone. And certainly not a problem for our foreign visitors alone.

When Michael Jordan's father was killed recently, a nation grieved, but no one knew the names of the other 22 people who died in that county this year. This is a national problem.

When I was born in 1946 homicide wasn't even in the top ten leading causes of death in America. In fact -- listen to this -- throughout my lifetime homicide never made the top ten until 1989. And yet, now, homicide is the second leading cause of death among Americans age 15 to 25. And more of our teenage boys die from gunshots now than any other cause.

Now, we can decide again what to do with this. Are we going to hunker down and turn away and pretend it's not happening? Maybe it will go away -- we've got a one chance in a hundred that will happen. Or we can face it, and we can face the problem in all of its human manifestations, just the way the Attorney General said.

These kids we just met out here who got in trouble and now they're in this program, pretty good kids. They've got a whole life ahead of them. They've got contributions they can make. And we need to see what we can do about preventing the life that might happen that none of us want to occur.

This initiative that we have undertaken in our administration to give more security and to make this society safer include at least three forms of prevention I want to emphasize, because we know they work and because they are rooted in getting people at the grass-roots community level more power over their own lives.

First is giving these children who get in trouble something to say yes to and some order and framework in their lives. Senator Moynihan said on television last Sunday -- the distinguished Senator from New York who's been a student of American social history for 50 years -- we have gotten used to accepting a lot of behavior from people in this country that's pretty destructive. We have gotten used to the fact that a lot of kids grow up alone or almost alone in conditions that are very damaging to themselves and aren't conducive to learning good things and good habits. And we have let it happen. But all over America there are programs like the boot camp program -- one of these young men just came out of the boot camp program of this program, and he told the Governor that he liked the program; more people ought to be in it. Because, he said it used to be you could -- he knew this. He said it used to be you should ship kids my age off to the service, but we're going down. We don't have a draft anymore. We're going down -- the number of people in the service. So we've got to have a substitute where people can learn discipline and order and be able to see the future as something that happens three years from now, not three minutes from now. And we have to have programs like this Marine Institute, which now is spreading across the country.

This program is giving young people a chance to take their future back, a chance to understand that there is good inside them, that they can do things that are useful and productive and profitable, and a lot more fun than whatever it is that got them into this program in the first place.

Those young people told me -- (applause) -- Those young people told me what it was like to learn how to give CPR, to learn how to scuba dive, to

learn how to repair a boat and fix it so it would sail, to learn how to deal with each other and with adults so that they could get jobs. This program now operates in partnership with grass roots people in seven other states nationwide. They've taken 20,000 young people at risk and helped them to become responsible citizens. And so far, after they leave this program 75 percent of the young people that go through this program never have any criminal convictions again. If every young person in America that got in trouble had a chance to be in a program like this, think what a difference it would make. (Applause.)

It's very important. How many times do you pick up the paper and read about somebody finally did something terrible after they had been arrested 13 times or 15 times or 20 times. We need a system in this country, and the national government cannot do it, but we can help you do it. We can help provide funds and support and technical expertise, but people at the grass roots level have to do it. We've got to have systems in this country where everybody in those critical young years has a chance to be in a boot camp like this -- like you have in Florida -- or a program like the Marine Institute, or both if they need it.

We have an experimental program we started last June. Ten military facilities have been enclosed across the country where kids who are high school dropouts are able to come back and get their GED and have the benefit of military-type training. And a lot of these kids just love it. It's just changed their whole outlook on life. We have got to understand that we are raising a generation without the structure and order and predictability and support and reinforcement that most of us just took for granted. (Applause.) We took it for granted.

And there's no use in us pretending that some national government program and money alone will fix it. But there's no use in us pretending that just preaching at people will fix it, either. We have to actually change the conditions of opportunity for these young people. (Applause.)

The second thing we have to do is to recognize that our police forces can do more if they're more closely connected to the community, if there are enough of them, and if they operate in the same neighborhoods and concentrate on the problem areas. That's known today -- the buzzword for that is community policing. And it works. It works. (Applause.)

I have been in cities all across America where the crime rate is dropping because of concentrated community policing strategy where police work in partnership with the citizens who live in a community, focus their resources on the areas of greatest opportunity, respond quickly to problems. I have seen that. That works.

The Chief of Police of St. Petersburg, Darrel Stephens, who's here, has been one of our nation's leading promoters of community policing. And it does move away from the old ways of trying to catch criminals after a crime occurs to doing as much as you can to prevent crime in the first place. That drives down the crime rate.

This year under Attorney General Reno's leadership, our Department of Justice will fund five community policing projects in our nation to serve as models for the rest of the country. In a competitive process, the Justice Department tried to find rural examples and urban examples, small and medium-sized towns as well as big ones. Due to the strength of the programs in your

communities, the Justice Department has selected two of the five prototypes to be here in Florida. One in St. Petersburg, and the other -- (applause) -- the other in Hillsboro County, right next door. (Applause.)

And these funds -- not massive amounts of money, \$200,000 apiece -- will enable these communities to strengthen their own community policing programs and develop them in a way that can be copied by other communities.

One of the things that the Attorney General and I were talking about on the way up here is it never ceases to amaze me that nearly every problem in America has been addressed well by somebody somewhere, but we don't learn very well from one another yet. And one of the things that this government is dedicated to doing in my administration is taking what works at the grass-roots level and giving other people a chance to do it. And I thank you for that. (Applause.)

Now, the third thing I want to emphasize and the third thing I think we have to recognize is, if you want to prevent crime in this country -- violent crime -- if you want to stop gunshot wounds from being the leading cause of death among young teenage boys, if you want to change the circumstance in which the average age of people killing each other is now under 16 in some of our cities, you have to change the fact that America is the only country in the civilized world where a teenager can walk the street at random and be better armed than most police forces. (Applause.)

We have to face that fact. The crime bill, which was introduced just a couple of days ago in both the Senate and the House, contains more funds for more police officers on the street -- something I believe in -- we want to put another 100,000 out there in America so everybody can adopt a community policing strategy. It also has the Brady bill which will require a five-day waiting period before anybody can purchase a handgun. (Applause.)

And in addition to that, there are several bills in the Congress, and I hope and pray one of them can reach my desk this year, which will ban various types of assault weapons entirely from being held in the possessions of our young people. (Applause.)

Let me tell you something, folks. I come from a state where more than half the adults have a hunting or a fishing license or both; where most of us were in the woods by the time we were six years old; where some schools and some plants have to be closed on the opening day of deer season. (Laughter.) Nobody shows up anyway. (Laughter.) There's not a person in this country that values the culture of the outdoors and the hunting and all of that any more than I do. But neither those who love to hunt, or who love to shoot weapons in contests, nor the framers of the Constitution when they wrote the Second Amendment ever envisioned a time when children on our streets would illegally be in possession of weapons designed solely to kill other people and have more weapons than the people who were supposed to be policing them. And we better stop it if we want to recover our country. (Applause.)

Just last week, the Governor of Colorado, Governor Roy Romer, signed a law that prohibits juveniles from owning handguns. He joined Governor Florio of New Jersey and 17 others who have passed that law this year.

These are things we have to do. All three of these things are preventive. There worth a pound of cure. Have more programs like this one. Give these kids a chance to have something to say yes to, not just telling them what they have to say no to; and a chance to order their lives and to fill themselves from the inside out. A lot of these programs don't deal with people from the inside out. That's the only way you can really change people's lives.

Give our police forces a chance to succeed with a community-based strategy that prevents crimes as well as catches criminals. And get the guns out of the hands of the kids. Give our law enforcement officers a fighting chance to keep the streets safe and people secure.

There are elements of prevention that will give us the security we need to make the changes we need economically to move into the 21st century. They will have the extra benefit of dramatically lowering the costs of health care and enabling us to finance the kind of progress we need in health care and enabling us to finance the kind of progress we need in health care which again will give us the security we need to be the people we have to be in this dynamic era.

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

END11:35 A.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

December 15, 1994

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE NATION

The Oval Office

9:00 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Good evening. My fellow Americans, ours is a great country with a lot to be proud of. But at this holiday season, everybody knows that all is not well with America; that millions of Americans are hurting, frustrated, disappointed, even angry.

In this time of enormous change, our challenge is both political and personal. It involves government, all right, but it goes way beyond government, to the very core of what matters most to us. The question is, what are we going to do about it?

Let's start with the economic situation. I ran for President to restore the American Dream and to prepare the American people to compete and win in the new American economy. For too long, too many Americans have worked longer for stagnant wages and less security. For two years, we pursued an economic strategy that has helped to produce over five million new jobs. But even though the economic statistics are moving up, most of our living standards aren't. It's almost as if some Americans are being punished for their productivity in this new economy. We've got to change that. More jobs aren't enough. We have to raise incomes.

Fifty years ago, an American president proposed the G.I. Bill of Rights, to help returning veterans from World War II go to college, buy a home, and raise their children. That built this country. Tonight, I propose a Middle Class Bill of Rights.

There are four central ideas in this Bill of Rights: First, college tuition should be tax deductible. Just as we make mortgage interest tax deductible because we want people to own their own homes, we should make college tuition deductible because we want people to go to college.

Specifically, I propose that all tuition for college, community college, graduate school, professional school, vocational education or worker retraining after high school be fully deductible, phased up to \$10,000 a year for families making up to \$120,000 a year. Education, after all, has a bigger impact on earnings and job security than ever before. So let's invest the fruits of today's recovery into tomorrow's opportunity.

Second, bringing up a child is a tough job in this economy. So we should help middle-class families raise their children. We made a good start last year by passing the Family Leave Law, making college loans more affordable, and by giving \$15 million American families with incomes of \$25,000 a year or less an average tax cut of more than \$1,000 a year.

MORE

Now, I want to cut taxes for each child under 13, phased up to \$500 per child. This tax cut would be available to any family whose income is less than \$75,000.

Third, we should help middle-income people save money by allowing every American family earning under \$100,000 to put \$2,000 a year tax-free in an IRA, an Individual Retirement Account. But I want you to be able to use the money to live on, not just retire on. You'll be able to withdraw from this fund, tax-free -- money for education, medical expenses, the purchases of a first home, the care of an elderly parent.

Fourth, since every American needs the skills necessary to prosper in the new economy -- and most of you will change jobs from time to time -- we should take the billions of dollars the government now spends on dozens of different training programs and give it directly to you, to pay for training if you lose your job or want a better one.

We can pay for this Middle Class Bill of Rights by continuing to reduce government spending, including subsidies to powerful interests based more on influence than need. We can sell off entire operations the government no longer needs to run, and turn dozens of programs over to states and communities that know best how to solve their own problems.

My plan will save billions of dollars from the Energy Department, cut down the Transportation Department, and shrink 60 programs into four at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Our reinventing government initiative, led by Vice President Gore, already has helped to shrink bureaucracy and free up money to pay down the deficit and invest in our people. Already, we've passed budgets to reduce the federal government to its smallest size in 30 years, and to cut the deficit by \$700 billion. That's over \$10,000 for every American family.

In the next few days, we'll unveil more of our proposals. And I've instructed the Vice President to review every single government department program for further reductions.

We've worked hard to get control of this deficit after the government debt increased four times over in the 12 years before I took office. That's a big burden of you. About five percent of your income tax goes to pay for welfare and foreign aid, but 28 percent of it goes to pay for interest on the debt run up between 1981 and the day I was inaugurated president. I challenge the new Congress to work with me to enact a Middle Class Bill of Rights without adding to the deficit and without any new cuts in Social Security or Medicare.

I know some people just want to cut the government blindly, and I know that's popular now. But I won't do it. I want a leaner, not a meaner government, that's back on the side of hard-working Americans; a new government for the new economy -- creative, flexible, high quality, low cost, service oriented -- just like our most innovative private companies.

I'll work with the new Republican majority and my fellow Democrats in Congress to build a new American economy and to restore the American Dream. It won't be easy. Believe you me, the special interests have not gone into hiding just because there was an election in November. As a matter of fact, they're up here stronger than ever. And that's why, more than ever, we need lobby reform, campaign finance reform and reform to make Congress live by the laws it puts on other people.

Together, we can pass welfare reform and health care reform that work. I'll say more about what I'll do to work with the new Congress in the State of the Union address in January.

But here's what I won't do. I won't support ideas that sound good, but aren't paid for -- ideas that weaken the progress we've made in the previous two years for working families; ideas that hurt poor people who are doing their dead-level best to raise their kids and work their way into the middle class; ideas that undermine our fight against crime, or for a clean environment, or for better schools, or for the strength and well-being of our Armed Forces in foreign policy. In other words, we must be straight with the American people about the real consequences of all budgetary decisions.

My test will be: Does an idea expand middle class incomes and opportunities? Does it promote values like family, work responsibility and community? Does it contribute to strengthening the new economy? If it does, I'll be for it, no matter who proposes it. And I hope Congress will treat my ideas the same way. Let's worry about making progress, not taking credit.

But our work in Washington won't be enough. And that's where you come in. This all starts with you. Oh, we can cut taxes and expand opportunities, but governments can't raise your children, go to school for you, give your employees who have earned it a raise, or solve problems in your neighborhood that require your personal commitment. In short, government can't exercise your citizenship. It works the other way around.

The problems of this new world are complicated, and we've all got a lot to learn. That means citizens have to listen as well as talk. We need less hot rhetoric and more open conversation; less malice, and more charity. We need to put aside the politics of personal destruction and demonization that have dominated too much of our debate. Most of us are good people trying to do better. And if we all treated each other that way, we would do better. We have got to be a community again.

Yes, some people do take advantage of the rest of us -- by breaking the law, abusing the welfare system, and flaunting our immigration laws. That's wrong, and I'm working to stop it. But the truth is that most people in this country, without regard to their race, their religion, their income, their position on divisive issues, most Americans get up every day, go to work, obey the law, pay their taxes and raise their kids the best they can. And most of us share the same real challenges in this new economy. We'll do a lot better job of meeting those challenges if we work together and find unity and strength in our diversity.

We do have more in common, more uniting us than dividing us. And if we start acting like it, we can face the future with confidence. I still believe deeply that there is nothing wrong with America that can't be fixed by what's right with America. This is not about politics as usual. As I've said for years, it's not about moving left or right, but moving forward; not about government being bad or good, but about what kind of government will best enable us to fulfill our God-given potential. And it's not about the next election, either. That's in your hands.

Meanwhile, I'm going to do what I think is right. My rule for the next two years will be: Country first and politics as usual dead last. I hope the new Congress will follow the same rule. And I hope you will, too.

This country works best when it works together. For decades after World War II, we gave more and more Americans a chance to live out their dreams. I know -- I'm blessed to be one of them.

MORE

I was born to a widowed mother at a time when my state's income was barely half the national average; the first person in my family to finish college, thanks to money my parents couldn't really afford -- scholarships, loans, and a half a dozen jobs. It breaks my heart to see people with their own dreams for themselves and their children shattered. And I'm going to do all I can to turn it around. But I need your help. We can do it.

With all of our problems, this is still the greatest country in the world -- standing not at the twilight, but at the dawn of our greatest days. We still have a lot to be thankful for. Let's all remember that.

Happy holidays, and God bless America.

END

9:12 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

December 15, 1994

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE NATION

The Oval Office

9:00 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Good evening. My fellow Americans, ours is a great country with a lot to be proud of. But at this holiday season, everybody knows that all is not well with America; that millions of Americans are hurting, frustrated, disappointed, even angry.

In this time of enormous change, our challenge is both political and personal. It involves government, all right, but it goes way beyond government, to the very core of what matters most to us. The question is, what are we going to do about it?

Let's start with the economic situation. I ran for President to restore the American Dream and to prepare the American people to compete and win in the new American economy. For too long, too many Americans have worked longer for stagnant wages and less security. For two years, we pursued and economic strategy that has helped to produce over five million new jobs. But even though the economic statistics are moving up, most of our living standards aren't. It's almost as if some Americans are being punished for their productivity in this new economy. We've got to change that. More jobs aren't enough. We have to raise incomes.

Fifty years ago, an American president proposed the G.I. Bill of Rights, to help returning veterans from World War II go to college, buy a home, and raise their children. That built this country. Tonight, I propose a Middle Class Bill of Rights.

There are four central ideas in this Bill of Rights: First, college tuition should be tax deductible. Just as we make mortgage interest tax deductible because we want people to own their own homes, we should make college tuition deductible because we want people to go to college.

Specifically, I propose that all tuition for college, community college, graduate school, professional school, vocational education or worker retraining after high school be fully deductible, phased up to \$10,000 a year for families making up to \$120,000 a year. Education, after all, has a bigger impact on earnings and job security than ever before. So let's invest the fruits of today's recovery into tomorrow's opportunity.

Second, bringing up a child is a tough job in this economy. So we should help middle-class families raise their children. We made a good start last year by passing the Family Leave Law, making college loans more affordable, and by giving \$15 million

Now, I want to cut taxes for each child under 13, phased up to \$500 per child. This tax cut would be available to any family whose income is less than \$75,000.

Third, we should help middle-income people save money by allowing every American family earning under \$100,000 to put \$2,000 a year tax-free in an IRA, an Individual Retirement Account. But I want you to be able to use the money to live on, not just retire on. You'll be able to withdraw from this fund, tax-free -- money for education, medical expenses, the purchases of a first home, the care of an elderly parent.

Fourth, since every American needs the skills necessary to prosper in the new economy -- and most of you will change jobs from time to time -- we should take the billions of dollars the government now spends on dozens of different training programs and give it directly to you, to pay for training if you lose your job or want a better one.

We can pay for this Middle Class Bill of Rights by continuing to reduce government spending, including subsidies to powerful interests based more on influence than need. We can sell off entire operations the government no longer needs to run, and turn dozens of programs over to states and communities that know best how to solve their own problems.

My plan will save billions of dollars from the Energy Department, cut down the Transportation Department, and shrink 60 programs into four at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Our reinventing government initiative, led by Vice President Gore, already has helped to shrink bureaucracy and free up money to pay down the deficit and invest in our people. Already, we've passed budgets to reduce the federal government to its smallest size in 30 years, and to cut the deficit by \$700 billion. That's over \$10,000 for every American family.

In the next few days, we'll unveil more of our proposals. And I've instructed the Vice President to review every single government department program for further reductions.

We've worked hard to get control of this deficit after the government debt increased four times over in the 12 years before I took office. That's a big burden of you. About five percent of your income tax goes to pay for welfare and foreign aid, but 28 percent of it goes to pay for interest on the debt run up between 1981 and the day I was inaugurated president. I challenge the new Congress to work with me to enact a Middle Class Bill of Rights without adding to the deficit and without any new cuts in Social Security or Medicare.

I know some people just want to cut the government blindly, and I know that's popular now. But I won't do it. I want a leaner, not a meaner government, that's back on the side of hard-working Americans; a new government for the new economy -- creative, flexible, high quality, low cost, service oriented -- just like our most innovative private companies.

I'll work with the new Republican majority and my fellow Democrats in Congress to build a new American economy and to restore the American Dream. It won't be easy. Believe you me, the special interests have not gone into hiding just because there was an election in November. As a matter of fact, they're up here stronger than ever. And that's why, more than ever, we need lobby reform, campaign finance reform and reform to make Congress live by the laws it puts on other people.

Together, we can pass welfare reform and health care reform that work. I'll say more about what I'll do to work with the new Congress in the State of the Union address in January.

But here's what I won't do. I won't support ideas that sound good, but aren't paid for -- ideas that weaken the progress we've made in the previous two years for working families; ideas that hurt poor people who are doing their dead-level best to raise their kids and work their way into the middle class; ideas that undermine our fight against crime, or for a clean environment, or for better schools, or for the strength and well-being of our Armed Forces in foreign policy. In other words, we must be straight with the American people about the real consequences of all budgetary decisions.

My test will be: Does an idea expand middle class incomes and opportunities? Does it promote values like family, work responsibility and community? Does it contribute to strengthening the new economy? If it does, I'll be for it, no matter who proposes it. And I hope Congress will treat my ideas the same way. Let's worry about making progress, not taking credit.

But our work in Washington won't be enough. And that's where you come in. This all starts with you. Oh, we can cut taxes and expand opportunities, but governments can't raise your children, go to school for you, give your employees who have earned it a raise, or solve problems in your neighborhood that require your personal commitment. In short, government can't exercise your citizenship. It works the other way around.

The problems of this new world are complicated, and we've all got a lot to learn. That means citizens have to listen as well as talk. We need less hot rhetoric and more open conversation; less malice, and more charity. We need to put aside the politics of personal destruction and demonization that have dominated too much of our debate. Most of us are good people trying to do better. And if we all treated each other that way, we would do better. We have got to be a community again.

Yes, some people do take advantage of the rest of us -- by breaking the law, abusing the welfare system, and flaunting our immigration laws. That's wrong, and I'm working to stop it. But the truth is that most people in this country, without regard to their race, their religion, their income, their position on divisive issues, most Americans get up every day, go to work, obey the law, pay their taxes and raise their kids the best they can. And most of us share the same real challenges in this new economy. We'll do a lot better job of meeting those challenges if we work together and find unity and strength in our diversity.

We do have more in common, more uniting us than dividing us. And if we start acting like it, we can face the future with confidence. I still believe deeply that there is nothing wrong with America that can't be fixed by what's right with America. This is not about politics as usual. As I've said for years, it's not about moving left or right, but moving forward; not about government being bad or good, but about what kind of government will best enable us to fulfill our God-given potential. And it's not about the next election, either. That's in your hands.

Meanwhile, I'm going to do what I think is right. My rule for the next two years will be: Country first and politics as usual dead last. I hope the new Congress will follow the same rule. And I hope you will, too.

I was born to a widowed mother at a time when my state's income was barely half the national average; the first person in my family to finish college, thanks to money my parents couldn't really afford -- scholarships, loans, and a half a dozen jobs. It breaks my heart to see people with their own dreams for themselves and their children shattered. And I'm going to do all I can to turn it around. But I need your help. We can do it.

With all of our problems, this is still the greatest country in the world -- standing not at the twilight, but at the dawn of our greatest days. We still have a lot to be thankful for. Let's all remember that.

Happy holidays, and God bless America.

END

9:12 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

BACKGROUND BRIEFING
BY SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS

October 26, 1993

The Old Executive Office Building

11:21 A.M. EDT

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Phil Lader and I are here to answer any questions about the National Performance Review because today is the introduction of the first big package of legislation taken from that review. I also have Colleen Preston from the Defense Department and Al Burman from OMB who will answer any detailed questions on the procurement reform package.

Q On that crime -- the \$4 to \$5 billion for crime, is that to come out of the first \$10 billion-plus that you know CBO will accept, or from the rest that gets you to the \$22 or \$30 billion?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Our estimates are that the first year of procurement reform will yield \$5.6 billion in savings. And the estimate is that that \$5.6 billion is a very conservative number, it can easily be saved. It represents -- think of it -- it's \$5.6 out of \$200 billion. If we can't save that amount of money, then we've really got problems, particularly if we loosen up the system. And that that should be sufficient to pay for the crime bill.

Q You promise \$10 billion in cuts --

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: That's deficit reduction.

Q Now, if you have \$10 billion in deficit reduction.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Yes, that's deficit reduction.

Q Now the \$5 billion is beyond that?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Beyond that. Yes.

Q But it's not counted in the CBO scoring?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: No. Well, CBO hasn't scored this yet because Senator Glenn is just introducing his bill this afternoon.

Q You said you knew you were going to get the \$10 billion plus some \$3 to \$5 billion from CBO.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: We hope we'll get \$3 to \$5 billion from CBO, yes.

Q Okay, is that where the crime money is or is it from the rest?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Yes, that's where the crime money is.

Q Three to \$5 billion is in the first -- do you think CBO is going to score this \$ 3 to \$ 5 billion in the first year?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: In the first year of procurement reform, yes. We hope.

Q And your estimate of where those savings come from -- is that primarily in lower prices?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Yes.

Q -- or is that -- is a lot of that in fewer government workers --

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Well, it's -- let's go through that because I think it's very important to this discussion.

The studies on defense procurement indicate -- have various estimates on how much money you can save. And I will let Colleen and Al talk to some details about this. Essentially the National Performance Review estimated that we could save -- we took a very low number, five percent, some studies were as high as 12 percent -- that would result from procurement reform. Five percent of \$800 billion over a four-year period, okay, gives you \$40 billion. We then took \$17 billion out of that because we didn't want to double count personnel that might be used for procurement reform. We put that into a separate personnel number. So the NPR recommended -- suggested that we will save \$22 billion over a four-year period. We didn't count anything for the first year because we didn't know how fast we'd get this enacted. Obviously if we get it faster, we'll get the money faster -- \$22 billion over a four-year period, \$5.6 billion in the first year.

Now, since we have already counted in our other cuts -- the personnel -- that is primarily in the cost of lower products to the federal government. And as I say, look at it in the context. If you're buying \$200 billion worth of goods and services a year, you ought to be able, particularly if the constraints on your volume are lifted as this procurement bill would do -- saving \$5 billion dollars out of that should not be terribly difficult. We think it's very doable.

Did you want to say anything on this. It's very important.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Perhaps I could just refer you to some studies that have been done that I think give credibility to these numbers and give you a sense of the magnitude of savings that are likely.

The Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown University has completed two studies over the last two years looking at this very issue. What they found is that firms -- particularly firms who are in the commercial marketplace -- had tended to separate their work. They just don't want to have the increased burdens and the increased audit requirements, the possibility of losing technical data to the federal government. And, as a result, they've set up separate entities to do their work for the government. When you take a look at what these entities charge the government in terms of paying for the items that we buy from them, they suggest that there's an administrative overhead cost three times higher for what the government gets than what the private sector gets.

The Defense Science Board just recently did a study, as well, looking at this very same issue. And in their report which was released just recently, identified a whole series of specific savings as well. For example, they mention Motorola developing a secure telephone that costs one-tenth the cost of what the government would have had to pay for it if Motorola hadn't used a commercial process for developing this item.

They talk about electronics savings, which is clearly important for defense weapon systems, since you're seeing significant amounts of money being spent in that area, even on the most technical government requirement. And here again, 30 percent to 60 percent of those kinds of costs for what the Defense Department buys is often electronics gear -- savings 20 percent to 30 percent here. So there's a whole host of these kinds of reports that we feel give good credibility to the notion that a five-percent estimate of savings is a conservative estimate.

Finally, there's one other effort that was recently completed, and this is something that had been referred to as well. The Section 800 panel that was set up by Congress to look at how we could streamline the way Defense does business, and the report of that panel suggested that commercial firms doing business with the government were paying up to 12 percent more -- the government was paying up to 12 percent more for the items being produced by these firms when the government buys these items, as opposed to when they're out in the private sector. So we see significant gains to be achieved here. And we feel that the percentage that we're estimating is a responsible number and, really, an average of many of these other figures coming from these other studies being done.

Q So if you save \$5.6 billion in the first year and that goes to the crime bill, then the \$10 billion for deficit reduction comes when and where?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: The estimate is a savings of \$22.5 billion over a five-year period with none of the savings in the first year. So the estimate is at a \$5 billion rate per year, each year.

Q Starting in which year?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Starting in 1995.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: No. In the report, we started the savings in '96. That's because we didn't know how long it would take --

Q So no deficit reduction will occur as a result of your action until 1996, is that correct?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: No, let me say in the report we started the savings in '96 because we did not know how long it would take to develop and pass a comprehensive procurement reform bill. So we gave ourselves a year. If this bill passes, as we hope it will in a couple of months, we can start seeing savings right away. We can start seeing savings right away. We can start seeing savings in '95. The package that Director Panetta talked about, the \$10 billion package, is \$10 billion dedicated to deficit reduction over five years.

Q I understand that you want to pass the procurement reform package very quickly, but are there going to be hearings to get industry input very quickly on these?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Yes, my understanding is the Senate plans for hearings. I believe they'll be joint hearings with the Armed Services and the Governmental Affairs Committee. And they are also committed to trying to make something happen this fall as is Mr. Conyers. So we hope to see something done over the next few weeks.

Q And industry witnesses to --

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: We expect that there will be witnesses from all sectors who will be interested in the procurement reform effort, including people from the private sector, from industry as well.

Q How do account for the large gap between what the CBO is likely to score the procurement savings at and the \$200 billion that you hope eventually to get out of this?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: No, no, no -- not \$200 billion --

Q Well, \$40 billion.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: -- that's what we spend a year -- \$22 billion.

Q Twenty-two billion, right.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: We don't account for that because we don't know yet how CBO will score this. We're hoping -- we would score it -- if we were scoring it, as anywhere from \$3 to \$5 billion per year. In the report, we said we think it will save \$5 billion. Here's the problem with scoring it. The problem with scoring it is it involves an estimate on what will be the reduction in the cost of goods and services to the government. And that's very -- that's a difficult thing to do.

Q The report included a recommendation on Davis-Bacon I don't see in this package. Vice President Gore mentioned something about working with Senator Bingaman on that. Can you tell us more about that?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Davis-Bacon crosses several of the -- the jurisdictions of several committees in the House and in the Senate. So far we've been working with the

Government Ops Committees and with the Armed Services Committees. Senator Bingaman will be working with us and with the Labor Committees to come up with an amendment dealing with Davis-Bacon and the Service Contract Act.

Q Can you elaborate on one of the executive orders that's supposed to be released dealing with reducing unfunded mandates to state and local governments as well as this idea of increasing waivers in statutory and regulatory requirements?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: The President signed that mandate this morning in a meeting with the representatives of the Big Seven -- the states, the counties, municipalities, governors associations. And that executive order is drawn from the National Performance Review. It basically sets up a procedure for having input from state and local governments in the making of regulations, and it advocates in legislation greater waiver authority for agency heads and Cabinet secretaries so that they can accommodate the law to special situations that arise at the states and localities. And that, of course, has been a big problem for smaller states, et cetera.

Q Could you give us some examples of unfunded mandates? What do have in mind there?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: I think that there is a lot of examples of unfunded mandates, and it kind of is in the eye of the beholder because the states and localities will define them somewhat differently. But a lot of environmental questions fall into that category, many health care provisions -- it's all over the place. And --

Q But how do you -- who is the ultimate determiner of what is an unfunded mandate?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Again, it's in the eye of the beholder. The people in Congress who pass the laws don't think they're doing such damage. Sometimes, the people on the ground who have to implement the laws complain about them and say this is really posing an enormous fiscal burden on my city or my county, and I can't deal with it.

We want to create a process -- we have created a process where we can have a better dialogue between the local governments and the federal government on all those issues.

Q So before you could actually reduce the number of unfunded mandates, you have to decide what they are.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Yes.

Q A follow-up on that question. Does that mean the executive order deals with stuff in the future rather than existing --

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: That's right.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

11:32 A.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

October 26, 1993

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN REINVENTING GOVERNMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

The Old Executive Office Building

10:26 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Ladies and gentlemen, the Presidential Memorandum on Electronic Commerce which I have just signed is, as the Vice President said, a direct result of the work done by the National Performance Review. It will make our antiquated paper-based procurement system accessible to anybody with a personal computer. It will open up a world of possibilities to small businesses in America and drive down costs to taxpayers.

This demonstrates why the National Performance Review has been and will continue to be a success. The NPR has become a true action plan for unprecedented cost cutting and reinvention across the entire governmental process. It's dedicated to reforms that will give us a government that actually does work better and cost less.

We want to give the taxpayer a more efficient government, to reduce the deficit, to provide new resources so that we can also respond to urgent national needs. The proposals we announce today meet every one of those objectives. By sending to Congress a bill that produces billions in savings, we will now be able to finance an expansion of our anticrime activities at a time when a country desperately needs it.

Reinventing government is working, and I want to say a special word of thanks to the Vice President for his outstanding leadership on this project.

Today I am sending to Congress a significant package of spending cuts, totaling \$10 billion, based on the National Performance Review, and fulfilling a promise I made to further reduce the deficit by spending cuts in that amount -- sending -- excuse me -- spending cuts in that amount to Congress that could be passed in this calendar year.

The Government Reform Act phases out federal support for wool, mohair and honey; consolidates environmental satellite programs; streamlines the operations of the Department of Agriculture, and Housing and Urban Development; reduces costly regulations; and proposes other reforms reflecting more than 20 deficit-cutting recommendations of the NPR. These cuts are part of our commitment to put our economic house in order.

Congress a bill that produces billions in savings, we will now be able to finance an expansion of our anticrime activities at a time when a country desperately needs it.

Reinventing government is working, and I want to say a special word of thanks to the Vice President for his outstanding leadership on this project.

Today I am sending to Congress a significant package of spending cuts, totaling \$10 billion, based on the National Performance Review, and fulfilling a promise I made to further reduce the deficit by spending cuts in that amount -- sending -- excuse me -- spending cuts in that amount to Congress that could be passed in this calendar year.

The Government Reform Act phases out federal support for wool, mohair and honey; consolidates environmental satellite programs; streamlines the operations of the Department of Agriculture, and Housing and Urban Development; reduces costly regulations; and proposes other reforms reflecting more than 20 deficit-cutting recommendations of the NPR. These cuts are part of our commitment to put our economic house in order.

With the passage of the economic plan last summer, containing about \$500 billion in deficit reduction, we've helped to drive down interest rates to historic low levels to keep inflation down. This has meant more private sector job growth in one year than in the previous four, increases in housing starts, and in mid-October, we know now that auto sales have climbed by 18.4 percent, the largest amount in several years. Orders for heavy equipment continue to rise.

While we have still clearly got a very long way to go, and many more good paying jobs to produce, this recovery is beginning to shift into a more promising phase. That's why our progress on continued deficit reduction is very important. We have to maintain the government's credibility in holding down the deficit, keeping interest rates down in order to provide a stable climate for long-term growth.

We must now move to achieve real savings through procurement reform. While the private sector is becoming more flexible, more innovative, government has become in many ways over the last 10 years even more bureaucratic. At a time when all businesses are looking for better suppliers and lower prices, the government is too often losing suppliers and actually paying higher prices by putting up so many costly hurdles and requirements in our procurement system.

Procurement waste is costing the taxpayers tens of billions of dollars and it has to stop. We must fundamentally reform this system, saving billions of dollars and using that money in ways that meet the basic needs of the American people. Senator Glenn and Congressman Dellums and Congressman Conyers and the other distinguished members of Congress who have joined us here today have introduced very important procurement reform legislation which will make it much easier for agencies to buy the same commercial products ordinary consumers and businesses buy off the shelf. It will cut down enormously on paperwork. It will speed deliveries. It will provide new incentives for small businesses.

At the same time, the Department of Defense has

requested, with my support, immediate congressional authorization to undertake seven pilot projects to reform their own procurement processes. These projects will allow the department to demonstrate innovative approaches to acquiring commercial jet aircraft and aircraft engines, as well as items like clothing and medical supplies.

Cost-saving innovations like these are critical to our ability to meet future military needs within our budgetary limits. I might say that the Department of Defense has been so confident of these things that, after we've completed our bottoms-up review, the leaders at the Defense Department said they thought one of the ways that we could actually meet our defense needs over the next five years within the tough budgetary restrictions imposed would be to require these kinds of procurement reforms. And I want to thank the Department of Defense for the aggressive attitude that they have taken toward this, and we all look forward to the results they will be achieving now.

Procurement reform also will enhance national security. Procurement regulations today virtually force defense contractors to develop business practices and products that are unique only to the military. This division of industry in the United States in the defense and nondefense sectors results in higher prices to the government, less purchasing flexibility to the Armed Services, and too often actually denies our military state-of-the-art technologies found in the commercial marketplace. Today five of the top 10 U.S. semiconductor producers refuse defense business because of the burdens and special requirements the government imposes.

Finally, procurement can work by allowing the government to run more like a business, buying products based on price and other important considerations such as how well a supplier has performed in the past. We want the marketplace, not the bureaucracy, to determine what we buy and what we pay.

According to the NPR report, if Congress does its part in passing legislation and we do our part in making it work, we could save more than \$5 billion in the first year of this reform alone. We ought to take some of that money that your government has been wasting all these years and use it to uphold government's first responsibility, which is to keep our citizens safe here at home. With that money, we can make our crime bill even stronger. We can make sure we put at least 50,000 police officers on the street over the next five years. We can help states to build more boot camps so we can take young criminals off the street and teach them more respect for the law and give them a chance to avoid a life in prison and live a life of constructive citizenship. We can have more drug courts, like the one the Attorney General started in Florida and the one our administration is helping to launch here in D.C., so we can stop sending tens of thousands of criminal addicts back onto the street every year where they'll commit more crimes if they don't get treatment first.

I want Congress to pass this crime bill and pass the savings I've asked to help pay for it. I want them to know that if these cuts aren't passed, I'm going to come back with more cuts. And if those aren't passed, I'll come back with still more. I'll keep coming back until we have the money we need to make America safer.

Procurement reform shares a common border with many of our most important goals: saving taxpayer money, reinventing

government, strengthening our military, improving our economy. But in a larger sense the steps we are taking here today are also about proving to the American people that we can honestly and seriously deal with the issues that matter most to them, and that for too long too many have felt powerless to change.

We can and will cut the deficit. We can and will run a government that works better and costs less. We can and will turn those savings to helping America, including helping more Americans be safer in their homes and on their streets.

I'd like to close by introducing to you Lieutenant Colonel Brad Orton. He has a story to tell that reveals the price we continue to pay by doing nothing in this important area.

During the Gulf War, the Air Force placed an emergency order for 6,000 Motorola commercial radio receivers. But because Motorola's commercial unit lacked the record-keeping systems required to show the Pentagon that it was getting the lowest available price, the deal reached an impasse. The issue was resolved in a remarkable way that Lieutenant Colonel Orton will now describe, involving the Japanese government. This should never happen again.

Today is about taking responsibility for doing better, working together to build a better America. We can do this -- Congress, the administration, the American people. Please join me in welcoming Lieutenant Colonel Orton. (Applause.)

END

10:35 A.M. EDT

GOVERNOR BILL CLINTON
REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY
DETROIT MICHIGAN
OCTOBER 17, 1992

I'm a Governor and a former Attorney General, but I am also a husband and a father. There is nothing I care more deeply about than keeping my family, and every American, out of harm's way.

I believe by any objective measure George Bush has utterly failed to do this. We have tried his approach to public safety for twelve years and it hasn't worked. As in so many things, it's time to change.

There have been many firsts in this campaign but today I am particularly proud of this one, where for the first time in history a majority of States Attorneys General have endorsed a Democratic ticket.

For that honor, and for this gathering of endorsing Attorneys General, District Attorneys, and Federal Prosecutors, an unusual joint effort that I hope is emblematic of the cooperation between agencies that will take place starting in January, for all this I thank you very much.

I am honored that today Sarah Brady has endorsed me, and joined us for this great event. We as a nation are in her debt, for the cause she has championed is the right cause.

I pledge to you Sarah that as President I will support the Brady Bill - no ands ifs or buts - and I will work hard to assure its passage early in my first term.

I'd also like to recognize Cathie Gould, the widow of Lt. Richard Gould. Lt. Gould was killed in 1989 by a mentally troubled person who had purchased a handgun that day. A background check and waiting period would have saved his life. I'm honored by your support, Ms. Gould, and I

will work with you to honor Lt. Gould's memory by passing the Brady Bill.

We know why we are all here.

We are here because George Bush has broken his promise to make our families safe again. He tries to cut funds for local law enforcement. He tries to cut funds for prisons. He stands with the NRA in opposing sensible restrictions of assault weapons and handguns. Although the number of violent crimes and innocent victims escalate beyond reason, George Bush is silent.

He's also surrendered in The War Against Drugs. There's too few treatment centers, too little anti-drug education for children, too few programs for addicted mothers, and he refuses to do anything about it.

If we are to retain the bonds of community that bind us together as Americans, bonds that are being torn apart by crime and drugs, we can do better.

It is inexcusable that America leads the world in violent crimes. But we do.

It is unacceptable that last year was the most violent and bloody in our history, with more murders, rapes, and robberies than ever before, but it was. There have been 90,000 murders in the last four years. There are more crimes committed by juveniles and against children and youth (check) than ever before.

And an American woman is raped every five minutes - a breathtakingly awful statistic - and also the worst record in our history.

Crime costs our businesses at least seventy-five billion dollars a year in lost productivity. Fire-arm injuries cost us more than sixteen billion per year, and according to a Congressional Committee the total cost of drug use including drug related crime, injuries, lost economic productivity, addicted infants, and workplace accidents - is one hundred and seventy six billion dollars

per year.

As all of you know, the crime epidemic shares a very long common border with the drug epidemic, but it is a border that George Bush has failed to patrol.

In spite of spending more than thirty billion dollars the Bush War on Drugs has failed.

There are more cocaine and heroine addicts than four years ago, more drug related crimes, more drug affected infants, and more drugs flowing into the country than ever before.

I do not blame George Bush completely for the wave of violent crimes and drug abuse that has occurred on his watch.

I do however blame him for his total failure to respond, his failure to lead this nation morally, to be sensitive to what crime and drugs are doing to us, and to the level of cynicism that is engendered when relief is promised and none given.

Prisons are filled beyond capacity. George Bush proposed cutting funds for prison construction.

Cops on the beat are the best anti-crime program, and we need more, thousands more. George Bush in his last budget proposed cutting funds to local law enforcement by more than one hundred million dollars.

Assault weapons - weapons made for war - are taking down our officers and countless other innocent victims. The police don't want these weapons, but the NRA does, so George Bush won't restrict them.

There is unanimous popular support for cracking down on white collar criminals. George Bush withdrew tough sentencing guidelines at the request of special interests, and in spite of his promise to establish twenty seven Regional S&L Fraud Task forces, he has set up two, and he has recovered less than one per cent of the money that was

ripped off the American people.

George Bush's response to crime has failed, and so has his response to drugs, which has basically been to hold a press conference.

Drug treatment programs work. The public supports them and users seek them out. Yet George Bush's treatment program ignores one million addicts who could be treated -- leaving them on our streets committing countless crimes.

George Bush promised to do whatever it took to limit the supply of drugs into America. Yet today the DEA has fewer agents than the Army Band has members. And, not surprisingly, George Bush's own drug Czar admits that the amount of drugs entering the country is on the rise.

He promised to never bargain with drug dealers. Then, according to Senator DeConcini, a former prosecutor, the President cut deals with five of the most notorious drug king-pins to secure testimony against the President's former friend Mr. Noriega. Today Panama, according to the general Accounting Office, is "even more a land of drug traffickers" than it was under Noriega.

Every American supports providing help to expectant mothers who are struggling with drugs. George Bush said he cared. But since 1988 one million drug affected infants have been born in America, and only one in ten of the women who needed treatment received it.

Under George Bush we've had two splashy Drug Summits and one phony drug buy across from the White House financed by taxpayer funds. Under him the so called Drug Czar has disappeared, while the Drug Czar's office has been filled with more political appointees than any agency in the Executive Branch.

I know we can do better. I'm Governor of a state that has done better.

In Arkansas we are tough with offenders and compassionate with the victims of crime. Most importantly,

for more than a decade we have worked very hard to provide every element of our prosecutorial and criminal justice system with the funds and the leadership necessary to get the job done.

We've toughened drug laws and increased the number of narcotics officers. We've eradicated a billion dollars worth of marijuana plants, and toughened DWI laws to include mandatory sentencing.

We've built a state of the art communications system for the police that is shared by other agencies and that has been used as a model by other states and nations.

In recent years we've doubled incarceration rates and in the last decade doubled the number of people behind bars. We've also begun successful "Boot Camp Program" for non-violent first offenders.

And, since I have been Governor I have signed seventy death warrants. There have been four executions in Arkansas during my Administration. Three involved police killings.

In the first half of 1992 in Arkansas the crime rate dropped by 6.2%, and the number of murder, rapes, and robberies decreased.

In short, in the last year Arkansas has become a safer place to live, and we are all very proud of that.

But our progress is not enough. All Americans deserve to live in safety. And you deserve a government that helps you see that they do.

As President, I will insist the government live up to its responsibility to protect people, and will ask the American people to live up to their responsibility to obey the law and help their communities enforce it.

First, I will put 100,000 more police officers on the streets in our neighborhoods and suburbs and rural communities.

We're going to work with local governments across America to use those new police officers in community policing programs, where they will walk a beat and get to know the families and business people who live and work there. The best anti-crime program is a still a police officer on the beat, patrolling the street.

Community policing reflects the core philosophy of what I mean by a changing federal role in law enforcement across the board.

It is a non-bureaucratic, non-traditional, local solution. It's not a tax and spend program. It empowers local police and prosecutors. It is designed to help prevent crime, not to track crime that has already taken place.

Community policing also means more neighborhood anti-crime measures. We will ask that people take more responsibilities within their communities to rid them of crime, and to work much more with the police to create better neighborhoods and safer streets.

And since the 1960's the federal role in aid to local law enforcement has been principally to provide hardware - computers, helicopters, and manpower for joint task forces. In keeping with our commitment to retraining working people and to reinvigorate rusty government programs, community policing allows the federal role to be one of encouraging institutional change and of providing law enforcement with new skills for new times. It is my sincere hope that among other things this emphasis will also foster more of a sense of trust between federal and local agencies, and less of a sense of turf.

Second, George Bush will not establish a waiting period to keep hand guns out of the hands of convicted criminals and drug addicts, in spite of the fact that every major police group in America as well as every living former President endorses the Brady Bill.

And as I said, I will fight to make the Brady Bill the law of the land.

Third, we will work directly with those communities

behind bars so they can be treated there. Drug dependency destroys lives. Period. We will target priority treatment for pregnant women to prevent the human tragedy of addicted infants, expand school-based clinics to help young people say no to drugs and say yes to education, and we will expand the treatment of addicts in our prisons, to break the cycle that begins when they hit the street with a drug habit that drives them to commit more crimes.

I'd like to close by making three brief but important points.

First, I have talked often in my campaign about change, about lifting America up from the empty policies of the last twelve years and returning to the kind of progressive and compassionate government that helped build America.

But George Bush will not change.

As a result, Americans are more insecure at work because of his failed economic program, and more anxious at home because of his failed war on drugs, crime, and violence. His reaction in both cases has followed the same pattern.. First he denied the problem, then he declared the problem solved, then he demeaned the Presidency through passivity, as the people demanded change.

Second, we have been extremely focused in this campaign. We have put forth a plan to get the economy moving again, to put people to work and invest in education and health care and training again, so we can compete and win again.

But also so we can be the just and fair society again. If we stop disinvesting in our people, if we end the policies that have favored the few at the expense of the many, especially at the expense of our children and those at the bottom, if we have leaders who believe in bringing all races and classes and regions together, we will go a long way to attacking our problems - including our crime and drug problems - where they begin, which is in a lack of social and economic opportunity.

We're going to work with local governments across America to use those new police officers in community policing programs, where they will walk a beat and get to know the families and business people who live and work there. The best anti-crime program is a still a police officer on the beat, patrolling the street.

Community policing reflects the core philosophy of what I mean by a changing federal role in law enforcement across the board.

It is a non-bureaucratic, non-traditional, local solution. It's not a tax and spend program. It empowers local police and prosecutors. It is designed to help prevent crime, not to track crime that has already taken place.

Community policing also means more neighborhood anti-crime measures. We will ask that people take more responsibilities within their communities to rid them of crime, and to work much more with the police to create better neighborhoods and safer streets.

And since the 1960's the federal role in aid to local law enforcement has been principally to provide hardware - computers, helicopters, and manpower for joint task forces. In keeping with our commitment to retraining working people and to reinvigorate rusty government programs, community policing allows the federal role to be one of encouraging institutional change and of providing law enforcement with new skills for new times. It is my sincere hope that among other things this emphasis will also foster more of a sense of trust between federal and local agencies, and less of a sense of turf.

Second, George Bush will not establish a waiting period to keep hand guns out of the hands of convicted criminals and drug addicts, in spite of the fact that every major police group in America as well as every living former President endorses the Brady Bill.

And as I said, I will fight to make the Brady Bill the law of the land.

Third, we will work directly with those communities

hardest hit by crime and drugs and who need extra assistance. We will ask these communities to develop their own comprehensive crime control programs -- and we will encourage them to use proven ideas like community policing, drug education, and drug treatment by demand, programs that will help them prevent crimes, as opposed to those that help them react to crime. And we'll work with public housing residents to organize and eliminate drugs from their communities.

Fourth, we will implement a safe schools initiative. Every parent who puts a child on a school bus in the morning deserves a President who cares as much about that child as they do.

Our goal will be to make every school in America gun-free, drug-free, and violence-free. We will help school districts pay for security officers and metal detectors. We'll encourage the states to give schools the authority to search students' cars and lockers for drugs and guns. And we'll provide more mentoring and outreach programs to help young make responsible choices in their lives.

And, fifth, we're going to make a significant new effort to protect the personal safety of women in America. We're going to make it easier to convict rapists and increase the penalties for sex crimes. And we're going to give police and prosecutors more resources to combat violent crimes against women.

And, starting January 20, we will begin a war of deeds not empty words; and a war of substance, not of symbols - on drugs.

We will lead a national and international fight against drug abuse, and we will begin by appointing a Drug Czar who's a law enforcement professional or a drug enforcement professional -- not a political professional. The war on drugs will become a foreign policy priority. We will strengthen our drug interdiction programs and defend America against dangerous drugs with the same determination that we would defend it against a foreign adversary.

And we will get drug addicts either into treatment or

Finally, I believe strongly in the importance of setting an example, in particular in the example that a President can set for a nation.

Whether you are a bored teenager looking for a thrill on a Saturday night, a banker a broker or a top official of the United States Government, you are bound to respect the law and to live by the rule of law.

When the top officials of Federal law enforcement are continually diverted by investigations of each others agencies, by the appearance that information has been withheld to stymie the criminal process, by regulatory failures that cost the public hundreds of billions of dollars, then the time for change has come.

I believe that Americans want safer and more secure lives and communities, and that they want leaders again who care enough to give it to them.

Join me, and together lets make America the country it was meant to be.

THE END

CLINTON • GORE ON CRIME AND DRUGS

Despite all the tough talk we hear from Washington, crime is expanding dramatically in America. Today more people are victims of crime, more crime is drug related, and more people are addicted to drugs than ever before. Across the country tens of thousands of volunteers are fighting to take back their streets from criminals and drug dealers. But they need more support. We have a national problem on our hands that requires a tough national response.

It's time to get tougher on crime by getting smarter about how to stop it. Bill Clinton and Al Gore have a national crime and drug strategy that will use the powers of the Presidency to prevent and punish crime and control the abuse of drugs.

We need to put more police on the streets of our cities and more dangerous criminals behind bars. We need to fight drugs on all fronts, both to staunch international supply, and to cut domestic demand. We need to help communities that fight crime and drugs in strong and sensible ways. Bill Clinton and Al Gore will do that.

THE CLINTON/GORE PLAN

Put 100,000 new police on our streets

Keep guns out of the hands of criminals

Make our schools and neighborhoods safe from drugs and crime

Crack down on violence against women

Staunch the international supply of drugs

Cut drug addiction to cut crime

Cut demand through treatment and education programs

Launch a new anti-heroin initiative

Tackle rural drug abuse and crime

Target drugs and AIDS

Crime breeds poverty just as much as poverty breeds crime. We must not permit another generation of Americans to grow up on streets too unsafe to walk. For the last eleven years we have reduced our efforts to put police on the street when we should have intensified them.

Put more police on our streets and more criminals behind bars

- Fight crime by putting 100,000 new police officers on the streets; create a National Police Corps; and offer veterans and active military personnel a chance to become law enforcement officers.
- Invest in our police force by offering them Law Enforcement Scholarships to prepare themselves for their increasingly complex duties.
- Discipline young people on their first encounter with the judicial system through Certainty of Punishment programs such as community service and restitution. Americans must be able to rest assured that young offenders receive more than unrestricted probation and suspended sentences.
- Give young offenders a second chance in community "boot camps" which will instill discipline, treat drug abuse, boost self esteem, teach decency and respect for the law and provide education and job assistance to help them start new lives. This will open up more space in our prisons for the truly hardened criminals.
- Support a Federal death penalty for heinous crimes, and habeas corpus reforms for death penalty appeals.

Keep guns out of the hands of criminals

- Provide the leadership we need to pass the Brady Bill, which will create a waiting period for handgun purchases to keep firearms off the streets and out of the hands of criminals.
- Ban assault weapons, like the "Street Sweeper", that have no legitimate hunting or sporting purpose; limit access to multiple round clips like the one used in the tragic killings in Killeen, Texas.

A partnership to make our neighborhoods safe

- Back effective community anti crime and drug projects with increased federal assistance. A renewed government commitment to acknowledge, support and expand effective community-based prevention programs will provide federal matching funds for communities hardest hit by crime.
- Empower local communities. We will work with residents and local law enforcement to enable them to reclaim neighborhoods and public housing from crime and drug abuse; support efforts like Operation Clean Sweep in Chicago, which helps residents take back their housing from gangs and dealers.
- Support community-based policing. Across America, local law enforcement officials are stopping crimes before they happen by moving from emergency response to community-based law enforcement. By putting

A system of justice that treats a rich offender who steals millions through insider trading better than a poor criminal who steals a car sends a cynical message to America: that justice is not blind if you happen to be rich. We'll send a tough message to white collar criminals. Those at the top of the totem pole who have benefited from the opportunities our society offers have a special responsibility to uphold the law, and if they don't, they should be punished.

more officers back on the beat, cities are winning the war on crime. Local residents must be able to get to know, trust and work with their police to make their neighborhoods safe.

- Keep our streets free from drug dealing and drug related violence. Community policing will help cut the local supply of drugs on the streets.
- Invest in hard hit urban communities. Provide jobs, opportunities and hope for local people. Give residents economic alternatives to drugs and crime.

Take back our schools

- Create a Safe Schools Initiative, so that children can focus on learning again. We will increase funding so that local school officials can provide the strong security and monitoring they need to ensure a safe learning environment. Expand funding for mentoring, counseling and outreach programs through partnerships with business so kids in trouble with crime, gangs or drugs can turn to someone for help.

Get tough on white collar crime

- Work to pass tougher criminal penalties for white collar crimes - including environmental crimes - so that serious white collar criminals serve jail time.
- Plea bargaining will be limited to questions of prison time, not how much money a white collar crook gets to keep.
- Jail sentences will be served in real prisons, not high-tech summer camp.

Crack down on violence against women

- Sign the Violence Against Women Act which would provide tougher enforcement and stiffer penalties to deter domestic violence.

Lead a national and international fight against drug abuse

- Appoint a national drug expert at the Cabinet level with the power and authority to lead a comprehensive crusade against drugs.
- Make the war on drugs a foreign policy priority. Lead a global fight against illegal drug production and trafficking, working through the United Nations and other international organizations.
- Launch an immediate and thorough review of the drug interdiction program. In 1991 interdiction stopped only one kilo in every hundred being imported into the country. We must ensure existing resources are

used in the most cost-effective way in this crucial fight to keep drugs out of America.

- Work toward centralizing operational authority for the nation's drug interdiction efforts, with the purpose of cutting the duplication of effort and reducing competition.
- Anticipate and tackle emerging drug problems before they become crises through long term planning. Crack cocaine took this Administration by surprise. We cannot let the same happen with the pending heroin epidemic.
- Pursue drug dealers with aggressive enforcement of asset forfeiture laws.

Cut addiction to cut crime

- Expand treatment of alcoholics and other addicts in prison to break the revolving door of recidivism. More than half the 1.2 million offenders currently behind bars have committed drug-related crimes. And in Federal prisons less than 1% get any form of drug treatment at all. Every year offenders are turned back out onto the streets with their addictions untreated. Yet recovering from drug addictions and alcoholism significantly reduces the chance they will offend again. We have to get offenders off drugs for all our safety.
- Explore innovative ways to stop drug related crime, and keep offenders on parole and probation free from drugs, including court mandated urine testing alongside treatment programs, and drug courts like those in Miami and Phoenix.

Expand treatment

- Treat more addicts to prevent crime and save resources. Many addicts have not committed violent crimes, but we have to treat them before they do. Their dependency destroys lives, drains the economy, health and social services and supports a violent and dangerous illicit drug market. Drug abuse is costing our country \$300 billion a year. Curing addicts saves the taxpayer money and prevents crime.
- Increase the effectiveness and success rate of treatment programs by expanding aftercare. More than half of treated addicts relapse. We have to expand support including skills training and job assistance where appropriate for recovering drug addicts and alcoholics to stop them relapsing.
- Cut dropout rates by making sure addicts are directed to the treatment program which is most appropriate to their circumstances, including outpatient programs, community based programs and residential programs.
- Provide cost effective drug dependency treatment on demand for those who need it. By working in partnership with private clinics, and self help organizations, federal assistance will help communities dramatically increase their ability to offer treatment and support to everyone who needs help.
- Target new treatment at pregnant women who are turned away from many clinics. Less than one in ten pregnant addicts were treated last year; 375,000 drug exposed babies were born.
- Help kids who get hooked on drugs and alcohol through school based clinics and outreach programs.
- Review and evaluate the effectiveness of drug treatment programs and instruct states to set up mechanisms to check that the money is well spent.

Drug education and prevention

- Stop our children abusing drugs and alcohol. Work with states and local communities to bring parents, educators, students, private business, local media, law enforcement personnel and community service workers together to prevent drug use. Provide worthwhile alternative activities and interests to keep youth off the streets.
- Review and evaluate the effectiveness of different drug and alcohol education programs. Schools must be able to show parents and local officials exactly what and how much alcohol and drug education children are receiving.
- Require training in drug education, prevention and intervention for teachers and other professionals.
- Combat rising drug use. Drug education must include extensive information on the risks of heroin, of hallucinogenic drugs, and of the new drugs produced by home chemists such as "ice" and "ecstasy". Abuse of these drugs is on the upsurge.
- Prevent drugs in the work place. Encourage business to provide employee assistance programs to identify drug and alcohol dependency among workers. Drug abuse and alcohol reduce productivity and threaten the safety of others.

Target groups at high risk of getting involved in crime and drugs

- Reach out to children and young adults in high risk situations to give them valued ties and commitments and hope and opportunities for the future.
- Fully fund the Head Start Program. Head Start was described by the Eisenhower Foundation as "the best drug prevention program we have." It provides children from low-income families with confidence and commitment to learning.
- Offer non college bound students valuable training and job opportunities by creating a National Apprenticeship Program in partnership with business.
- Give school dropouts a second chance through a Youth Opportunity Corps. Teenagers will be matched with adults who care about them and will help them develop self discipline, literacy and valuable skills.

A new strategy against heroin

- Launch an anti-heroin strategy. We have to take seriously the threat of a heroin epidemic. The dangers of heroin must be a part of drug education programs, and concerted effort made to target new heroin users with AIDS awareness education, as IV drug users are high risk for HIV infection.
- Target the international supply of heroin through a coordinated international effort beginning with a Pacific Rim Drug Summit.

A new strategy for rural drug abuse and crime

- Tackle rural drug abuse and alcoholism. Illegal drug abuse is not just an inner cities problem. We will ensure that policing, treatment and drug education are available to protect rural commu-

nities from the risks of drug related crime. We will create rural drug task forces linking up local law enforcement, DEA officers, and local community groups to fight illegal drugs.

Drug abuse and AIDS

- Target AIDS education at drug abusers. Drug use is now the number one cause of infection with the AIDS virus. Approximately 32% of all adult/ adolescent AIDS cases are related to IV drug use. To stop AIDS we must stop drug abuse. We have to make everyone aware of the twin risks, and support local efforts to reduce the spread of AIDS through drug abuse.

THE RECORD

Getting tough on Crime

- Governor Clinton increased penalties for repeat offenders, drug dealers and violent crimes.
- Enforced Arkansas' capital punishment law.
- Senator Gore was a primary author of the Brady Bill which required a background check during a mandatory waiting period.
- Cosponsored legislation to provide a mandatory 5-year minimum prison sentence for anyone who uses a gun to commit a federal crime.
- Cosponsored legislation to provide a mandatory 5-year prison sentence for anyone who uses armor-piercing ammunition ("cop-killer bullets").
- Cosponsored the Career Armed Criminal Act, which would have created a mandatory minimum sentence of 15 years in a federal penitentiary for burglary.
- Voted for the Violent Crime and Law Enforcement Act which contains provisions including tougher penalties for use of a gun during violent crime and gun possession by felons, and the establishment and authorization of anti-gang programs.
- Voted for Omnibus Crime Bill of 1990 which strengthens S&L fraud enforcement, adopts and Victims of Child Abuse Act, and strengthens attacks on drug-related crime.

Creating prisons that work

- Clinton established "boots camps" which require a 105-day program of paramilitary exercise, arduous work, drug treatment and education to instill discipline in non-violent first offenders. To date, boot camp participants have a low return rate of 13.2 percent.
- Adopted new "good time" policies encouraging inmate education. Since 1983, almost 4,000 inmates have received their GED's through this program, and have had a low recidivism rate (11.2 percent).
- Kept Arkansas prison costs to the lowest per inmate and prison escape rates eight lowest in the nation.

Fighting Drugs

- Under Governor Clinton's leadership, a highly successful marijuana eradication program destroyed more than one million marijuana plants with an estimated value of more than \$1 billion between 1982 and 1991.
- Strengthen drug laws (for example, the rebuttable presumption for intent to deliver cocaine was reduced from 2 grams to 1 gram), toughened penalties for individuals convicted of selling drugs on or near school property, and increased the number of narcotics officers on the beat.
- Senator Gore cosponsored the Omnibus Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, which employed a multi-faceted approach to combatting drug abuse and added muscle to existing efforts.
- Cosponsored the National Narcotics Leadership Act, passed as part of the 100th Congress Omnibus Anti-Drug Bill, which established a Cabinet-level anti-drug official.
- Cosponsored legislation which makes robbery of a pharmacy a federal offense.
- Voted to allow the military to assist federal drug enforcement efforts.

Protecting victim's rights

- Governor Clinton fought for victims' rights: In 1977, as Attorney General, Clinton submitted two bills to provide compensation to crime victims. As Governor, Clinton passed laws to guarantee the right of victims and to compensate victims and their families. The National Organization for Victim Assistance has recognized Arkansas' program as one of the most progressive in the country.
- Senator Gore has consistently supported legislation to provide assistance to states in setting up and maintaining victim compensation programs.
- Introduced and helped enact the campus Crime Statistics Act to help increase safety and awareness on college campuses.

CLINTON • GORE ON CRIME AND DRUGS

Despite all the tough talk we hear from Washington, crime is expanding dramatically in America. Today more people are victims of crime, more crime is drug related, and more people are addicted to drugs than ever before. Across the country tens of thousands of volunteers are fighting to take back their streets from criminals and drug dealers. But they need more support. We have a national problem on our hands that requires a tough national response.

It's time to get tougher on crime by getting smarter about how to stop it. Bill Clinton and Al Gore have a national crime and drug strategy that will use the powers of the Presidency to prevent and punish crime and control the abuse of drugs.

We need to put more police on the streets of our cities and more dangerous criminals behind bars. We need to fight drugs on all fronts, both to staunch international supply, and to cut domestic demand. We need to help communities that fight crime and drugs in strong and sensible ways. Bill Clinton and Al Gore will do that.

THE CLINTON/GORE PLAN

Put 100,000 new police on our streets

Keep guns out of the hands of criminals

Make our schools and neighborhoods safe from drugs and crime

Crack down on violence against women

Staunch the international supply of drugs

Cut drug addiction to cut crime

Cut demand through treatment and education programs

Launch a new anti-heroin initiative

Tackle rural drug abuse and crime

Target drugs and AIDS

Crime breeds poverty just as much as poverty breeds crime. We must not permit another generation of Americans to grow up on streets too unsafe to walk. For the last eleven years we have reduced our efforts to put police on the street when we should have intensified them.

Put more police on our streets and more criminals behind bars

- Fight crime by putting 100,000 new police officers on the streets; create a National Police Corps; and offer veterans and active military personnel a chance to become law enforcement officers.
- Invest in our police force by offering them Law Enforcement Scholarships to prepare themselves for their increasingly complex duties.
- Discipline young people on their first encounter with the judicial system through Certainty of Punishment programs such as community service and restitution. Americans must be able to rest assured that young offenders receive more than unrestricted probation and suspended sentences.
- Give young offenders a second chance in community "boot camps" which will instill discipline, treat drug abuse, boost self esteem, teach decency and respect for the law and provide education and job assistance to help them start new lives. This will open up more space in our prisons for the truly hardened criminals.
- Support a Federal death penalty for heinous crimes, and habeas corpus reforms for death penalty appeals.

Keep guns out of the hands of criminals

- Provide the leadership we need to pass the Brady Bill, which will create a waiting period for handgun purchases to keep firearms off the streets and out of the hands of criminals.
- Ban assault weapons, like the "Street Sweeper", that have no legitimate hunting or sporting purpose; limit access to multiple round clips like the one used in the tragic killings in Killeen, Texas.

A partnership to make our neighborhoods safe

- Back effective community anti crime and drug projects with increased federal assistance. A renewed government commitment to acknowledge, support and expand effective community-based prevention programs will provide federal matching funds for communities hardest hit by crime.
- Empower local communities. We will work with residents and local law enforcement to enable them to reclaim neighborhoods and public housing from crime and drug abuse; support efforts like Operation Clean Sweep in Chicago, which helps residents take back their housing from gangs and dealers.
- Support community-based policing. Across America, local law enforcement officials are stopping crimes before they happen by moving from emergency response to community-based law enforcement. By putting

A system of justice that treats a rich offender who steals millions through insider trading better than a poor criminal who steals a car sends a cynical message to America: that justice is not blind if you happen to be rich. We'll send a tough message to white collar criminals. Those at the top of the totem pole who have benefited from the opportunities our society offers have a special responsibility to uphold the law, and if they don't, they should be punished.

more officers back on the beat, cities are winning the war on crime. Local residents must be able to get to know, trust and work with their police to make their neighborhoods safe.

- Keep our streets free from drug dealing and drug related violence. Community policing will help cut the local supply of drugs on the streets.
- Invest in hard hit urban communities. Provide jobs, opportunities and hope for local people. Give residents economic alternatives to drugs and crime.

Take back our schools

- Create a Safe Schools Initiative, so that children can focus on learning again. We will increase funding so that local school officials can provide the strong security and monitoring they need to ensure a safe learning environment. Expand funding for mentoring, counseling and outreach programs through partnerships with business so kids in trouble with crime, gangs or drugs can turn to someone for help.

Get tough on white collar crime

- Work to pass tougher criminal penalties for white collar crimes - including environmental crimes - so that serious white collar criminals serve jail time.
- Plea bargaining will be limited to questions of prison time, not how much money a white collar crook gets to keep.
- Jail sentences will be served in real prisons, not high-tech summer camp.

Crack down on violence against women

- Sign the Violence Against Women Act which would provide tougher enforcement and stiffer penalties to deter domestic violence.

Lead a national and international fight against drug abuse

- Appoint a national drug expert at the Cabinet level with the power and authority to lead a comprehensive crusade against drugs.
- Make the war on drugs a foreign policy priority. Lead a global fight against illegal drug production and trafficking, working through the United Nations and other international organizations.
- Launch an immediate and thorough review of the drug interdiction program. In 1991 interdiction stopped only one kilo in every hundred being imported into the country. We must ensure existing resources are

used in the most cost-effective way in this crucial fight to keep drugs out of America.

- Work toward centralizing operational authority for the nation's drug interdiction efforts, with the purpose of cutting the duplication of effort and reducing competition.
- Anticipate and tackle emerging drug problems before they become crises through long term planning. Crack cocaine took this Administration by surprise. We cannot let the same happen with the pending heroin epidemic.
- Pursue drug dealers with aggressive enforcement of asset forfeiture laws.

Cut addiction to cut crime

- Expand treatment of alcoholics and other addicts in prison to break the revolving door of recidivism. More than half the 1.2 million offenders currently behind bars have committed drug-related crimes. And in Federal prisons less than 1% get any form of drug treatment at all. Every year offenders are turned back out onto the streets with their addictions untreated. Yet recovering from drug addictions and alcoholism significantly reduces the chance they will offend again. We have to get offenders off drugs for all our safety.
- Explore innovative ways to stop drug related crime, and keep offenders on parole and probation free from drugs, including court mandated urine testing alongside treatment programs, and drug courts like those in Miami and Phoenix.

Expand treatment

- Treat more addicts to prevent crime and save resources. Many addicts have not committed violent crimes, but we have to treat them before they do. Their dependency destroys lives, drains the economy, health and social services and supports a violent and dangerous illicit drug market. Drug abuse is costing our country \$300 billion a year. Curing addicts saves the taxpayer money and prevents crime.
- Increase the effectiveness and success rate of treatment programs by expanding aftercare. More than half of treated addicts relapse. We have to expand support including skills training and job assistance where appropriate for recovering drug addicts and alcoholics to stop them relapsing.
- Cut dropout rates by making sure addicts are directed to the treatment program which is most appropriate to their circumstances, including outpatient programs, community based programs and residential programs.
- Provide cost effective drug dependency treatment on demand for those who need it. By working in partnership with private clinics, and self help organizations, federal assistance will help communities dramatically increase their ability to offer treatment and support to everyone who needs help.
- Target new treatment at pregnant women who are turned away from many clinics. Less than one in ten pregnant addicts were treated last year; 375,000 drug exposed babies were born.
- Help kids who get hooked on drugs and alcohol through school based clinics and outreach programs.
- Review and evaluate the effectiveness of drug treatment programs and instruct states to set up mechanisms to check that the money is well spent.

Drug education and prevention

- Stop our children abusing drugs and alcohol. Work with states and local communities to bring parents, educators, students, private business, local media, law enforcement personnel and community service workers together to prevent drug use. Provide worthwhile alternative activities and interests to keep youth off the streets.
- Review and evaluate the effectiveness of different drug and alcohol education programs. Schools must be able to show parents and local officials exactly what and how much alcohol and drug education children are receiving.
- Require training in drug education, prevention and intervention for teachers and other professionals.
- Combat rising drug use. Drug education must include extensive information on the risks of heroin, of hallucinogenic drugs, and of the new drugs produced by home chemists such as "ice" and "ecstasy". Abuse of these drugs is on the upsurge.
- Prevent drugs in the work place. Encourage business to provide employee assistance programs to identify drug and alcohol dependency among workers. Drug abuse and alcohol reduce productivity and threaten the safety of others.

Target groups at high risk of getting involved in crime and drugs

- Reach out to children and young adults in high risk situations to give them valued ties and commitments and hope and opportunities for the future.
- Fully fund the Head Start Program. Head Start was described by the Eisenhower Foundation as "the best drug prevention program we have." It provides children from low-income families with confidence and commitment to learning.
- Offer non college bound students valuable training and job opportunities by creating a National Apprenticeship Program in partnership with business.
- Give school dropouts a second chance through a Youth Opportunity Corps. Teenagers will be matched with adults who care about them and will help them develop self discipline, literacy and valuable skills.

A new strategy against heroin

- Launch an anti-heroin strategy. We have to take seriously the threat of a heroin epidemic. The dangers of heroin must be a part of drug education programs, and concerted effort made to target new heroin users with AIDS awareness education, as IV drug users are high risk for HIV infection.
- Target the international supply of heroin through a coordinated international effort beginning with a Pacific Rim Drug Summit.

A new strategy for rural drug abuse and crime

- Tackle rural drug abuse and alcoholism. Illegal drug abuse is not just an inner cities problem. We will ensure that policing, treatment and drug education are available to protect rural commu-

nities from the risks of drug related crime. We will create rural drug task forces linking up local law enforcement, DEA officers, and local community groups to fight illegal drugs.

Drug abuse and AIDS

- Target AIDS education at drug abusers. Drug use is now the number one cause of infection with the AIDS virus. Approximately 32% of all adult/ adolescent AIDS cases are related to IV drug use. To stop AIDS we must stop drug abuse. We have to make everyone aware of the twin risks, and support local efforts to reduce the spread of AIDS through drug abuse.

THE RECORD

Getting tough on Crime

- Governor Clinton increased penalties for repeat offenders, drug dealers and violent crimes.
- Enforced Arkansas' capital punishment law.
- Senator Gore was a primary author of the Brady Bill which required a background check during a mandatory waiting period.
- Cosponsored legislation to provide a mandatory 5-year minimum prison sentence for anyone who uses a gun to commit a federal crime.
- Cosponsored legislation to provide a mandatory 5-year prison sentence for anyone who uses armor-piercing ammunition ("cop-killer bullets").
- Cosponsored the Career Armed Criminal Act, which would have created a mandatory minimum sentence of 15 years in a federal penitentiary for burglary.
- Voted for the Violent Crime and Law Enforcement Act which contains provisions including tougher penalties for use of a gun during violent crime and gun possession by felons, and the establishment and authorization of anti-gang programs.
- Voted for Omnibus Crime Bill of 1990 which strengthens S&L fraud enforcement, adopts and Victims of Child Abuse Act, and strengthens attacks on drug-related crime.

Creating prisons that work

- Clinton established "boots camps" which require a 105-day program of paramilitary exercise, arduous work, drug treatment and education to instill discipline in non-violent first offenders. To date, boot camp participants have a low return rate of 13.2 percent.
- Adopted new "good time" policies encouraging inmate education. Since 1983, almost 4,000 inmates have received their GED's through this program, and have had a low recidivism rate (11.2 percent).
- Kept Arkansas prison costs to the lowest per inmate and prison escape rates eight lowest in the nation.

Fighting Drugs

- Under Governor Clinton's leadership, a highly successful marijuana eradication program destroyed more than one million marijuana plants with an estimated value of more than \$1 billion between 1982 and 1991.
- Strengthen drug laws (for example, the rebuttable presumption for intent to deliver cocaine was reduced from 2 grams to 1 gram), toughened penalties for individuals convicted of selling drugs on or near school property, and increased the number of narcotics officers on the beat.
- Senator Gore cosponsored the Omnibus Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, which employed a multi-faceted approach to combatting drug abuse and added muscle to existing efforts.
- Cosponsored the National Narcotics Leadership Act, passed as part of the 100th Congress Omnibus Anti-Drug Bill, which established a Cabinet-level anti-drug official.
- Cosponsored legislation which makes robbery of a pharmacy a federal offense.
- Voted to allow the military to assist federal drug enforcement efforts.

Protecting victim's rights

- Governor Clinton fought for victims' rights: In 1977, as Attorney General, Clinton submitted two bills to provide compensation to crime victims. As Governor, Clinton passed laws to guarantee the right of victims and to compensate victims and their families. The National Organization for Victim Assistance has recognized Arkansas' program as one of the most progressive in the country.
- Senator Gore has consistently supported legislation to provide assistance to states in setting up and maintaining victim compensation programs.
- Introduced and helped enact the campus Crime Statistics Act to help increase safety and awareness on college campuses.

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

October 22, 1993

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN NAFTA MEETING WITH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The Cabinet Room

9:17 A.M. EDT

Q What do you think about sending the National Guard, or allowing the National Guard to patrol the city here?

THE PRESIDENT: I think it should be reviewed. I've given a lot of thought to it, and I've asked our Legal Counsel to get with the Justice Department and look into the legality of it and what the legal hurdles are, and also what the practical problems are.

Keep in mind, Guardsmen are not full-time military people; they do weekend duty, by and large. And except in the summertime, again by and large, they're not on full-time duty. So if you call out the Guard in other times in any substantial numbers, you can be disrupting the normal work lives of a lot of people.

But I'm very sympathetic with the problems that the Mayor has and that Washington has. There are 1,500 shooting here a year now. It's one reason -- I certainly hope that we can pass this crime bill in a hurry. If we do, we'll have another 50,000 police officers on the street, and it will reduce the pressure for National Guard officers.

But I will review it, and I think it deserves to be reviewed. It obviously is not a precedent that can easily be confined just to Washington, D.C. So there are a lots of questions that have to be thought through here. But I want to wait until she sends me the letter and then review the specific proposal.

I hope that we can use this moment to emphasize the need to move on the Brady bill, the crime bill, the question of whether minors should be restricted in the ownership of handguns, the questions of the assault weapons. I think all of these things are part of a rising tide of anger and fear and frustration on the part of the American people that we need to respond to.

Copyright 1993 Federal Information Systems Corporation
Federal News Service

NOVEMBER 1, 1993, MONDAY

SECTION: WHITE HOUSE BRIEFING

LENGTH: 5325 words

HEADLINE: U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FEDERATION
NATIONAL SATELLITE TOWN HALL MEETING
TOPIC: NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT (NAFTA)
PARTICIPANT: PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON
WASHINGTON, DC

BODY:

... us in the Mexican market over our competitors in Japan and Europe and because of the leverage that will then give us to get a worldwide trade agreement that the world desperately needs to restore global growth. Without that, we're not going to be able to sell our products, we're not going to be able to create more jobs, we're not going to be able to see our workers' incomes go up. With it, we have the prospect of having several years now of sustained, vigorous economic growth because we are getting control of our economic house, we are putting things in order, we are getting our priorities straightened out in this country, we are focusing on investment and on training. We have to have the markets. Now, let me just say one final thing about this. I think if there were a secret vote in the Congress today, we would win. Now, that's a big issue, winning the secret ballot. I say that not to criticize anyone or to put anyone down, but to recognize that the pressures against NAFTA are enormous, but they reflect, as I have said many times in many places, the accumulated frustrations and grievances and insecurities people bring to this day in American history. More and more people are worried about losing their jobs. More and more people know if they lose their jobs, they won't get it back. That's true. That's true. We have an unemployment system premised on a set of conditions that no longer exist. You know, you lose your job and then the recession's over and your old company hires you back. That only happens about one in five times now.

So there is all this uncertainty out there in America today. I understand that, and our administration has done what we could to try to alleviate the insecurities of the American working families. The family leave law was designed to say to people, you can be a good worker and a good parent. The attempt to control health care costs and still provide health care for everyone is an attempt to say, yes, you may lose your job, but at least your family can be taken care of. The attempt that the Congress is making now on a bipartisan basis to pass a new crime bill is a way of saying, we know you have to feel safer on your streets. If you work hard and play by the rules, you shouldn't worry about having your

children shot going to and from school. But with all of this, we cannot turn away from the global economy that is engulfing us. And what I want to ask all of you to do, every one of you listening to me today, is to think about what you can do between now and November the 17th, either directly by contacting a member of Congress, or indirectly by getting employees or friends or others to contact members of Congress, to say we know America can compete and win. We are not going to turn tail and run. We have not given up on America. The Mexican economy may have 90 million people, but today it is the size of California from Los Angeles to the Mexican border. The idea that America is just going to shrivel up if we adopt this trade agreement is ridiculous. This trade agreement is a door that opens all of Latin America to us. It is a lever that will open a broader trading system in the world to us, and we cannot run away. We've got to compete and win. You have to be, in other words, the engines of confidence in our future. And employees, people who work with you who understand this, can have a huge impact on turning what is now only a secret ballot victory on NAFTA into a public victory on November 17th. This is a difficult time for America and it's hard for people to have confidence when they've been battered and pushed around and worried. But we cannot turn away from the future that is there before us. I honestly believe the next 20 years could be the best 20 years this country ever had if we have the courage and the vision to take advantage of the end of the Cold War, the continued efforts to reduce nuclear arms, the fact that economic competition may expand opportunity for everyone if we do it right. But this issue -- when we started, NAFTA had a significance for those who were fighting against it, all out of proportion, all out of proportion to the impact it could have. You saw on that film, there are several unions, many major unions in this country who are going to ...

Copyright 1993 Federal Information Systems Corporation
Federal News Service

THE BUSH RECORD: THE RAP SHEET ON CRIME

Record crime rates

- Americans are now more likely to become victims of violent crime than ever before. Between 1990 and 1991, the violent crime rate increased by 4 percent, to 758 per 100,000, an all-time high.

- The murder rate increased by 4 percent. There were 24,703 reported murders in 1991, an all-time high. An American was murdered every 21 minutes.
- The forcible rape rate increased by 3 percent to an all-time high. In 1991, a woman was raped every 5 minutes.
- The robbery rate increased by 6 percent to an all-time high.
- The aggravated assault rate increased by 2 percent to an all-time high. There were 1.1 million aggravated assaults in 1991. [Uniform Crime Index, FBI]

- On George Bush's watch, crime rates have risen dramatically. Between 1988 and 1991:
 - The violent crime rate was up 19 percent.
 - The murder rate was up 17 percent.
 - The forcible rape rate was up 13 percent.
 - The robbery rate was up 23 percent.
 - The aggravated assault rate was up 17 percent. [Uniform Crime Index, FBI]

Cuts on the frontlines

- In his fiscal year 1992 budget, Bush proposed cutting local law enforcement aid by \$100 million -- 20 percent [NYT, 3/14/91]. For fiscal year, 1993, he proposed \$117 million in cuts -- 16.5 percent.
- Bush now wants to cut \$64 million earmarked to fight violence in schools -- 89 percent of the total funds allocated. (National Education Association, 1/92)
- Between 1990 and 1991, while the number of violent crimes reached an all-time high, the number of police officers on America's streets did not change. There continued to be 2.2 police officers per 100,000 inhabitants. [Uniform Crime Index, FBI]

Guns for Everybody

- Bush has refused to sign the Brady Bill, which will give police a waiting period to determine whether gun buyers have criminal histories. Even Ronald Reagan favors the bill.
- While guns remain widely available, they continue to play an overwhelming role in violent crime:
 - Firearms are used in 70% of all murders.
 - Firearms are used in 31% of murders, robberies, and aggravated assaults.
 - Firearms are used in 40% of robberies, up 17% in one year. (Uniform Crime Statistics, FBI)
- Bush's history of flip-flops on gun control is particularly dazzling. In 1968 he voted for the gun control act (HR 17735). In 1980 he opposed restrictions on buying and owning firearms (NYT, 2/19/80). In 1988, even after a schoolyard massacre, he stood firm and opposed a ban on imports of AK-47 assault weapons (WP, 2/17/89). Finally in 1990 he banned the import of assault rifles (WP, 1/25/90).

Drug war as farce

- President Bush's drug war has failed miserably:
 - By January 1992, more Americans than ever before were using cocaine or heroin every week -- more than 3 million people, or 1 in 80 Americans.
 - In 1991, 1.1 million Americans used crack cocaine for the first time -- a 40% increase from 1990.
 - President Bush has claimed one real victory since he developed his "Drug Strategy" -- the reduction in casual drug use. In fact, casual drug use was declining more rapidly before Bush released his drug strategy than since then. (NYT, 11/3/91; Senate Judiciary Committee and International Narcotics Control Caucus, 1/92)
- There are fewer agents of the Drug Enforcement Administration than there are members of the United States Army Military Band. (John Lawn, DEA Director, on the MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour, 3/22/90)
- As Vice President, Bush acted as chief of the National Narcotics Border Interdiction System -- the special executive board which supervises anti-drug efforts. Between 1983 and 1988, the amount of drugs coming into the country tripled. (Newsday, 9/6/89; Boston Globe, 8/13/89)
- Bush tried to reduce anti-drug funding to the states by 25 percent (National Governors' Association, 1989).

Kinder and Gentler to White Collar Criminals

- In 1990, White House Chief Counsel C. Boyden Gray asked the Justice Department to soften white collar crime sentencing guidelines (WP, 6/18/90)
- By January, the Bush Administration had collected \$365,000 of the \$83.6 million in court-ordered S&L fines-- less than one-half of one percent (GAO, 2/1/92).

BILL CLINTON'S NATIONAL CRIME STRATEGY

- Put 100,000 new police officers on the streets. Bill Clinton will create a National Police Corps and offer unemployed veterans and active military personnel a chance to become law enforcement officers at home.
- Give young offenders a second chance by supporting the creation of "boot camps" for non-violent, first-time offenders. These shock incarceration programs require rigorous exercise and arduous work to instill discipline, boost self-esteem, and teach decency and respect for the law.
- Make communities hit hardest by crime eligible for federal matching funds to assist in the war on crime when they create a comprehensive crime control plan. Bill Clinton would aid cities which adopt proven measures like community-based policing, drug-treatment on demand, and drug education.
- Provide the leadership we need to pass the Brady Bill, and sign it.
- Ban weapons like the so-called "Street Sweeper" that have no legitimate hunting purpose; limit access to multiple-round clips like the one used in the tragic killings in Killeen, Texas.
- Support the efforts of public housing residents to organize and eliminate drugs and weapons from public housing.
- Implement a Safe Schools Initiative, so that children can focus on learning again. Bill Clinton will increase funding to pay for metal detectors and security personnel; encourage states to grant school officials greater authority to conduct locker and automobile searches; and expand funding for mentoring, counseling, and outreach programs.
- Fight for tougher criminal penalties for white collar crimes -- including environmental crimes -- so that serious white collar criminals serve jail time.
- Limit plea bargaining to questions of prison time, not how much money a white collar crook gets to keep.

THE CLINTON RECORD IN ARKANSAS

- Vetoed a bill sponsored by the National Rifle Association, the only Southern governor ever to do so. The legislation would have prevented cities and counties from enacting gun control. Clinton vetoed it twice -- in 1989 and 1991.
- Strengthened drug laws (for example, reduced the rebuttable presumption for intent to deliver cocaine from 2 grams to 1 gram), toughened penalties for individuals convicted of selling drugs on or near school property, and increased the number of narcotics officers on the beat.
- Established "boot camps," which require 105-days of paramilitary exercise, arduous work, drug treatment and education to instill discipline in non-violent first offenders. Boot camp participants have a low recidivism rate of 13.2 percent.
- Supports the death penalty and has signed execution orders for cop-killers and multiple-murderers.
- Fought for victims' rights: In 1977, as Attorney General, Clinton submitted two bills to provide compensation to crime victims. As Governor, Clinton passed laws which guarantee

the right of victims to be present in the courtroom in all phases of the judicial process. Because of Clinton a Victim/Witness Coordinator assists victims and their families in negotiating the criminal justice system, and a Victim Reparations Act compensates victims and their families. The National Organization for Victim Assistance has recognized Arkansas' program as one of the best in the country.

- Adopted new "good time" policies encouraging inmate education. Since 1983, almost 4,000 inmates have received their GEDs through the program, and they have had a low recidivism rate of 11.2 percent.

THE BUSH RECORD: THE RAP SHEET ON CRIME

Record crime rates

- Americans are now more likely to be killed, raped, or robbed than ever before. The violent crime rate is up 22.6% under Republicans -- 14.8% under Bush alone.
 - The aggravated assault rate is up 14.6% under Bush and 41.8% under Republicans.
 - The murder rate is up 11.9% under Bush and 7.8% under Republicans.
 - The forcible rape rate is up 9.6% under Bush and 12.0% under Republicans.
 - The robbery rate is up 16.3% under Bush and 2.4% under Republicans. [Uniform Crime Index, FBI]

Cuts on the frontlines

- Bush proposed cutting local law enforcement aid by \$100 million -- 20% -- in his fiscal year 1992 budget. [NYT, 3/14/91]
- Bush now wants to cut \$64 million earmarked to fight violence in schools -- 89 percent of the total funds allocated. (National Education Association, 1/92)

Drug war as farce

- President Bush's drug war has failed miserably:
 - By January 1992, more Americans than ever before were using cocaine or heroin every week -- more than 3 million people, or 1 in 80 Americans.
 - In 1991, 1.1 million Americans used crack cocaine for the first time -- a 40% increase from 1990.
 - President Bush has claimed one real victory since he developed his "Drug Strategy" -- the reduction in casual drug use. In fact, casual drug use was declining more rapidly before Bush released his drug strategy than since then. (NYT, 11/3/91; Senate Judiciary Committee and International Narcotics Control Caucus, 1/92)
- There are fewer agents of the Drug Enforcement Administration than there are members of the United States Army Military Band. (John Lawn, DEA Director, on the MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour, 3/22/90)
- As Vice President, Bush acted as chief of the National Narcotics Border Interdiction System -- the special executive board which supervises anti-drug efforts. Between 1983 and 1988, the amount of drugs coming into the country tripled. (Newsday, 9/6/89; Boston Globe, 8/13/89)
- Bush tried to reduce anti-drug funding to the states by 25 percent (National Governors' Association, 1989).

Guns for Everybody

- Bush has refused to sign the Brady Bill, which will give police a waiting period to determine whether gun buyers have criminal histories. Even Ronald Reagan favors the bill.
- Bush's history of flip-flops on gun control is particularly dazzling. In 1968 he voted for the gun control act (HR 17735). In 1980 he opposed restrictions on buying and owning firearms (NYT, 2/19/80). In 1988, even after a schoolyard massacre, he stood firm and opposed a ban on imports of AK-47 assault weapons (WP, 2/17/89). Finally in 1990 he banned the import of assault rifles (WP, 1/25/90).

Kinder and Gentler to White Collar Criminals

- In 1990, White House Chief Counsel C. Boyden Gray asked the Justice Department to soften white collar crime sentencing guidelines (WP, 6/18/90)
- As of January, the Bush Administration had collected \$365,000 of the \$83.6 million in court-ordered S&L fines-- less than one-half of one percent (GAO, 2/1/92).

BILL CLINTON'S NATIONAL CRIME STRATEGY

- Put 100,000 new police officers on the streets. Bill Clinton will create a National Police Corps and offer unemployed veterans and active military personnel a chance to become law enforcement officers at home.
- Give young offenders a second chance by supporting the creation of "boot camps" for non-violent, first-time offenders. These shock incarceration programs require rigorous exercise and arduous work to instill discipline, boost self-esteem, and teach decency and respect for the law.
- Make communities hit hardest by crime eligible for federal matching funds to assist in the war on crime when they create a comprehensive crime control plan. Bill Clinton would aid cities which adopt proven measures like community-based policing, drug-treatment on demand, and drug education.
- Provide the leadership we need to pass the Brady Bill, and sign it.
- Ban weapons like the so-called "Street Sweeper" that have no legitimate hunting purpose; limit access to multiple-round clips like the one used in the tragic killings in Killeen, Texas.
- Support the efforts of public housing residents to organize and eliminate drugs and weapons from public housing.
- Implement a Safe Schools Initiative, so that children can focus on learning again. Bill Clinton will increase funding to pay for metal detectors and security personnel; encourage states to grant school officials greater authority to conduct locker and automobile searches; and expand funding for mentoring, counseling, and outreach programs.
- Fight for tougher criminal penalties for white collar crimes -- including environmental crimes -- so that serious white collar criminals serve jail time.
- Limit plea bargaining to questions of prison time, not how much money a white collar crook gets to keep.

THE CLINTON RECORD IN ARKANSAS

- Vetoed a bill sponsored by the National Rifle Association, the only Southern governor ever to do so. The legislation would have prevented cities and counties from enacting gun control. Clinton vetoed it twice -- in 1989 and 1991.
- Strengthened drug laws (for example, reduced the rebuttable presumption for intent to deliver cocaine from 2 grams to 1 gram), toughened penalties for individuals convicted of selling drugs on or near school property, and increased the number of narcotics officers on the beat.
- Established "boot camps," which require 105-days of paramilitary exercise, arduous work, drug treatment and education to instill discipline in non-violent first offenders. Boot camp participants have a low recidivism rate of 13.2 percent.
- Supports the death penalty and has signed execution orders for cop-killers and multiple-murderers.
- Fought for victims' rights: In 1977, as Attorney General, Clinton submitted two bills to provide compensation to crime victims. As Governor, Clinton passed laws which guarantee the right of victims to be present in the courtroom in all phases of the judicial process. Because of Clinton a Victim/Witness Coordinator assists victims and their families in negotiating the criminal justice system, and a Victim Reparations Act compensates victims and their families. The National Organization for Victim Assistance has recognized Arkansas' program as one of the best in the country.
- Adopted new "good time" policies encouraging inmate education. Since 1983, almost 4,000 inmates have received their GEDs through the program, and they have had a low recidivism rate of 11.2 percent.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
OCTOBER 17, 1992

CONTACT: Bob Boorstin
(501) 399-3900

SARAH BRADY, COALITION OF PROSECUTORS ENDORSE CLINTON/GORE

Handgun control advocate Sarah Brady joined a majority of the nation's Attorneys General and more than 200 other prosecutors in endorsing Governor Bill Clinton and Senator Al Gore today.

"It is clear that only one candidate has the courage to stand up for the Brady Bill," said Sarah Brady, wife of former Reagan Press Secretary Jim Brady and a lifelong Republican. "That candidate is Bill Clinton. Sad to say, the leader of my own party will not do what it takes. Bill Clinton is a smart, tough new Democrat. He will."

Governor Clinton thanked Sarah Brady. "I am honored that today Sarah Brady has endorsed me, and joined us for this great event. We as a nation are in her debt, for the cause she has championed is the right cause."

Speaking on behalf of the 32 State Attorneys General endorsing Clinton, Michigan Attorney General Frank Kelley said, "We all know why we're here. We are tired of a President who uses law enforcement officials as props instead of partners. And we see that Bill Clinton and Al Gore offer tough, innovative solutions -- and that they will put them into action, not just break their promises."

During his address, Clinton outlined a six-point program to fight crime:

- Put 100,000 new police officers on the streets.
- Sign the Brady Bill.
- Work directly with hard-hit communities, supporting proven anti-crime measures such as community policing, drug education, and drug treatment by demand.
- Implement a Safe Schools Initiative.
- Toughen measures to stop violence against women
- Fight a real war on drugs -- strengthening interdiction and expanding drug treatment and education.

"It is unacceptable that last year was the most violent and bloody in our history, but it was," Clinton said. "As President, I will insist the government live up to its responsibility to protect people."

Cathy Gould, whose husband was a Florence, South Carolina police officer murdered with a handgun, also spoke. Holding a picture of her husband Rick with then Vice President Bush, Gould said, "After all his kind words, we thought George Bush was on our side. We were terribly wrong."

More than 30 former federal prosecutors -- including former U.S. Attorneys General Nicholas Katzenbach (Kennedy and Johnson) and Benjamin Civiletti (Carter) -- also endorsed Governor Clinton today.

Today's event was the latest in an unprecedented series of law enforcement endorsements of Governor Clinton and Senator Gore. Organizations already endorsing the ticket include the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), International Brotherhood of Police Officers (IBPO), International Union of Police Associations (IUPA), and Combined Law Enforcement Associations of Texas (CLEAT).

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
AUGUST 20, 1992**

**CONTACT: DEE DEE MYERS
(501)-399-3840**

**CLINTON CALLS FOR SAFER STREETS IN AMERICA; RECEIVES
ENDORSEMENT OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POLICE ORGANIZATIONS**

Oakland, MI -- Governor Bill Clinton received the endorsement of the 135,000 member National Association of Police Organizations today in Oakland, Michigan.

Clinton called for passage of the Brady Bill and a new commitment by the federal government to guarantee the safety of the nation's streets and schools.

"While the people who suffer most are those who can't afford their own security guards and their own private systems, the American people have heard nothing but rhetoric from this administration for the last twelve years. We must do better," said Clinton.

Robert Scully, President of NAPO, said in his introduction of Clinton, "I am here today because America needs new leadership and NAPO believes that Bill Clinton and Al Gore represent the kind of change America needs. Until the economy gets going again, we won't be able to treat our own families right, and we won't be able to protect American families like we should. Only Bill Clinton has a real plan for America's future."

While the violent crime rate is up 14.8% under Bush-Quayle, the administration proposed cutting local law enforcement aid by \$100 million. And while Bush refuses to sign the Brady Bill, the nation's murder rate has skyrocketed 11.9% over the last four years.

"Al Gore and I will make our nation's streets safe again. We're going to take the servicemen and women who won the Cold War and give them a chance to win wars hear at home," said Clinton. "We've got a plan to put another hundred thousand police officers on the street, keeping our neighborhoods safe by community policing."

The Clinton-Gore crime strategy calls for a National Police Corps to put a 100,000 new police officers on the streets, creation of "boot camps" for non-violent, first time offenders, and passage a Safe Schools Initiative to make the nation's schools a safe and positive learning environment.

"I want tomorrow to be better than today, I want America to be strong, free and safe. Al

Gore and I have a plan that puts people first and will make America safe again," said Clinton.

~~-30-30-30-~~

**For Immediate Release:
LaVelle
September 30, 1992
3840**

**Contact: Avis
(501)-399-
3840**

George Bush: Get Serious About Crime

Today, on Good Morning America, President Bush cynically dismissed the recent National Association of Police Organizations' endorsement of Bill Clinton and Al Gore, saying NAPO was just another "liberal group who had endorsed Michael Dukakis."

George Bush should get his facts straight.

NAPO did not endorse Dukakis in 1988-- they were neutral. In fact, NAPO endorsed Ronald Reagan in both 1980 and 1984.

It's not surprising that George Bush dismisses the courage and dedication of the officers NAPO - he has been dismissing America's crime problems for the last twelve years.

If George Bush thought NAPO was just another liberal group, then why did the Bush Campaign care enough to send campaign aides to the NAPO convention for the entire week they were meeting attempting to sway the NAPO endorsement.

If George Bush thought NAPO was just another liberal group, than why did Vice President Dan Quayle lobby Bob Scully, President of NAPO, and other board members prior to the endorsement vote. Apparently, the Bush administration thought NAPO's endorsement was worth a high-

level personal appeal.

George Bush dismisses NAPO, dismisses funding for fighting crime, and dismisses the Brady Bill. It's time the American people dismiss George Bush.

-30-30-30-

**VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
MARCH 30, 1993**

Congress is moving our plan along in near record time because the American people, who chose change in November, prevailed upon their elected representatives to vote for change in march.

We've started to shift priorities back to our families, our communities, and our businesses, and through them, to build a new prosperity based on the values that have always been the source of America's strength.

And we have done something else that is very important.

We are working very hard to improve the way the federal government works -- to make it more responsive, effective, and sensitive to the real concerns of the american people -- and to improve our working relationship with every level of government that serves our communities.

And traditionally there is no more important area of Federal-State partnership than law enforcement, the partnership we all rely on to punish and prevent crime, to ensure our streets are safe and our families secure.

The American people deserve leaders who will do everything possible to protect them. And I believe you and other law enforcement officials can do much more if given adequate resources and greater cooperation.

That is why I am pleased that Congress has passed our budget, which makes specific new investments to fight crime.

The American people deserve to feel safe and secure in their neighborhoods and in their homes. They want to know that their children are safe. And they want assurances that we are on their side, working to protect them and their families.

We know that crime is linked to a deteriorating economy and to pressures on families and to shifting values. We know, regrettably, that there will always be some violence in human nature and some in our country.

But crime in America has reached unacceptably high levels. There is too much violence, too many handguns, too many innocent victims of crime.

At these moments we have to ask ourselves if we've done all we can.

We must make the people of this country safer and make our policies saner and re-create a sense of security, by supporting law enforcement, and by doing things we know will work. This is the essence of our program and of our commitment to a truly genuine anti-crime partnership.

We were honored last year when Sarah Brady, whose eloquence and courage have inspired so many, stood with us. Today is the twelfth anniversary of the terrible day President Reagan and Jim Brady were shot. Since then she has worked tirelessly to remind us how desperately we need a system that keeps handguns out of the hands of criminals and the mentally unstable.

Our budget contains the new funds you need to conduct criminal background checks quickly and accurately. I am pleased to report that when the brady bill becomes law -- and it will -- you will have the funds you need to make it work.

The same philosophy -- that it's time we took the side of people in law enforcement again -- is reflected throughout our plan.

I have seen the crime rate drop in New York City and in philadelphia and in houston after community policing began, and after more police were added to the beat. We need more police on the street, getting to know the community and the people who live and work there, preventing crimes as well as expediting the handling of criminal cases.

Our plan will give you the resources to put 100,000 new police officers on the street.

We expand community policing and provide matching grants for the salaries of new officers. We establish a national police corps, giving scholarships to students who are trained as police officers and who agree to serve their communities as police officers for four years.

One of the reasons we must have more police on the beat is that drug abuse has become a national nightmare and a problem that we must confront.

Again, we owe it to the american people to do those things we know work, and that will make our communities safer. Drug treatment programs work. The public supports them and users seek them out. We can get addicts off the streets and reduce their propensity for crime, but we must devote more time to preventing and treating drug addiction and less to rhetoric.

It is time to change. Our plan includes an additional \$1.5 Billion for increased drug treatment and substance abuse prevention. It is time those waiting lines of thousands seeking treatment begin to shrink, and under our budget they will.

There's much more in our new anti-crime initiative to help make our families safer.

We earmark more than \$300 million from hud so we at the federal level can fashion flexible new partnerships with local housing authorities, to increase the number of law enforcement personnel and expand community crime prevention efforts, and to implement community policing programs.

We expand the community development block grant program by \$2.5 Billion as part of our stimulus plan, and many of those funds can be used to hire law enforcement personnel, to install additional security devices, and for other anti-crime initiatives.

And, we earmark nearly \$400 million from the Department of Education for a SAFE SCHOOLS Program. Now we will be able to help school districts that need them pay for the metal detectors and security guards necessary to protect our children, as well as for mentoring programs and for new anti-drug programs.

If no other part of a dangerous city is safe, the schools ought to be safe and drug-free. Our children deserve at least one safe haven, and they deserve our help in creating it.

We have tried to coordinate the different components of our stimulus package and our investment package and our crime package so that they work together for fundamental change.

We have tried to reward the people who work hard and play by the rules, and punish those who cut corners and break the law.

For the same reasons, tough new child support enforcement provisions will be central to our forthcoming welfare reform package. Governments don't raise children, parents do, and we want to give you all the help you need to crack down on deadbeat parents.

Finally, our investments in children - in WIC and Head Start and Immunizations -- will give our most vulnerable children the skills and the care and most importantly the hope they need to thrive and prosper. Our summer jobs program and our enterprise zone initiative for hard-hit urban and rural communities will provide jobs for hundreds of thousands.

We call these "investments in people", "putting people first", "restoring fairness" - but these are also anti-crime programs.

All of us are deeply concerned about crime. We've all been frightened for ourselves and our loved ones. We watch as drugs tear our country apart and threaten our children's future.

We can do much better, and we are starting to.

We are about to pass this budget, the foundation of our program for change. We have begun an exciting new era of progress and partnership on behalf of the people who placed their trust in us.

Together, let's build an America we can be proud to leave our children.

Thank you very much.

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
REMARKS TO JUSTICE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES
APRIL 29, 1993**

The past few weeks have been extraordinary even for a city where we are used to history occurring all around us.

After twelve long years we're shifting the basic focus of government back to the needs of the middle class and to economic growth and to investing in the future, so we can leave our children a richer and a safer world.

But the changes we are making go beyond policy and I hope beyond politics. This is a time of new ideas, too, and new hope. There's a sense again that each of us can contribute to making our country better in whatever job we do.

If you think about it, and I did a great deal when I was Attorney General of my State, when you work to ensure the full protection of the law for every citizen, you help sustain the most fundamental values of democracy, and through them, our very freedom.

I know most of you here today came to your work with similar feelings for the law. I have enormous respect for those motives. I come from a generation that revered the law because we too believed it gave us the tools to help people. I still believe it.

I have asked Janet Reno to lead us because these are her values too. In my opinion the first qualities a chief law enforcement officer needs are honesty and integrity and quiet strength under duress, or even in times of great tragedy. I have been so proud of her in the last several days. She's doing a terrific job.

It isn't typical of perhaps someone from my Party but I have spent a lot of time these early weeks focused on law enforcement issues. I believe the American people want a change. They want less crime and less drug use and less violence and less illegal use of hand guns, and I'm going to try my best with your help to give them all these things.

I've endorsed and will sign and will fund the Brady Bill, and give us a chance to stop some of these senseless killings.

I've proposed a major new safe schools program. If no other part of a city is safe, schools ought to be drug free and safe.

I've just appointed Lee Brown to be Director of the Drug Control Office, the first police officer to hold that position.

Dr. Brown basically invented community policing, which I know many of you have a deep interest in.

I have asked for additional resources for drug education programs for children, and for drug treatment programs for those that want to get better.

And to increase police presence in our communities, I have asked for substantial new funding to eventually add a hundred thousand more local police officers to do community policing, many of whom will walk the beat. We must make the streets safer for our families, and we know community policing is a local solution that works. I hope this is just the beginning.

These are our commitments. They are new. Our intent is to do more to prevent crime with a strong economy and stronger families and better schools and better programs, and have tougher law enforcement across the board for those that don't play by the rules. And that includes those who commit white collar crimes or crimes against the environment.

I believe the government must be consistent and must set an example.

We will have a very tough child support enforcement program. I have asked my appointees to adhere to the strictest ethics law ever. I have cut my own staff and begun a government wide review of every program we operate.

If we expect the American people to be more responsible, even though most of them are already working harder for less, we must sacrifice in Washington, and adhere to a strict code of legal and ethical conduct in our agencies and our programs.

America is great because we provide opportunity to all, freedom of speech and worship to all, and because we provide equal justice under the law to all. We have become the custodian of freedom's dream for the entire world - because people like you do a great job in a great cause.

My goals for the Justice Department are simple: to be totally free of political controversy and political abuse; to be an innovator in crime reduction and in law enforcement; to create a genuine partnership with our colleagues in state and local systems of justice; to set an example in the practice of law and in the protection of civil rights that makes us proud; and, to make our communities, our children, our families and our friends safe again.

In closing let me say how proud I am to name these seven Assistant Attorneys General to the Justice Department team. Some

are new to me, some I have known and admired for a long time. I am very pleased each has agreed to join our Administration.

With these appointments, our Administration has in 100 days nominated 172 people for consideration by the Senate. At the same point in their Administrations, President Reagan had named 152 and President Bush had named 99. By any measure, we are making great strides in staffing our Administration and defining our mission.

Today when I walked in through these doors I couldn't help but reflect that Bobby Kennedy walked through them when he worked here. It's impossible not to still be very moved by his memory and his work.

I hope twenty-five years from now another daughter or son of America will walk in here, and remember what you accomplished here, and be moved.

I believe the tradition for greatness here is still very much alive. The American people want you to succeed in your work. I do too. I know, working together, we will make the country proud, and do honor to the great history of the United States Department of Justice.

Thank you.

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
APPOINTING DR. LEE BROWN DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG
CONTROL POLICY
APRIL 28, 1993**

It is with great pleasure that I announce the appointment of Dr. Lee Brown -- the first police officer to hold this job -- to serve as Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

A few weeks ago I elevated this office to Cabinet level status, because I believe drug abuse is as serious a problem as there is in America. Lee Brown shares that view, and I am proud that he will join us in this new position.

As Americans who care about our future we cannot let drugs and drug related crimes continue to ruin our communities, threaten our children even in school, and fill up our prisons with wrecked and wasted lives.

We must do a better job of preventing drug use and treating those who seek treatment, and we must do more to protect law abiding citizens from those who victimize them in the pursuit of drugs or profits from drugs.

I am committed to winning this struggle, as all Americans are, and there is no better person to lead us in this fight than Lee Brown.

He has been the chief law enforcement officer in Atlanta, Houston and New York. He's a policeman and a Ph.D in Criminology who brings to this tough job a truly extraordinary record -- of innovation and crime reduction -- and a sensitivity to the problems of real people who want to walk home safe at night.

To reduce drug use and drug related crimes we must do many things at the same time.

It has to start with community policing, with more police at the local level working with neighbors and friends to prevent crime and to quickly punish criminals. There must be better education and prevention efforts starting at the earliest ages. And there must be treatment for those who want to get better.

Dr. Brown knows a little something about community policing. It's nearly his invention. He turned the Houston police force into a model of community policing, and for many serious crimes the crime rate there dropped. In New York he added thousands of officers to foot patrols, men and women who he empowered to help solve problems, not with a federal program but with a commitment to a better life in the neighborhood. And reports of serious crime there fell.

He's had the vision to see conditions clearly and the courage to change what isn't working. Most importantly, he gets results, and this is exactly what we need in the war against drugs.

I pledge to him and the American people an exceptionally focused and very carefully executed anti-drug effort from the federal government.

At the heart of our efforts will be more funds for local police officers, more for treatment and more for prevention. We will continue to work with countries that have shown the political will to fight illegal drugs. They will continue to get our full support and cooperation. But it's time we turned our attention home, and built a strategy to make the neighborhoods of America safer.

We want to close the gap between those who want treatment and available treatment. Treating addiction is good urban policy and good anti-crime policy and good health policy. We have asked for a ten per cent increase in treatment funds for 1994, and will make drug treatment part of our national health care plan. Our goal is to work towards treatment on demand.

I believe the parents of America want and deserve more help in educating children about drugs. We can prevent drug abuse. School programs work. Public service programs work. But they aren't miracles. They require a commitment. We have asked for a sixteen per cent increase in drug prevention funding.

Finally, we are determined to put more police on the street and to expand community policing. It's a local program, it's old fashioned law enforcement, but it works -- there's less crime. I think it's time to go back to the basics. I asked for 200 million dollars in the stimulus package for community policing, and have proposed almost 600 million in policing and similar initiatives for 1994.

The most basic responsibility of the government is to protect the American people. It's our sacred duty to do our best. I believe we have a great program. It's basic. There's more officers, more education, and more treatment.

And with the leadership of Dr. Brown, it promises to be more effective. I look forward to working with him to meet, and master, the challenges ahead.

Thank you very much.