

# North Korea's Reactors

**N**EGOTIATING NUCLEAR policy with North Korea is a strange and eerie process. The United States and its friends are not entirely sure who's really in charge there, or what he (or they) might really want. Nuclear energy is not suited to the economic needs of an extremely poor country, but the North Koreans are determined to have reactors for what they claim are peaceful purposes and make it clear that the only open question is which kind. The alternative to these discussions is to revert to the positions of last spring, in which the United States fitfully threatened sanctions and North Korea fitfully threatened war. In these circumstances, the preliminary deal they have now struck represents at least movement in the right direction—though wall-to-wall caveats are required.

The dangers are obvious. North Korea has promised not to produce more plutonium, from which it could make nuclear weapons—in addition to the one or two weapons that the CIA thinks it may already possess. It says it will also abandon two reactors, now under construction, that could produce much more plutonium. In response the United States has agreed to move toward normal diplomatic relations and to help North Korea build two big reactors of the type widely used in the advanced industrial countries. The American negotiators defend this conces-

sion by pointing out that these machines—light-water reactors—would produce less plutonium than the graphite reactors that the North Koreans are currently building. They also argue that it would take nearly 10 years to build the light-water reactors and in that time many things can happen in North Korea. They are counting on a closer involvement with South Korea and Japan, which would apparently bear most of the heavy costs of these projects.

It would be crucial to ensure that not only legally but physically North Korea could not break its commitments—that the new reactors would be built into a system that could not be severed along national boundaries. That needs to be a central purpose of these talks, which are only now beginning.

One further objection is that the new reactors would constitute a multibillion-dollar bribe to the North Koreans to desist from violating past promises. This unsettling truth cannot be wished or talked away. It is an unhappy circumstance that implies at least two imperatives for the American negotiators. One is that they find ways to ensure that they are not setting a precedent for Iran or Libya. The other is that they get real, demonstrable and enforceable results for any such deal, which is to say that they make sure the outcome would be worth it.

## Slow Judges

**W**HEN AN elected representative fails to do his job, he can be voted out of office. When a civil servant in the executive branch is derelict, complaints can be filed with a supervisor or a member of Congress. But when a judge fails to attend to his responsibilities in a timely manner, the litigants are put in a terrible position. They can file repeated motions asking for a decision, but the judge can ignore these requests. They can petition a higher court for a writ of mandamus—an order demanding that the dilatory judge act—but that is understandably risky and unlikely to endear the party filing the petition to the judge under attack. Or they can wait it out in the hope that eventually justice will be done. That is hardly a satisfactory alternative when the wait extends for years.

Congress acknowledged this problem in 1990 by passing a law requiring all federal trial judges to file a report on their backlogs annually, in the hope and expectation that making this data available to the public would move slow judges. In many parts of the country, this has been an effective device. In the District of Columbia, however, the filings reveal that terrible problems remain. There are some legitimate reasons for delay in this jurisdiction, among them the fact that there are vacancies on the court so the sitting judges are hard pressed to keep up. In addition, the U.S. District Court here handles far more criminal cases than other federal courts, and more complex civil litigation involving the government. But any blanket excuse fails to explain why some judges are able to keep their caseload current

and others are not. For the second year in a row, for example, this year's report, filed on March 31, reveals that Judges Charles Richey and Stanley Sporkin have perfect records: not a single motion or completed bench trial pending for six months. Senior judges often handle a lighter caseload, but of these, Thomas Flannery is current and Oliver Gasch has only two motions pending, and valid explanations for these.

Most of the other judges have some old matters—Judge Stanley Harris has 29—but their backlogs do not extend beyond this decade. This can't be said of three judges, however, who deserve special criticism. Judge Norma Holloway Johnson has failed to act on two employment discrimination cases that have been ready for decision since 1988 and 1989, respectively. Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson has failed to rule on seven motions that were filed in 1988 and 1989, though in one of these (coincidentally involving The Washington Post) the bankruptcy of one of the parties contributed to the delay. Unfortunately, for the second year in a row, the chief judge, John Garrett Penn, is the worst offender. Not only does he have seven matters pending since the '80s, one of these has been ready for decision since 1986. That is unconscionable. No litigants should have to wait eight years for a ruling. And no judge should be allowed to ignore his responsibility for that long. The U.S. Court of Appeals, which has the power to supervise the performance of all judges in the circuit, has an obligation to investigate here.

## 'Social Pork' and a Kid's Death

**T**HIRTEEN-YEAR-OLD Anthony Stokes probably wasn't on the mind of anyone on Capitol Hill when the crime bill went down in defeat last Thursday. He certainly wasn't in the thoughts of the National Rifle Association, which was busy keeping assault weapons on the nation's streets. Or House Republicans who were having a field day trashing the bill, especially the crime-prevention programs. But Anthony Stokes ought to be remembered in Congress if President Clinton is successful in getting the bill back to the House floor. Because two nights after the crime bill failed, Anthony—for whom some of the bill's anti-crime features were intended—went down in Washington too. He was fatally wounded on a Northwest street from a gunshot fired in anger by another youth about his own age.

When opponents like House Republican Whip Newt Gingrich speak derisively of crime-prevention programs as "social pork," they should think about what so many families and young people trapped in our cities are up against. President Clinton, in his Sunday church service remarks, spoke of the gulf between youths like Anthony and those members of Congress who sneer at programs aimed at helping communities produce summer and after-school activities intended to steer youths away from crime.

"There are people who represent places where all the children can go to the ballpark, where they've got a place to go swimming in the summertime and they literally cannot imagine what it is like for some of our children," he said. "And so they say, oh, these programs to let these kids play basketball at midnight instead of walk the streets are pork." The president's got it exactly right.

Teenagers are being murdered in America at a brutal rate. It's hard to find a more compelling task than to keep more from becoming a part of that nightmare. In Anthony's case, his youth club football and basketball coaches had gone beyond the call of their jobs to keep him away from trouble. Trophies adorning the mantle in Anthony's house symbolized their success. His 74-year-old grandmother tried, too, by stepping in for his incarcerated mother and a father on work release. But despite their best attempts to fill the parental void, they were in competition—losing, as it turns out—with the lure and danger of the streets.

The defeated crime bill would have given the country more life prison terms, jails and death sentences. If resurrected, it should also continue to give support to institutions, groups and individuals in American communities who struggle daily to save the Anthony Stokes of this world.

## Dominican Democracy

**R**EPAIRING a flawed election is a delicate and difficult process. The count of the votes in the Dominican Republic last May was at best grossly incomplete, and the legitimacy of President Joaquín Balaguer's reelection is under a heavy cloud. Mr. Balaguer and his opponents have now worked out a compromise remedy that could repair the damage—if carried out in good faith.

But the recent record suggests that good faith may be in short supply. Mr. Balaguer is a master at playing for time, and some of the people around him are plainly reluctant to risk losing power.

The official results of the May election reported Mr. Balaguer the winner by a hairline margin of less than one percent of the votes cast. Because of trouble with computers and erroneous voting rolls, a much larger number of voters had been prevented from casting ballots, most of them in areas that went heavily for the leading opposition candidate, Jose Francisco Pena Gomez. The best solution would have been new elections, at least in the districts where the registration errors were most prevalent. That opportunity has been lost, unfortunately, and Mr. Balaguer, who has been president for 20 of the past 28 years, is to be inaugurated again today.

Last week's compromise would have given him a

short term of 18 months instead of the normal four years, with a special election to be held in November 1995. Mr. Balaguer, who is 86 years old, has said he will not run again. This agreement was spelled out in a document dubbed the Pact for Democracy, signed by Mr. Balaguer, Mr. Pena Gomez, the heads of the other parties and more than 100 eminent citizens. But the government has already begun to slide back from it. The National Assembly has just enacted legislation giving Mr. Balaguer not 18 months but two years.

Mr. Pena Gomez and the other opposition leaders are owed much credit for holding their protests within the limits of legal and peaceful negotiation. Mr. Balaguer's supporters would do a terrible disservice to their country if they were to give the opposition reason to conclude that this decision had been a mistake. Similarly, the Clinton administration has pushed in the right direction by making it clear that it is not prepared to overlook the nature of the May election in order to get the Dominican Republic's cooperation in enforcing the embargo of Haiti. Democracy in good working order is no less important at one end of the island those two countries share than at the other.

54

TALKING POINTS  
WHY THIS IS THE TOUGHEST, SMARTEST CRIME BILL EVER  
August 11, 1994 -- 1 P.M.

\* No crime bill has ever won the unanimous support of every major law enforcement organization in the country -- until now.

\* Here's why: The single largest element of this crime bill is more than \$13 billion for law enforcement:

- \* \$9 billion to put 100,000 new police officers on the street;
- \* \$1 billion to hire more border control agents, deport criminal aliens, and track illegal immigrants;
- \* More than \$1 billion for more FBI agents, DEA agents, and ATF agents to crack down on violent crime, drug crime, and gun crime.
- \* \$1 billion in Byrne grants to states for anti-drug task forces and other law enforcement support;
- \* More money for federal and state courts and federal, state, and local prosecutors so that we can unclog our overcrowded criminal justice system that lets too many criminals walk.
- \* And this bill makes three strikes and you're out the law of the land so that the worst criminals never go free.

\* But that's not all: The next largest element of this crime bill is nearly as big -- more than \$10.5 billion for prisons -- which is more than any other crime bill in history:

- \* This bill will help states bring 15,000 vacant prison cells that they have already built but can't afford to use on line immediately -- that means the revolving door will slam shut for 15,000 violent criminals the day we pass this bill.
- \* Moreover, for the first time ever, in order to get prison money, the federal government will require states to enact tough new truth-in-sentencing requirements that make violent criminals serve at least 85% of their full sentence.
- \* And this bill includes nearly \$2 billion to help states pay the costs of locking up criminal aliens until they can be deported.

\* There's prevention money in this bill, too -- because the law enforcement organizations that wrote this bill told us they needed it. It's money well spent -- but that part of the bill is no bigger than when this House passed it back in April.

\* And remember: there's not one dime of new taxes in this bill. Every dollar will come from cutting the federal bureaucracy by over 250,000 positions, until we have the smallest federal government since John F. Kennedy. This bill cuts the bureaucracy in Washington to put more police on the street and get criminals off the street. That's a good trade for the American people.

August 21, 1994

Dear Representative:

In a few hours, the House of Representatives will have an historic chance to help fulfill government's most fundamental responsibility, which is to give our citizens the right to feel safe. I urge you to give them the toughest, smartest attack on crime in history by passing the Crime Bill without further delay.

I want to congratulate members of Congress in both parties who have reached across party lines and worked in good faith to produce this Crime Bill. This isn't a Democratic Crime Bill or a Republican Crime Bill -- it's an American Crime Bill, and it will make a difference in every town, every city, and every state in our country.

A summary of the Crime Bill is attached. It will put 100,000 new police officers on our streets in community policing. It will shut the revolving door on our prisons, and keep violent criminals off the streets for good by making three-strikes-and-you're-out the law of the land. It will protect unsuspecting families from sexual predators in their communities, and make it a capital crime to kill a law enforcement officer. It includes an unprecedented effort in crime prevention to steer young people away from crime, drugs, and gangs, and to do everything we can to prevent crimes from happening in the first place. It bans juvenile ownership of handguns, and bans deadly assault weapons that gangs and drug dealers use to outgun police officers and kill innocent people. And the entire Crime Bill will be paid for not with new taxes, but by reducing the federal bureaucracy to its lowest level in 30 years.

I urge you to support the rule that will bring this Crime Bill to the floor. After all the hard work that has gone into this effort by members of both parties acting in good faith, this Crime Bill deserves a vote.

Even after the vote on the rule, some opponents will try to send the Crime Bill back to conference yet again. That motion may attempt to gut important, tough elements of the bill that the American people and America's law enforcement overwhelmingly support. But whatever form this motion takes, whatever rationale is offered for its adoption, make no mistake: A vote for the motion to recommit is a vote to kill the Crime Bill for this year.

The American people have waited six years for a comprehensive Crime Bill. We owe it to the law-abiding citizens of this country to pass this Crime Bill without delay.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 14, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
DURING CHURCH SERVICES

Full Gospel AME Zion Church  
Temple Hills, Maryland

1:25 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you so much. If you've been listening to the news the last few days, you know that the President has had his annual loss of voice. (Laughter.) But when I heard the choir today I kind of got my voice back. (Laughter.)

First, Pastor and Mrs. Cherry, on behalf of my wife, my daughter and all of our company here, thank you so much for making us feel at home today. This was a beautiful, wonderful day for us. We've brought some old friends of ours that we've known for many years, and several members of our White House staff. Our good friend, Congressman Albert Winn joined us -- we're glad to see you. Thank you so much, sir.

I came here today of two minds. Usually, on summer Sundays like this, Hillary and Chelsea and I go up to Camp David, and we go to the beautiful little chapel in the woods there. And instead of being in a vast church, we worship at 9:00 a.m. on Sunday morning with about 50 people, and about six or seven people singing in the choir -- (laughter) -- including the President, who gets to sight read the music when he can talk. (Laughter.)

I wanted to come here today for two reasons. First of all, because, as it turned out, I needed to hear the sermon. (Laughter and applause.) Next week, Pastor, I'll try to be a little more like Jehoshaphat. (Laughter and applause.) Maybe I won't have to ask you face all our enemies all at once. (Laughter.)

The second reason I wanted to be here is that this church to me symbolizes what American should be all about right now. And it also, I believe, came about because of all the things that America should not be about right now. I mean, let me ask you, how is it that a church in 1981 could start with 24 members, and in 1994 could have 16,000 members? How could an African American church with all of the cliches people say about the black community in America have 16,000 members and over 40 percent of them be males? (Applause.)

God has worked through this Pastor and his wife and his family and all of you. But why did you have to come into being? Because of this great hole that's in our country now. Because of the breakdown of the families and the communities, and the loss of the things which hold people together inside and out -- not just the spiritual problems, but the jobs, too, and the opportunities and the

things which make people believe in the future on this Earth.

And in that great vacuum, look what has usually happened. When people lose hope and lose their families and lose their communities and lose their sense of right and wrong, what has so often happened? Seventy percent increase in America in 10 years in the number of children being born out of wedlock. And let's get the whole record on -- today the fastest growth is among young, white women giving birth out of wedlock. Soon, if we don't do something about it, we'll all be equal -- too high.

In 10 years, a doubling of the rate of murder among teenage young people. Sixty-five people in America get killed every day. While we've been in church, another teenager has been murdered. Every two hours a teenager gets murdered in America. And in this great vacuum, you have teen pregnancy and drugs and crime and, worst of all, violence.

I wanted to come here because you are filling that void from the ground up and from the inside out. And I believe that this church could never have come into existence and exploded the way it has if everybody had been in a church, in a family, in a community, in a job, and had hope and direction inside and outside, and structure.

You've filled a vacuum with something good and pure and wonderful. And I thank you for it. It's beyond the reach of any president to do. It is God's work through a religious ministry. But the Bible says that the rest of us has ministries, too.

Do you remember when Martin Luther King said if you're just a street sweeper, just sweep the streets as if you were Michelangelo, painting the Sistine Chapel. (Applause.) Everybody has a job to do. And today, I don't think we have a bigger job in trying to keep our children alive and rebuild our families; and rebuild our communities; and to try to communicate some sense of right and wrong; and to give our kids something to say yes to, as well as something to say no to. It's two sides of the same coin.

And I'll tell you, before I got here, I've been pretty down the last two or three days because the Congress voted that crime bill down. Not because it's the answer to all life's problems; here is the answer to all life's problems. (Applause.) But because this country is literally coming apart at the seams for millions of our young people. And because there are too many streets where old folks are afraid to sit and talk, and children are afraid to play. Because we're not really free anymore and people aren't free to pursue the American Dream anymore as long as we feel like we can just tear each other apart. Because our police officers go out on the streets where the gangs are supposed to -- are better armed than they are. And things are all mixed up now in our country. And so often it seems that petty political things, or superficial divisions keep us from doing what in our heart we know is right.

And I have been so troubled at the thought that at least those of us who have been given this authority by you -- the President, the Congress -- the least we can do is to help you to save the lives of your children. There are children in this church who have been gunned down; I know it. The least we can do is to help you to be protected. The least we can do is to put people on the streets who can not only catch criminals, but prevent crime as good law enforcement officers. The least we can do if people are totally

hopeless is to get them out of your hair so they won't be bothering you. And the least we can do is to, yes, give your children more things they can say yes to, not just things they can say no to.

That's what all that debate was about in the crime bill. It really wasn't about whether if you had written the crime bill or I had or anybody else, it would have been just the way it turned out to be. What is a democracy, after all, but people getting together and putting their different ideas and then arguing it out and having a bunch of votes and a majority rules?

Alexis de Toqueville said many years ago, this was a good country, and as long as it was a good country it could be a great country. We're around after 218 years because more than half the time more than half the people have been right, and God has permitted us to stay and go and flourish. I believe that. Do you?

AUDIENCE: Yesss.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that's what this is all about. We don't have a bigger problem than the violence which is eating the heart out of this country, and the breakdown of the basic fabric of values that says it is wrong to hurt other people; it is wrong to act in an instant for some momentary advantage in ways that will devastate other people's lives; it is wrong to take this kind of advantage. And we have to find a way out of this that punishes wrongdoers, yes, but that also offers the hand of hope, that rebuilds our people from the grass roots up.

And in a political moment, the Congress walked away from that last week. There are people in my part of the country, good people -- they are in their churches today just like we're here --who say, we don't break the law, and we go hunting every time they open the season, and we don't want any weapons being banned. These 19 assault weapons, folks -- I had a .22 when I was 12; you don't need an assault weapon to shoot a deer or to kill quail. (Laughter.) If you're that bad a shot, you ought to be doing something else. (Laughter.) You shouldn't be hunting. But their fears are all welled up in them and they scare some of their members of Congress.

Then there are people who represent places where all the children can go to the ballpark, where they've got a place to go swimming in the summertime, where they're in church two or three times a week, and they literally cannot imagine what it is like for some of our children. And so they say, oh, these programs to let these kids play basketball at midnight instead of walk the streets are pork.

I tell you, folks, I will have to, like all the rest of you, answer to God for everything I have done, right or wrong. We all will. I have been a governor. I have presided over the execution of criminals. I have built prison cells. I believe in punishing wrongdoing. I think when people go out and deliberately hurt each other, somebody ought to do something to them and stop it. I believe that. And that's what this bill does.

But I also know that there are countless little children out there, and they could go one way or the other. You know what the best thing about this day to me was? When everybody was asked to come up here, there were all those beautiful young people standing here. They've got a chance now. And we have to give more of them a chance now.

I came here because I needed to hear the sermon. I came here because your church stands for what our country ought to be and where it ought to go. I came here because the Bible says that good Christians are also supposed to be good citizens. And I ask you this whole week to pray for me and pray for the members of Congress; ask us not to turn away from our ministry.

Our ministry is to do the work of God here on Earth. And that starts with giving our children and our families a place in which at least they can be safe and secure. It starts with standing up against this mindless violence which has torn the hearts out of people who are this church and nearly every church in the United States. It starts with trying to put families back together. And it is not the province of any one race. It is increasingly not the province of any region or any economic group. But it savages the poor the worst because that is where the families are most broken.

And I ask you to pray, and to speak to your friends and neighbors and to hope somehow we will all find the wisdom and the judgment to come back and do the will of God in our ministries, which is to make you as safe as we possibly can.

Thank you so much for giving us this wonderful day with you. God bless you all. (Applause.)

END

1:40 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 15, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
AT CRIME BILL EVENT

The Rose Garden

1:55 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Thank you very much, Mark, Janice, Steve, and Dewey, and to all the rest of you who are here. We have just heard from the real American interests in the crime bill.

Last week, the House of Representatives walked away from Polly Klaas and Jody Sposato and James Darby, and all the law enforcement officials in this country who have worked so very hard for this crime bill. When you walk away from our police officers and from our kids, from our hard-working citizens with their futures before them, or our senior citizens who have given their lives to make this a better country, and you do it on a procedural trick so you can still go back home and pretend that you didn't vote against the crime bill, and you would even have voted for it had it only come to a vote, there's something wrong with the American system of government.

And it finds its way into the lives of people that are still around. Polly's sister, Annie, told me she's still afraid of being kidnapped, so she's built an elaborate alarm system in her room with ropes and bells. There's something wrong when James Darby and his classmates who are still living were so afraid of violence that they had to participate in a special program to help them cope with it. And the worst part of their fears is that there's truth behind them.

Yes, this is the greatest country in the world, and the longest-lasting democracy in the world. And none of us would live anywhere else for anything. But we have to face the fact that we have the highest murder rate in the world and that our children are more at risk here than they would be in most other countries and all other advanced countries, because we have simply failed to act with the discipline and determination necessary to preserve democracy's most fundamental obligation -- the maintenance of law and order -- without which freedom and progress cannot proceed.

The crime bill makes three strikes and you're out the law of the land, puts 100,000 police on the street, builds more prisons to lock up serious offenders, takes handguns away from juveniles and bans assault weapons, and provides investments and prevention to give our kids a better start in live; deals more sensibly with the terrible scourge of drugs that are responsible for so many of the crimes we have. These are things which ought to be done.

How can the House explain to Mark Klaas why the law that might have saved his daughter's life had it been enacted years ago couldn't come up for a vote? How could a politician go to a little child like Meghan Sposato and explain that, well, they just couldn't figure out a way to bring to a vote a law that would have taken the deadly weapon that killed her mother out of the hands of a deranged person? And how could a member of Congress explain to James Darby's mother why they won't put police on the street who might have allowed little James to complete his last walk home?

If Washington had acted six years ago, some of these lives might have been saved. If Washington will act this week, a whole lot of lives can still be saved.

Last Friday I met with some police officers in Minnesota. I told them that they had never walked away from us and that Washington should not walk away from them. Well, the parents of this country should have the same pledge. And the children of this country should have the same pledge. You heard Janice say that in James Darby's wonderful letter to me, which I have read over and over and over again since last Mother's Day -- he said, "I know you could do something about this, and I'm asking you nicely to do it."

Well, my fellow Americans, we have asked the Congress nicely long enough. There should be no more excuses, no more tricks, no more delays -- and no more discussion about whether this bill is a Democratic bill or a Republican bill or a Clinton bill. I don't know when I will ever be able to get it across to people here that what we do here is not about us. It is about the rest of America. So let Congress here this: Pass the Darby-Klaas-Sposato crime bill and do it now.

Thank you. (Applause.)

END

2:02 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 13, 1994

RADIO ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT  
TO THE NATION

Camp David

10:06 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. As I'm sure you know, a couple of days ago the House of Representatives had a chance to pass the toughest attack on crime in our history. And they tried to take the easy way out. But the terrible threat of crime and violence is too great for us to let them get away with it. The easy way out is not an option.

Two hundred and twenty-five members of Congress participated in a procedural trick orchestrated by the National Rifle Association and intensely pushed by the Republican congressional leadership -- a trick designed with one thing in mind, to put the protection of partisan and special interests over the protection of ordinary American families. They ought to be ashamed of themselves.

The American people have been very clear on this. The most important job is to keep the streets and the neighborhoods of America safe. The first responsibility of government is law and order. Without it, people can never really pursue the American Dream. And without it, we're not really free. And the American people have said over and over again, today they're worried about crime. They're fighting for their personal security.

The House of Representatives has a responsibility to do something about it, but this week the House walked away from that responsibility. They had a vote on law and order, and law and order lost. But that can't be the end of this fight. The hard-working, law-abiding citizens of the United States deserve better.

Yesterday I went to Minnesota, where I addressed the National Association of Police Organizations. This group represents more than 150,000 police officers across the country. They strongly support the crime bill. Earlier in the week, I met with the heads of every major law enforcement group in America. Together, they represent over a half-million law enforcement officers. They don't walk away from their responsibility. They put their lives on the line every day for us. And we can't let Congress walk away from them.

The crime bill we're fighting for is a crime bill America's police officers and law enforcement officials want. Our prosecutors, our teachers, our principals, our parents, our attorneys general, our community leaders -- they've all joined these police organizations in endorsing this crime bill. For six years Congress has bickered and battled over a crime bill when the average violent

felon only serves four years in prison.

This crime bill departs from all those labels of the past, from liberal or conservative, or tough or compassionate. This crime bill emphasizes punishment, police and protection.

Some people in Congress say it's time for their August vacation. Well, the crime-plaguing ordinary American is not about to take a vacation, and it's only fitting that Congress stay in Washington until they get this job done. They can't walk away on a procedural trick.

I want a crime bill that puts 100,000 new police officers on the street; one that makes three strikes and you're out the law of the land; one that builds prisons to lock up violent criminals where they belong; one that takes handguns away from minors; one that provides prevention programs that police officers demand to help steer our kids in troubled areas away from crime and drugs in the first place. And the bills must be paid for not by raising taxes, but by cutting the federal bureaucracy.

I gave the Congress a plan to reduce the federal bureaucracy by 250,000 and more over the next five years, to bring the federal government to its lowest level in 30 years and to put all the savings in a trust fund to pay for the crime bill. And let me be clear about this: The crime bill must ban the assault weapons that have no place on our streets.

We don't need any more Washington, D.C. games like the House of Representatives played last week. Up until that vote, this crime bill was bipartisan all the way, with Republicans and Democrats voting for everything that must be included. Now the Republicans say, well, there's too much money for prevention in this bill. They call it pork. Well, all I know is, all the police officers in this country know we need to give kids something to say yes to.

I know that 65 Republicans voted for a bill that had even more prevention funds back in the spring, but only 11 would stand up to the withering pressure of their leadership when the bill came back and was ready to pass just this week.

The American people have to make it clear to members of Congress from both parties that even if they disagree with a particular measure in this crime bill, the overall bill is the best, the smartest bill we have ever had in this country, and the American people need it. It's time to put politics aside and finish the job. Help our nation's police officers make our streets safer.

This fight is not over. I am continuing it. I want you to fight with me. Our children, our families, our future deserve no less.

Thank you for listening.

END

10:11 A.M. EDT

Statement on  
House Passage of the Crime Bill  
August 21, 1994

Today is a great day for law-abiding American citizens.

For six long years, while families were under siege and senseless violence grew unchecked, the American people waited for Washington to do something. Today \_\_\_ Democrats and \_\_\_ Republicans reached across party lines to pass the toughest attack on crime in our history.

Today the House moved beyond politics as usual to assume responsibility for protecting our citizens and punishing those who prey on them. From now on, the government will do everything it can to make sure that people who commit crimes get caught, that those who are guilty get convicted, that those who are convicted serve their time; and that those who can be saved from a life of crime are found when they're young and given a chance to do better.

This Crime Bill is a victory for the police, the prosecutors, and the parents of America who deserve all the help we can give them. And it is a victory for all Americans who want their government to come together to solve their problems.

It will put 100,000 new police on the streets of America, keep repeat violent criminals off the streets for good by making three-strikes-and-you're-out the law of the land, prohibit juveniles from owning handguns, and help get young people off the streets and out of gangs and teach them right from wrong.

And this Crime Bill will make the police officers of America safer by taking deadly assault weapons off the street. Some people said we could have passed this Bill a lot sooner if we had walked away from the assault weapons ban. But I insisted on it, because we must never walk away from the brave men and women who risk their lives every day, and the innocent people they are sworn to protect.

And the entire Crime Bill will be fully paid for -- not with new taxes or by cutting necessary services -- but by reducing the size of the federal bureaucracy to its lowest level in 30 years.

In passing this Crime Bill today, we may have finally begun to throw off the old habits that have held us back for too long. This fight against crime is far from over -- the Senate still must pass the Bill this week. But I hope that Senators will recognize what \_\_\_ members of the House recognized today: This isn't a Republican Crime Bill; it isn't a Democratic Crime Bill. It's an American Crime Bill, and they should pass it without delay.

And when they do, the way will be clear for us to attack other problems together, across party lines, as the American people want us to -- and as we should.

Date: 08/20/94 Time: 14:41

Text of President Clinton's weekly radio address delivered

Text of President Clinton's weekly radio address delivered  
Saturday:

Good morning.

This morning I want to talk with you about crime and violence. All of us know it's too familiar a threat to Americans in almost every neighborhood in our country.

Right now, just as I'm delivering this address, the family, friends and neighbors of a 13-year-old boy are gathered in a church not far from the White House to lay him to rest. His name was Anthony Stokes. He was shot last Saturday night apparently by another boy about the same age.

Later this morning, as Anthony Stokes' family buries him, House and Senate negotiators will meet to finish work on the crime bill. Soon after, each member of the House of Representatives will face a simple choice to pass the toughest attack on crime in history, or to block it one more time.

We must not walk away from the American people in the fight against crime.

Anthony Stokes was killed just two days after Congress succumbed to intense political pressure and allowed the crime bill to be derailed. We fought hard over the last 10 days to get it back on track. And it is back on track because members of Congress of both parties have worked together in good faith, determined to deliver a crime bill for the American people.

Now Congress must finish the job and pass the crime bill I've been fighting for nearly two years now. When they do, it's going to make a difference in every town, every city, every state in our country.

It's a tough bill. It'll put 100,000 new police officers on our street a 20 percent increase in the number of officers walking the beat, protecting our neighborhoods and preventing crime as well as catching criminals. It will shut down the revolving door on our prisons and make violent criminals serve their time. Police officers and law-abiding citizens should no longer have to watch in fear and frustration as dangerous criminals are put right back on the street.

It will stiffen penalties for criminals who prey on children. It will protect unsuspecting families from sexual predators in their communities by requiring local authorities to alert them to their presence. It will lock the most dangerous criminals up for good by making three strikes and you're out the law of the land.

But this crime bill is smart as well as tough, because our approach recognizes what the law enforcement community has been saying for years and years. There isn't a single victim of crime who wouldn't trade the toughest sentence in the world for some way to have prevented the crime from happening in the first place.

That's why this bill includes an unprecedented effort in crime prevention to help kids stay away from crime and drugs and gangs. It gives them something to say yes to. At the same time, we make it clear there are some things young people must say no to. The crime bill bans juvenile ownership of handguns. There's no reason why kids should be carrying guns to schools instead of books.

Finally, it bans deadly assault weapons that were designed to be used in war for rapid-fire combat. Today they are the weapons of choice for gangs and drug dealers who use them to outgun police officers and to kill innocent people. They don't belong on our

streets, and the crime bill will take them off.

And the entire crime bill will be paid for and this is important not with a new tax, not by taking money away from some other needed service, but by reducing the size of the federal bureaucracy to its lowest level in 30 years.

This crime bill answers the call of every parent afraid that random violence will harm a child; of every police officer who's been hurt or killed by the terrible fire power of an assault weapon; of every innocent, law-abiding man, woman and child in America. The crime bill offers this pledge: From now on, our government will do everything we can to make sure that people who commit crimes get caught; that those who are guilty are convicted; that those who are convicted serve their times; that those who can be saved from a life of crime are found when they're young and given a chance to do better.

For all these reasons, and for a young man named Anthony Stokes who's being laid to rest today, we must not let this chance pass us by. We must seize the opportunity before us to make a dramatic difference in every neighborhood. And as we do, I hope we can make a difference in the way our government works.

Let today mark the beginning of a determined effort on the part of all of us to work in good faith across party lines. I have shown my good faith, and in so doing I have taken the risk that all people take when they talk to people who oppose them.

Soon the Congress will have a chance to show the risk was worth it. And once they pass the crime bill, the way will be clear for us to attack other problems together, across party lines, as the American people want us to do and as we should.

APNP-08-20-94 1442EDT

President William J. Clinton  
Radio Address  
August 20, 1994

This morning in particular I want to talk to you about the crime and violence that has become an all too familiar threat to Americans in almost every neighborhood of our country. Right now, just as I'm delivering this address, the family, friends, and neighbors of a thirteen year old boy are gathered in a church not far from the White House to lay him to rest. His name was Anthony Stokes. He was shot last Saturday night, apparently by another boy about the same age.

Later this morning, just as Anthony Stokes' family buries him, House and Senate negotiators will meet to finish work on the Crime Bill. Soon after, each Member of the House of Representatives will face a simple choice: to pass the toughest attack on crime in history or to block it yet again. And we must not walk away from the American people in the fight against crime.

Anthony Stokes was killed just two days after Congress succumbed to intense political pressure and allowed the Crime Bill to be derailed. We've fought hard over the past ten days to get it back on track -- and it is back on track, because Members of Congress of both parties worked together in good faith, determined to deliver a Crime Bill for the American people.

Now, Congress must finish the job and pass the Crime Bill I have been fighting for these past two years. When they do, it is going to make a difference in every town, every city, and every state in this land.

This Crime Bill is tough. It will put 100,000 new police officers on our streets, walking the beat, protecting our neighborhoods, and preventing crime.

It will shut down the revolving door on our prisons and make violent criminals serve their time. Police officers and law-abiding citizens should no longer have to watch in fear and frustration as dangerous criminals are put right back on the street.

It will stiffen penalties for criminals who prey on children; it will protect unsuspecting families from sexual predators in their communities by requiring local authorities to alert them to their presence; and it will lock the most dangerous criminals up for good by making three-strikes-you're-out the law of the land.

The Crime Bill is smart too -- because our approach recognizes what the law enforcement community has been saying for

years: There isn't a single victim of crime who wouldn't trade the toughest sentence in the world for some way to have prevented the crime from happening in the first place. That's why it includes an unprecedented effort in crime prevention, to help kids stay away from crime and drugs and gangs, and gives them something to say yes to.

But at the same time, we make it clear that there are some things young people must absolutely say no to -- the Crime Bill bans juvenile ownership of handguns. There is no reason why kids should be carrying guns to school instead of books.

Finally, it bans deadly assault weapons that were designed to be used in war for rapid-fire combat. Today, they are the weapons of choice for gangs and drug dealers who use them to outgun police officers. They don't belong on our streets -- and the Crime Bill will take them off.

This Crime Bill answers the call of every parent afraid that random violence will harm their child. It answers the call of every police officer who has been hurt or killed by the terrible firepower of an assault weapon. It answers the call of every innocent, law-abiding man, woman, and child in America -- and offers this pledge: From now on, this government is going to do everything it can to make sure that people who commit crimes get caught, that those who are guilty get convicted, and those who are convicted serve their time.

For all these reasons, for a young man named Anthony Stokes laid to rest today -- we must not let this chance pass us by. We must seize the opportunity before us to make a dramatic difference in every neighborhood. And as we do that, I hope we can make a difference in the way this government works. Let today mark the beginning of a determined effort on the part of all of us to work in good faith across party lines. I have shown my good faith -- and, in so doing, I have taken the risk that all people take when they talk to people who are opposed to them.

Soon, the Congress will have a chance to show the risk was worth it. And once they pass the Crime Bill, the way will be clear for us to attack other problems together, across party lines, as the American people want us to -- and as we should.

Thanks for listening.

Statement on  
House Passage of the Crime Bill  
August 21, 1994

Today is a great day for law-abiding American citizens.

For six long years, the American people have waited for Washington to do something about the crime and violence that is tearing this country apart. Today \_\_\_ Democrats and \_\_\_ Republicans reached across party lines to pass the most sweeping attack on crime in our history.

Today the House stood up for government's most fundamental responsibility, to give its citizens the right to feel safe. This Crime Bill is a victory for the police, the prosecutors, and the parents of America who deserve all the help we can give them.

And it is a victory for all Americans who want their government to work together to solve their problems.

It will put 100,000 new police on the streets of America -- a 20% increase in the number of police officers walking the beat, preventing crime as well as catching criminals.

It will shut the revolving door on our prisons, and keep violent criminals off the streets for good by making three-strikes-and-you're-out the law of the land.

It will launch an unprecedented effort in crime prevention to steer young people away from crime and drugs and gangs, and give them something to say yes to.

It also tells them that there are some things they must say no to, by prohibiting juveniles from carrying handguns.

And this Crime Bill will make the police officers of America safer by taking deadly assault weapons off the street. We could have passed this Bill a lot sooner if we had walked away from the assault weapons ban. But I will never walk away from the brave men and women who risk their lives to protect us every day.

And the entire Crime Bill will be fully paid for -- not with new taxes or by cutting necessary services -- but by reducing the size of the federal bureaucracy to its lowest level in 30 years.

In passing this Crime Bill today, we may have finally begun to throw off the old habits that have held us back for too long. This fight against crime is far from over -- the Senate still must pass the Bill this week. But I hope that Senators will recognize what \_\_\_ members of the House recognized today: This isn't a Republican Crime Bill; it isn't a Democratic Crime Bill. It's an American Crime Bill, and they should pass it without delay.

And when they do, the way will be clear for us to attack other problems together, across party lines, as the American people want us to -- and as we should.

**Statement on  
House Passage of the Crime Bill  
August 21, 1994**

Today is a great day for law-abiding American citizens.

For six long years, the American people have waited for Washington to do something about the crime and violence that is tearing this country apart. Today \_\_\_ Democrats and \_\_\_ Republicans reached across party lines to pass the most sweeping attack on crime in our history.

Today the House stood up for government's most fundamental responsibility, to give its citizens the right to feel safe. This Crime Bill is a victory for the police, the prosecutors, and the parents of America who deserve all the help we can give them.

It will put 100,000 new police on the streets of America -- a 20% increase in the number of police officers walking the beat, preventing crime as well as catching criminals.

It will shut the revolving door on our prisons, and keep violent criminals off the streets for good by making three-strikes-and-you're-out the law of the land.

It will launch an unprecedented effort in crime prevention to steer young people away from crime and drugs and gangs, and give them something to say yes to.

It also tells them that there are some things they must say no to, by prohibiting juveniles from carrying handguns.

And this Crime Bill will make the police officers of America safer by taking deadly assault weapons off the street. We could have passed this Bill a lot sooner if we had walked away from the assault weapons ban. But I will never walk away from the brave men and women who risk their lives to protect us every day.

And the entire Crime Bill will be fully paid for -- not with new taxes or by cutting necessary services -- but by reducing the size of the federal bureaucracy to its lowest level in 30 years.

In passing this Crime Bill today, we may have finally begun to throw off the old habits that have held us back for too long. This fight against crime is far from over -- the Senate still must pass the Bill this week. But I hope that Senators will recognize what \_\_\_ members of the House recognized today: This isn't a Republican Crime Bill; it isn't a Democratic Crime Bill. It's an American Crime Bill, and they should pass it without delay.

And when they do, the way will be clear for us to attack other problems together, across party lines, as the American people want us to -- and as we should.

President William J. Clinton  
Opening Statement  
Press Conference  
August 19, 1994

Good afternoon. In recent weeks, the Castro regime has encouraged Cubans to take to the sea in unsafe vessels to escape their nation's internal problems. In so doing, it has risked the lives of thousands of Cubans, and several have already died in their efforts to flee.

Castro's action is a cold-blooded attempt to maintain his grip on Cuba and to divert attention from his failed Communist policies. He is trying to export to the United States the political and economic crises he has created in defiance of the democratic tide flowing throughout our hemisphere.

Let me be clear: the Cuban government will not succeed in its attempt to dictate American immigration policy. The United States will do everything within its power to ensure that Cuban lives are saved and that the current outflow of refugees is stopped.

I have today ordered that illegal refugees from Cuba will not be allowed to enter the United States. Refugees rescued at sea will be taken to our naval base at Guantanamo while we explore the possibility of other safe havens in the region.

To enforce this policy, I have directed the Coast Guard to continue its expanded effort to stop any boat attempting to bring Cubans to our shores through the Florida straits. The United States will detain, investigate and, if necessary, prosecute

Americans who take to sea to pick up Cubans. Vessels used in such activities will be seized.

I want to compliment the Coast Guard and the Immigration and Naturalization Service for their efforts and thank Florida officials -- starting with Governor Chiles and the Florida Congressional delegation -- for their help in protecting and saving the lives of Cubans who seek to escape the Castro regime.

I want to speak for a moment about the Crime Bill. In the last week, I have fought hard to put the Crime Bill back on track. After extensive talks with members of Congress from both parties, I have indicated my support for strengthening the provisions that require sexual predators to report to the police and that make sure our communities are notified of their presence. And I support cutting overall spending in the bill by ten percent. The cuts will ensure that every dollar authorized in the Bill will be paid for, not with new taxes or cuts in necessary services, but -- as I have always insisted -- with savings from reducing the federal bureaucracy to its lowest level since John F. Kennedy was President. All of these historic savings will go to help empower our communities make their streets safe again.

I have insisted that we retain the most profoundly important elements of the Crime Bill. We are going to keep it tough -- by putting 100,000 more police on the street, building more prisons and putting violent criminals away for good by making "three-strikes-and-you're-out" the law of the land and, with other

requirements, making sure criminals serve their time. And we are going to keep it smart -- with sensible crime prevention programs that steer our kids away from drugs and gangs and give them something to say yes to.

This Crime Bill must ban handguns for juveniles and take deadly assault weapons off our streets. Even though we have come under intense pressure from forces that will say or do anything to take the assault weapons ban out of this Bill, I won't do it.

Let's keep in mind what this Crime Bill is all about. It is about removing fear from our streets, our schools and our homes. Innocent Americans should not have to fear being preyed upon. Young lives should not be snuffed out by insane violence. We owe it to the American people to make sure that those who commit crimes get caught, those who are guilty get convicted and those who are convicted do their time.

That is why it is so important that no one be allowed to turn this into a partisan issue. This isn't a Democratic Crime Bill or a Republican Bill. It is an American Crime Bill, and I call on Congress to pass it without further delay.

President William J. Clinton  
Radio Address  
August 20, 1994

This morning in particular I want to talk to you about the crime and violence that has become an all too familiar threat to Americans in almost every neighborhood of our country. Right now, just as I'm delivering this address, the family, friends, and neighbors of a thirteen year old boy are gathered in a church not far from the White House to lay him to rest. His name was Anthony Stokes. He was shot last Saturday night, apparently by another boy about the same age.

Later this morning, just as Anthony Stokes' family buries him, House and Senate negotiators will meet to finish work on the Crime Bill. Soon after, each Member of the House of Representatives will face a simple choice: to pass the toughest attack on crime in history or to block it yet again. And we must not walk away from the American people in the fight against crime.

Anthony Stokes was killed just two days after Congress succumbed to intense political pressure and allowed the Crime Bill to be derailed. We've fought hard over the past ten days to get it back on track -- and it is back on track, because Members of Congress of both parties worked together in good faith, determined to deliver a Crime Bill for the American people.

Now, Congress must finish the job and pass the Crime Bill I have been fighting for these past two years. When they do, it is going to make a difference in every town, every city, and every state in this land.

This Crime Bill is tough. It will put 100,000 new police officers on our streets, walking the beat, protecting our neighborhoods, and preventing crime.

It will shut down the revolving door on our prisons and make violent criminals serve their time. Police officers and law-abiding citizens should no longer have to watch in fear and frustration as dangerous criminals are put right back on the street.

It will stiffen penalties for criminals who prey on children; it will protect unsuspecting families from sexual predators in their communities by requiring local authorities to alert them to their presence; and it will lock the most dangerous criminals up for good by making three-strikes-you're-out the law of the land.

The Crime Bill is smart too -- because our approach recognizes what the law enforcement community has been saying for

years: There isn't a single victim of crime who wouldn't trade the toughest sentence in the world for some way to have prevented the crime from happening in the first place. That's why it includes an unprecedented effort in crime prevention, to help kids stay away from crime and drugs and gangs, and gives them something to say yes to.

But at the same time, we make it clear that there are some things young people must absolutely say no to -- the Crime Bill bans juvenile ownership of handguns. There is no reason why kids should be carrying guns to school instead of books.

Finally, it bans deadly assault weapons that were designed to be used in war for rapid-fire combat. Today, they are the weapons of choice for gangs and drug dealers who use them to outgun police officers. They don't belong on our streets -- and the Crime Bill will take them off. *THE ONLY CB PAID FOR W/O ANY SORT OF NEW TAXES, BUT BY CUTTING THE*

This Crime Bill answers the call of every parent afraid that random violence will harm their child. It answers the call of every police officer who has been hurt or killed by the terrible firepower of an assault weapon. It answers the call of every innocent, law-abiding man, woman, and child in America -- and offers this pledge: From now on, this government is going to do everything it can to make sure that people who commit crimes get caught, that those who are guilty get convicted, and those who are convicted serve their time.

For all these reasons, for a young man named Anthony Stokes laid to rest today -- we must not let this chance pass us by. We must seize the opportunity before us to make a dramatic difference in every neighborhood. And as we do that, I hope we can make a difference in the way this government works. Let today mark the beginning of a determined effort on the part of all of us to work in good faith across party lines. I have shown my good faith -- and, in so doing, I have taken the risk that all people take when they talk to people who are opposed to them.

Soon, the Congress will have a chance to show the risk was worth it. And once they pass the Crime Bill, the way will be clear for us to attack other problems together, across party lines, as the American people want us to -- and as we should.

Thanks for listening.

**President William J. Clinton  
Opening Remarks, LESC Meeting  
The White House  
August 8, 1994**

I asked the Law Enforcement Steering Committee to come here today because the Crime Bill is being held hostage by special interests using a parliamentary trick for a mask.

These men and women are experienced in unmasking deceit -- and they've come here to remind anyone who's forgotten exactly what we're fighting for. Don't let anybody fool you: The most important thing this Crime Bill will do is put 100,000 new police officers on the streets, a 20% increase of the best protection, toughest enforcement, and smartest prevention you can find.

The police chiefs, the sheriffs, the attorneys general, the rank and file officers, the DA's -- the law enforcement community has never been so united. These officers are here to remind the Congress that the people we all work for want this Bill, and they are watching.

No Member of Congress should be intimidated by anything except the American people -- and the American people want action now. When you strip away all the rhetoric and all the procedural trickery, anyone who blocks this bill is blocking the toughest attack on crime in history, and should be prepared to answer for it.

*We ought to be*

*Locking up violent criminals, not crime bills*

*The special interests want to lock up the crime bill.*

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 19, 1994

PRESS CONFERENCE BY THE PRESIDENT

The East Room

1:30 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon. In recent weeks the Castro regime has encouraged Cubans to take to the sea in unsafe vessels to escape their nation's internal problems. In so doing, it has risked the lives of thousands of Cubans, and several have already died in their efforts to leave.

This action is a cold-blooded attempt to maintain the Castro grip on Cuba, and to divert attention from his failed communist policies. He has tried to export to the United States the political and economic crises he has created in Cuba, in defiance of the democratic tide flowing throughout this region.

Let me be clear: The Cuban government will not succeed in any attempt to dictate American immigration policy. The United States will do everything within its power to ensure that Cuban lives are saved and that the current outflow of refugees is stopped.

Today, I have ordered that illegal refugees from Cuba will not be allowed to enter the United States. Refugees rescued at sea will be taken to our naval base at Guantanamo, while we explore the possibility of other safe havens within the region.

To enforce this policy, I have directed the Coast Guard to continue its expanded effort to stop any boat illegally attempting to bring Cubans to the United States. The United States will detain, investigate and, if necessary, prosecute Americans who take to the sea to pick up Cubans. Vessels used in such activities will be seized.

I want to compliment the Coast Guard and the Immigration and Naturalization Service for their efforts. And I want to thank Florida's officials, including Governor Chiles and the Florida congressional delegation, for their help in protecting and saving the lives of Cubans who seek to escape the regime.

Now I'd like to speak just for a moment about the crime bill. In the last week I have fought hard to put this crime bill back on track. After extensive talks with members of both parties, I have indicated my support for strengthening the provisions that require sexual predators to report to the police and make sure their communities are notified of their presence. And I support cutting overall spending in the bill by 10 percent.

These cuts will ensure that every dollar authorized in the bill will actually be paid for -- not with new taxes, and not by diverting dollars from other needed programs, but, as I have always insisted, with the savings we will gain from reducing the size of the federal government by over a quarter of a million people over the next six years, to its lowest size in over 30 years since President Kennedy was here. And all these historic savings will go back to the American people to make their streets and their homes, their schools safer.

MORE

I have insisted that we keep the most profoundly important elements of the crime bill -- to keep it tough by putting 100,000 police officers on the street, building more prisons, putting violent criminals away for good, by making three strikes you're out the law of the land, and by other stronger provisions on sentencing. And we're going to keep it smart, with the sensible crime prevention programs that steer our kids away from drugs and from drugs and gangs, and give them things to say yes to.

The crime bill must ban handguns for juveniles and take assault weapons off our streets. Even though we've come under intense pressure from forces that will apparently say anything to take the assault weapons out of the bill, I have refused to do so.

Let's keep in mind what this crime bill is all about. It's about removing fear from our streets, our schools, and our home. Innocent Americans should not have to fear being preyed upon, as so many do today. Innocent children should not have to fear losing their childhoods, as so many do today. We owe it to the American people that do the work and pay the bills in this country to make sure that people who commit crimes get caught, that those who are guilty get convicted, and those who are convicted serve their time. We also owe it to them to do whatever we can to prevent crime in the first place. That's what the police and the prevention programs are all about.

That's why it is so important, and why I have worked so hard to make sure that do not turn this crime issue into yet another Washington partisan issue. This is a grass-roots mainstream nonpartisan issue, and so it should remain. It must be an American crime bill. We have worked hard on it, and I call upon Congress to pass it without delay.

Helen.

Q Mr. President, on behalf of all the press corps, we want to wish you a happy birthday. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.

Q And now -- (laughter) -- (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you could all do a lot to make it happy. (Laughter.) That is not a guilt trip; feel no pressure. (Laughter.) Thank you.

Q Mr. President, in the last 35 years we've had an embargo against Cuba and increased the economic burden on them. I understand that's why the refugees are coming in. What is the problem with taking a few small, albeit brave, steps to negotiate a possible movement toward democracy with Cuba? We've dealt with many communist countries through the last 35 years, and we're dealing with them now.

THE PRESIDENT: There aren't many left. I support the embargo, and I support the Cuban Democracy Act, which was passed in 1992. And I do not believe we should change our policy there.

The fundamental problem is, democracy is sweeping the world, democracy and freedom are sweeping our hemisphere. In the Caribbean alone, and in Central and South America and all of this region, there are only two countries now not democratically governed with open societies and open economies. The real problem is the stubborn refusal of the Castro regime to have an open democracy and an open economy. And I think the policies we are following will hasten the day when that occurs, and we follow those policies because we believe they are the ones most likely to promote democracy and ultimately prosperity for the people of Cuba.

Q But that's not true of North Korea or China, and you're dealing with them every day.

THE PRESIDENT: I think the circumstances are different and I think our policy is correct.

Q Mr. President, recognizing that you're slowing down the process, do people fleeing Cuba still get automatic entry to the United States as political refugees if they're not criminals or ill?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q You're ending --

THE PRESIDENT: The people leaving Cuba will not be permitted to come to the United States; they will be sent to safe havens.

Q The people who reach here.

THE PRESIDENT: The people who reach here will be apprehended and will be treated like others. They will be -- their cases will be reviewed. Those who qualify can stay, and those who don't will not be permitted to. They will be now treated like others who come here.

Brit.

Q Mr. President, under the law it has always been clear that the Cuban refugees had a certain priority on staying here. The policy, of course, has been that anybody who got here got to stay. What restraints are you operating under in terms of the law in changing this policy? Or are you likely, sir, to be sued over this?

THE PRESIDENT: No -- let me -- I'm glad you asked that question in contradistinction to the one you asked right afterward. The Cuban Adjustment Act will continue to be the law of the land. But we are doing our best within that -- we will detain the Cubans who come here now, they will not simply be released into the population at large. And we will review all their cases in light of the applicable law, including the Cuban Adjustment Act.

Q Do you know how long it will take, how long --

THE PRESIDENT: It depends on how many there are, of course. And we don't know.

Andrea.

Q Can you give us some more details? Are these people going to be taken to Guantanamo? What kind of strain might this place on our naval forces, the Coast Guard? Already we're being told that drug interdiction is being cut back. And can you respond to criticism already from Bob Dole and Newt Gingrich? In particular, Mr. Gingrich said that your new policy is appalling, it's an example of mixed morality, and that he thinks it is illegal under the act.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first, let me answer the factual questions. The refugees, those who are fleeing, will be taken first to Guantanamo where we will seek safe havens for them. That is plainly not illegal under international law, nor do we believe it is illegal under the Cuban Adjustment Act.

Secondly, as to whether it is immoral, I just would say it is my belief that the American people and that the Cuban American people and the people of Florida -- but the people of the entire United States -- do not want to see another Mariel Boatlift. They do

not want to see Cuba dictate our immigration policy. They do not want to see Mr. Castro able to export his political and economic problems to the United States.

Now, that is what is plainly being set up. We have gone through that once. We had 120,000 people sent to this country as a deliberate attempt -- not because they themselves initially wanted to flee; they were encouraged to flee, they were pushed out; we had jails open, we had mental hospitals open -- all in an attempt to export all the problems of Cuba to the United States. We tried it that way once. It was wrong then, and it's wrong now. And I'm not going to let it happen again.

Q Can you respond to that other question?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, that's my answer to them.

Q What about the naval forces, the Coast Guard? Are they up to this -- will it affect drug --

THE PRESIDENT: I think the Coast Guard is plainly up to it. We may have to have a little more Navy support. I met with the Secretary of Defense this morning; we discussed it at length. He is confident that we can do what we have to do without undermining our fundamental mission.

Q President Clinton, previously you said that the crime bill was something that you supported, that you wanted to sign as it was. Now you're saying you can take 10 percent out of it. Why shouldn't the American people believe that there's still a lot of fat that can come out of it?

THE PRESIDENT: First of all, anytime you start a -- I've never seen a bill that started new programs that you couldn't cut some and maintain its fundamental integrity. I said that crime bill was a strong and good bill as it was, and it was a strong and good bill.

But one of the things that happened in conference that has, I think, been largely overlooked is that in an attempt to get as much money as possible for police officers and law enforcement and for prisons and for border patrol, funds were appropriated or were authorized in the crime bill that came out of conference in an amount greater than we could provide in the trust fund.

Keep in mind, the great beauty of this crime bill is it's the first major program in American history that's being financed entirely by reducing the size of the federal bureaucracy and taking all the savings from the federal government and putting it in a trust fund to help grass-roots Americans get better control over their own lives.

The practical impact of what we are doing by cutting 10 percent of this will be to be able to put everything that's left into the trust fund. So, in terms of real dollars, I believe there will be more money actually appropriated and spent for tough law enforcement and for police officers. And I believe that all the fundamental important things in the prevention strategy will be maintained at a very high level, and dramatically higher than now.

The principles of the bill are intact -- it's the biggest increase in police in the history of the country; it's the toughest increase in punishment in the history of the country; it's the biggest increase in prevention programs in the history of the country.

I am not a member of the Congress. They have to work out all the details. If they produced this bill out of the

conference, I would have happily supported this, as I did the other one.

Q Wouldn't you just be getting into politics then, by accepting the original bill?

THE PRESIDENT: Now, that's one of those questions designed to spoil your birthday. (Laughter.) Because it's something else -- it's designed to confuse the American people about what really goes on up here.

The President is not a member of the Congress. The Congress made a decision that they had a bill that they all wanted. They accommodated the interests as best they could. It met all my fundamental criteria -- assault weapons ban, ban on handgun ownership by kids, tougher penalties, longer imprisonment, more prevention. So does this bill. This bill has the added virtue of being able to be fully funded in the trust fund that we are creating by reducing the federal government to its lowest size in 30 years.

And if, in fact -- let me just say, Rita -- if, in fact -- there has been no conference. If in fact, the conference proceeds along the lines that I generally believe it's going on, and it has the added virtue of some strengthening of the language which was put in involving this whole sexual predator issue -- so, in that sense, I think it is a fine bill that meets all the criteria, and it doesn't just gut the prevention programs, which I was determined to see not happen.

Q Mr. President, you say that you're not going to allow Fidel Castro to dictate U.S. immigration policy. But hasn't he just done that by forcing you to reverse three decades of a policy? And secondly, what do you say to Cuban Americans, especially in Florida, who feel betrayed by this change in policy?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I believe that most Cuban Americans want us to be very firm. The Cuban Americans that I know, without regard to their party, supported the Cuba Democracy Act, and they remember how awful it was for the United States when the Mariel Boatlift occurred. They remembered what it did in this country and how -- the feelings it engendered in this country. And I do not believe they want another Mariel Boatlift. And I do not believe we can afford to do that. And so my own view is that most Cuban Americans will support what we're trying to do and wish us to be firm.

I would remind you that the Attorney General, who is in charge or oversees the INS, who has done a lot of work on this and who will have a press conference, I think, when I finish to answer some of the details of this policy was the prosecuting attorney in Dade County. I talked to the governor last night at some length about this -- of Florida.

I think my own feeling is -- and I've talked to Cuban Americans, of course, exhaustively for years now, and we've been in touch with them and with the Florida congressional delegation. I believe this policy will have broad support. I will be surprised if it does not have broad support.

Q By telling Cubans basically to stay home and at least temporarily to stomach conditions there, does that make it incumbent on you to be more active in seeking to oust Castro?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, what we are telling Cubans is that we have a provision for their coming to the United States through in-country processing. And at least as of this date, we have no evidence that the Castro has done anything to discourage Cubans from coming to the in-country processing, applying for the visas if

they're eligible to come here, and getting them. That's what we're saying to them. That is, we do not have any evidence that would justify believing that that that process won't work in Cuba as it has in other places. And, indeed, the Castro government has encouraged Cubans to go down and apply to come here. But we don't object to that, that's the policy we have everywhere and that's the policy we should have there.

Q But doesn't that make it incumbent on you to unilaterally or multinationally press for the ouster of Castro in some way -- military, economic -- whatever?

THE PRESIDENT: The United States had done more than any other country to try to bring an end to the Castro government. We have done it through the Cuban Democracy Act. We have done it through the embargo. We have worked hard, often laboring almost alone, to that end. And we will continue to do that by whatever reasonable means are available to us.

Q Mr. President, one of your fellow Democrats in the Senate, Sam Nunn of Georgia, said yesterday that it would be months if not years before a health care reform bill is produced. And the Congressional Budget Office said that a possible moderate compromise didn't cost out. There's a growing feeling in Washington that this health care crusade is hopelessly bogged down in Congress at this point. What is your view of the situation?

THE PRESIDENT: That they should keep working at it; that if we don't move there's a chance that it won't happen at all. You know, the congressional timetable is often different from the American timetable. I mean, it took seven years to pass the Brady Bill and seven years to pass family leave.

But for 60 years people have acknowledged that not covering all Americans and having no system for dealing with the explosive costs and the inequalities in the health care system were a problem. They have reached a significant crisis stage here, with five million more Americans losing their health insurance in the last five years alone, with the costs exploding in the last 12 years. And I believe that the time has come to deal with this.

Now, Senator Nunn simply observed what I think is clearly a fact, which is that in the Senate there is unlimited debate and you can have unlimited amendments. But a lot of these issues do need to be worked through.

I think the comments Senator Kennedy and Senator Mitchell made today about the fact that this bipartisan group was at least attempting to work with them, and in the process of so attempting, finding out how hard it is -- it's easy to stand on the sideline and lob brick bats at these efforts, and quite another thing to produce your own effort. But their comment made me believe that there is still a chance that people will work together and resolve this. So I would say to them, keep working, keep working at it, because if you delay, you may lose it altogether.

Q Well, at this point, would you take something less than what Mitchell or Gephardt has proposed just to keep the process moving, since, as you say, if we don't get it now, we probably --

THE PRESIDENT: I think that, for one thing, that's not so easy to do, because as we've also seen from the studies of the Catholic Health Association and others, the so-called "something less" approach often does more harm than good; that when you just try to patchwork this, often you lead to more people without insurance and higher insurance rates.

What I would say to you is, give the process time to unfold. I know for a you it's been going on a long time, since we first began to debate this a year and a half ago. I think for the American people, it's almost like the baseball season -- the pennant's just begun. I hope we can have the pennant in the other one, too, and the series. But I think we need to let this thing unfold a little more; I wouldn't prejudge it yet.

Q Mr. President, back to the crime bill. If the approach you're offering now, the changes you're offering now, does not produce enough votes to pass the bill, will you under any circumstances agree to sever the assault weapon ban for a separate vote in the House and the Senate?

THE PRESIDENT: I won't agree to that because I think it's a mistake. And let me say -- I don't want to overly comment on it, but let me try to describe what the problem is. The bill has already passed the House. But in the Senate, as you know, we could have 55, 56, 57, 59 votes for that bill in the Senate and it could still be filibustered. And we should not permit that to happen.

I also believe that there is a chance that this whole process in the last few days -- we may look back on this in a year or so and think that this was the beginning of an effort, again, in other areas to work in good faith across party lines. I have shown my good faith. I have taken the risk that all people take when they talk to people who are opposed to them of being asked the questions like Rita asked me. But in this town it won't work if we have American problems unless we try to reach out across party lines. A lot of these issues don't work like that.

So if we can work through this in good faith, my view is that we'll maybe be setting the stage to have more things like NAFTA, and the Brady Bill, and the education bills, and then this one where we can work together. So I don't believe we will have to do that, and I am against doing it. I think it would be a real error.

Q Mr. President, Fidel Castro has been very high on the list of American demonology because he is a national security threat. I think of the Cuban missile crisis; he would provide a base for the Soviet Union. That's all ended now. Do you foresee a form of government, democratic government, in Havana with free elections that includes Fidel Castro? Or is it a case that Castro must go before there's any normalization?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, in any democracy it's up to the people to make their own decisions. The United States does not pick leaders or delete leaders for other countries; we let people make their own decisions.

I don't want to get into that. I think what we need is a movement toward democracy and a free economy.

Q Mr. President, when the legal defense fund was set up for you to handle the costs of defending against the litigation, Lloyd Cutler said he was intervening in that as Presidential Counsel because it threatened the presidency, these tremendous costs. Since then, the fund has decided it cannot legally solicit, leaving no explanation since then of, a, how will the money be raised to pay these bills and, two, in lieu of enough funding to do it, what other options do you have to protect the presidency from the threat that he was talking about?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know. I don't know the answer to that. I'll just have to let you ask Mr. Cutler that. I'm just trying to stay away from that whole issue of the fund, and I can't answer those questions.

Q Mr. President, I hate to ask you one of those questions that might spoil your birthday again, but in light of problems that you have been having up on Capitol Hill, many people are wondering if changing your communication strategy, shuffling your staff might not be really addressing the problem; that perhaps I was wondering if you've thought about this -- that as a President elected with 43 percent, you may be trying to do too much too fast. And Democrats on Capitol Hill may be trying to take too much of a partisan advantage of having control of the entire government and perhaps exceeding your mandate.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first, I don't want the Democrats to take partisan advantage, I just want us to get what's necessary for the country done. I do not believe the country believes that we should sit still up here.

And for all your talk about trouble, let me remind you that every objective survey says that in 1993 this administration got more support from Congress than any administration since World War II except President Eisenhower in 1953, when he had a less ambitious agenda, and President Johnson in 1965, when he had a bigger mandate and more support from the Congress. So I think we're doing quite well with the Congress if you look at it in any kind of historic pattern.

Now, I realize the fights and the conflicts and the delays endure more than the achievements. But we reversed Reaganomics. We passed an economic program that was part of a strategy that has given us three years of deficit reduction for the first time since Truman, over four million jobs. We have the most advances in trade than we've had in a generation in the last year and a half. This economic program is working. We broke seven years of gridlock with the Brady Bill. We passed NAFTA, which was deadlier than a doornail when I became President; we revived it and passed it.

So I believe this Congress is capable of working together, often on a bipartisan basis. And they still have some great opportunities here. They have the crime bill; the campaign finance reform bill; the lobby reform bill; the bill that passed the House last week that has not yet passed the Senate to require the Congress to live under the laws it imposes on the American people, which I think is a very good bill; and, of course, the health care challenge.

But I believe what I have to do is to keep trying to change things. Anytime you try to provoke as much change as I have, you're going to have resistance. And you will be criticized. Is it more difficult that I had 43 percent of the vote? Perhaps it is. But I think you can make another argument, which was that 62 percent of the American people voted for fundamental change in the things that we were doing and in the way government works.

If anything, I would say that I've been most disappointed, looking back, not so much in my inability to get things done, because once people look at the list it's a very long and impressive list, but I haven't been as successful in changing the way it works -- that is, in trying to get the Democrats and Republicans to reach across to each other in good faith and work through these things. That's why I think this crime bill could be an important thing. It could be a way of people in both parties saying, we're putting you first for a change, not ourselves.

Q Mr. President, the Federal Reserve raised interest rates again this week. Some Democrats are saying that it could cause an economic slowdown. How many more rate increases will you take before you also criticize the Fed?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, when the Federal Reserve raised rates this week, the Chairman, Mr. Greenspan, said that he thought that this would be sufficient for a time. The truth is that our economic strategy has produced more rapid growth than they thought it would and that we thought it would. We are even doing better than we thought we would. We have got over four million jobs already in the last year and a half, and we've got rapid growth in the economy, dramatic new investments in the private sector. So they're worried about inflation. When it is apparent to me that the drag on the economy will be more about slowing the economy down than stopping inflation, I will do what I can to influence that policy. But I think my policy of letting them do their job and having me do mine has worked out rather well.

And I would remind you that from the time we announced -- let me just go back through a little history here -- from the time we announced that we would have a serious assault on the deficit after the election in November, from that day for a very long time thereafter, we had dramatic drops in interest rates which fueled last year's expansion. So I think that we have to recognize that the Fed did respond to the efforts we made, and what they're responding to now is a robust and growing economy. Of course, it could be slowed down too much, but we don't have any evidence at this time that that has, in fact, occurred.

Q Mr. President, happy birthday. Next Sunday, Mexico is going to have presidential elections. Can you give us your assessment, what do you think, what do you expect, and what is going to be the impact in the relations of Mexico and the United States? Do you expect continuity?

THE PRESIDENT: I expect the elections to be free, open and fair. And I expect them to produce a result which will be accepted by the people of Mexico. And I expect the United States to continue its deepening friendship with Mexico. I think that our relationships are growing. I think, in spite of the political changes and the economic difficulties of Mexico in the last two years, we have had great success. I think NAFTA clearly was a great success, if you look at the economic benefits to the United States and what has happened. So I'm looking forward very optimistically to the future with Mexico.

Q Mr. President, on the Middle East, sir, progress continues between Israel and the Palestinians, but there is still violence. But I wondered, sir, if you have an assessment on that. What -- is there any update on the Syrian front? Have you heard recently from President Assad? And also, has any progress been made in countering worldwide terrorism?

THE PRESIDENT: You've asked me a lot of questions there. Let me try to answer them all. I believe we are still on a path of steady progress in the hope of achieving an agreement that resolves the differences between Israel and Syria. Syria's problems remain, but I would say significant advances are being made.

With regard to the Palestinian agreement, I think everyone always knew there would be some operational difficulties because the PLO had -- to be fair to them -- never had been in charge of a country. That is, they had never had to operate a government and to deal with all the mundane and maybe sometimes even boring day to day problems that, unless they are properly managed, you can't keep a society together. I think we're making some headway there. I don't want to minimize the difficulties, but I do not expect them to be so great as to derail what we're doing.

On the terrorism front, I can tell you that every week, several times a week, I get an update on our efforts. And while -- as you could appreciate, I cannot discuss many of them in great

detail. I believe that we are making progress, but I believe this is a problem we'll all have to be very vigilant about for years to come.

Q Mr. President, can we turn the subject to your birthday today? What stirs within you as you celebrate another birthday? And if you could have three wishes fulfilled today, what would those three wishes be?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I woke up this morning just grateful to be here. That's what I'm feeling -- I mean, grateful to be alive, grateful to have my health, grateful to have my family, grateful to have the chance to serve. And, you know, I like the tough fights, so this is an exhilarating period for me. I like the big challenges. I think we're all put on this earth to try to make a difference.

If I had three wishes, I would wish for the crime bill to pass -- (laughter) -- one; I would wish that I would make more progress on the way we do things around here as well as on the substance, because if we can open our minds and hearts to each other and play a little less politics, we can solve the health care problem, too, and other things.

And I would wish that I won't have to give up my whole vacation -- (laughter) -- because I still have dreams of breaking 80 on the golf course before I'm 50. (Laughter.)

Let me say, I feel that I -- this is not an easy job for you either, so since it's my birthday, if we adjourn here, let's go into the dining room and we can have some cake and whatever else is in there.

Thank you very much. Come on, let's have some cake.

END

2:06 P.M. EDT

Bruce Reed  
Domestic Policy Council  
Room 216 OEOB

THE WHITE HOUSE  
Office of the Press Secretary

August 15, 1994

PRESS BRIEFING  
BY DEE DEE MYERS

The Briefing Room

2:45 P.M. EDT

MS. MYERS: No announcements today. The President is spending the day -- as you know, he did his event on Social Security and on crime. He'll spend a good part of the day on the phone working on the crime bill.

Other than that -- Andrea?

Q Panetta indicated that there might be some room for compromise. Is there room for compromise on, for instance, the assault weapons ban? Mr. Stokes said that that is not negotiable. Is that the President's position as well?

MS. MYERS: Well, I think the President has made his position clear. He wants to see his principles protected, which include 100,000 police officers on the street, additional money for prevention, three strikes and you're out as the law of the land, and the ban on assault weapons. Now, I certainly don't want to rule out any reasonable compromises. At the same time, I wouldn't rule out that the bill would pass as it is. At this point, we're in discussions. The President is very committed to getting this bill passed.

Q Did the people who spoke at the White House --

Q You didn't try to answer that, I don't think. Do you -- is he standing firm or not on the assault weapons?

MS. MYERS: I just said he expects to see the assault weapons ban in the bill.

Q As is?

Q Well, I don't know what he expects. We want to know is he standing firm on that, that's not negotiable.

MS. MYERS: He has said assault weapons ban will be in the bill, period.

Q As it is or changed?

MS. MYERS: I'm not going to negotiate from this podium unless somebody can produce eight votes. But at the same time --

Q -- using that word suggests that negotiations are underway, which could lead to some change in it at least. Is that not -- that's possible, correct?

MS. MYERS: I think that the Chief of Staff Leon Panetta said today that he wouldn't rule out any reasonable compromises. I'm certainly not going to rule out any reasonable compromises. At the same time, the President is standing by those four principles. He

MORE

#196-08/15

expects to see a bill that includes 100,000 police officers on the street, three strikes and you're out as the law of the land, a ban on deadly assault weapons, and money for prevention.

Q Did the President have any principles that are not subject to being changed in some way? I mean, you say he's standing by the principle, but you won't rule out a reasonable compromise. I don't understand.

MS. MYERS: I think you do understand.

Q I don't either.

Q Were the questions that were asked today -- the persons who spoke today, did they write their own speeches, or did the White House work with them to coordinate their remarks?

MS. MYERS: Generally, those individuals write their own remarks. Sometimes the White House sees them in advance. I simply don't know in this case if we saw them in advance. Certainly, Mark Klaas is somebody who has speaking all over the country, and I think he's made those same kinds of remarks. Mr. Sposato has been here in the past as well; he's also spoken out on this consistently. And I think, again, his remarks were consistent with what he's been saying over the course of the last year.

Q They each spoke about a very specific area of the President's plan, and then, of course, we had the head of the Chiefs of Police making a nonnegotiable standpoint. And the question is, how carefully and to what extent did the White House work with these people on their remarks. Could you get that for us?

MS. MYERS: Sure. Let me just say that I think certainly we would stand ready to help these individuals. But their stories speak for themselves. These are people who all have an experience out there that in some way could have perhaps been changed had the crime bill been passed, had these measures been in place.

Q Right, but it's a pretty simple question, did the White House work with them on their remarks, or not.

MS. MYERS: I'm happy to take it.

Q More directly, on the question of compromise, are you willing to give up part of the crime prevention monies if that's the price of getting the bill through?

MS. MYERS: Again, I am not going to negotiate from this podium. I don't think that's appropriate. The President is going to continue to fight, publicly to talk about this. Again, I think what he did today was underscore the importance of this bill to the American people. The American people want this bill passed. They want to see more cops on the street; they want to see additional money for prevention; they want three strikes and you're out as the law of the land. And the President is going to fight as hard as he can to see that that happens.

At the same time, members of Congress have to work out the schedule for the vote and the specific forum that the bill will go back to vote in. I think the President is going to, again, fight very hard to keep the bill and to keep the provisions in the bill that he thinks are important.

Q Would he fight for the LeMar University grant for Jack Brook's district?

MS. MYERS: That's not one of the principles.

(Laughter.)

Q Who paid for these three individuals to come to the White House today?

MS. MYERS: The White House did.

Q Has the President reached the point now where he knows he has to make revisions in order to sell it?

MS. MYERS: No, I don't think that that's clear. I think the President feels very strongly about this bill. I think he's going to continue to try to turn up the heat on members of Congress who voted against this bill, particularly those who did so for partisan reasons. At the same time, I think he's going to work very hard for a bipartisan solution. This bill had bipartisan support throughout the process; had bipartisan support when it came out of the House; it had bipartisan support in the conference. But when it came down to the vote on the rule, there was a partisan, I think, objective to stopping it.

Now, I think the President certainly has made a point out of that over the course of the last few days. At this point, what's important is moving forward and getting the bill done and getting it for the American people.

Q If the President wants to find an answer, why has he declined to meet with Dole and Gingrich and company?

MS. MYERS: Because, first of all, there have been a number of meetings with the leadership, both --

Q Since Friday. They asked for a meeting Friday and they asked for a meeting on Saturday.

MS. MYERS: They met on Saturday, as you know. Not with the President, but the bipartisan leaders met on Saturday, and if they had a specific proposal for the President they could have passed it on to him following that meeting. They did not. I think the President has made clear what he would like to see in this bill. It's up to the members of Congress to work it out. There have been a number of meetings on this throughout the process, and quite frankly, it was partisan procedural maneuver that blocked this bill and not any substantive objection.

Q Since the vote, they're asking for talk. And since they stopped it, presumably, and are being blamed for stopping it, they say they've got an answer. Why won't the President talk to them?

MS. MYERS: Well, then they should have sent that answer to the meeting on Saturday, which they did not.

Q What is the White House telling congressional leaders in terms of timing of action on the crime bill, particularly as it relates to the schedule of votes on the health care bill? You haven't got too much time left on the Hill. Do you want this thing finished this week, the crime bill, so that you can free the House to take up health care after that?

MS. MYERS: Sure, I think it's our view, the President's view, that he'd like to see this finished as quickly as possible. Speaker Foley indicated this morning that he thinks a vote is possible and it will likely happen this week. The President would certainly like to see it happen, again, as quickly as possible.

As for health care, I think the House is still waiting for CBO to report back on the specifics of the bill. And in the Senate I think it's the Republican leadership, again, that's blocking further progress. If they'd just let a vote go forward, we could get on with it.

Q What about the House timing on health care? Because in addition to waiting for CBO scoring reports, there's also a growing sentiment in the Democratic caucus to really put this off until after Labor Day to find out what the Senate will do in the meantime on health care. What does the President, what does the White House say to House Democrats with regard to health care and timing?

MS. MYERS: Well, the President has made it very clear that he'd like to see both the House and the Senate act as quickly as possible on this. The leadership -- and he'd like to see them stay in to deal with health care and with crime.

The leadership, certainly Majority Leader Mitchell, has made it clear that he's going to keep the Senate in six days a week until this gets done. And the House is still trying to work out its schedule; that's something for them to resolve. But again, I think they're waiting on CBO. And as soon as CBO produces some accounting of various plans, they can move forward.

Q Would the President want the House, once CBO weighs in, to do the same thing as the Senate, to stay in for six days a week?

MS. MYERS: The President has urged them to stay in to deal with this. And it's up to the House leadership now to figure out exactly how to move forward, but I think the President has made clear that he'd like to see them stay in. He's willing to stay here. He'd like to see the House and Senate stay in to deal with this.

Q Dee Dee, on health care, can you tell us what went into the decision to abandon the commitment to guaranteed private insurance?

MS. MYERS: There's been no decision to abandon that.

Q Well, Dee Dee, the President has endorsed the Gephardt bill. That's 50 percent, roughly, Medicare. Obviously, if that were to pass and he were to accept it, that would be the end of that. He's publicly endorsed it, so how can there not have been -- I mean, is it willy-nilly?

MS. MYERS: The priority in that plan is still -- and the presumption in that plan is still to move people into private programs. Failing that, there's a fallback of public programs in order to make sure that people have insurance.

That's the top priority, is guaranteeing benefits for everybody. But the presumption is still -- and this is a question that was posed to the President at his press conference last week and one that he answered -- that the presumption is toward private.

Q But, excuse me, does not the Gephardt bill inevitably result in a large expansion of public insurance?

MS. MYERS: The Gephardt bill creates an opportunity for people who would not otherwise have insurance to have it through the public sector. But it also creates opportunities for people who are currently on -- receiving public insurance to move into the private sector, and certainly that the presumption is to move in that direction.

Q Well, it certainly can't be said to be guaranteed private insurance, can it?

MS. MYERS: But it is -- it guarantees benefits for everybody, and again, the presumption is on private and it tries to move people in that direction.

Q Does it guarantee presumption in favor of private insurance? Is that the principle involved here?

MS. MYERS: I think the principle is benefits for everybody that can't be taken away.

Q Dee Dee, will the President be meeting with any of the 58 Democrats who voted against the crime bill?

MS. MYERS: I certainly wouldn't rule it out. The President is going to seek votes from the Democrats who voted against the bill, from members of the Black Caucus who voted against the bill and from Republicans who voted against the rule, actually.

Q Will he be meeting today?

MS. MYERS: None scheduled, but I certainly wouldn't rule out that people will be coming up here.

Q Today?

MS. MYERS: Yes. I think over the course of the next several days if we think -- I don't know of anybody coming up today. Most members are out of town.

Q Did he meet with Foley and Mitchell on this today?

MS. MYERS: He did not. It was Mr. Panetta met with Foley and Mitchell as part of their regularly scheduled meetings to talk about crime, health care and other issues.

Q In that meeting did Mr. Foley indicate to the White House when he thinks he will bring up the crime? You said earlier likely this week. Did he give a specific day, or what has to happen first?

MS. MYERS: I don't know if he made a commitment to a specific day. They did talk about a number of issues. And I think Foley has said publicly that he's shooting for Thursday.

Q You said he's calling members today. Can you give us a ballpark how many, and are all these members who voted against the rule?

MS. MYERS: I don't think we're going to get into specifics. Generally, he is going to call people who he hopes to persuade to vote for the rule.

Q Is it in the range of a dozen or two dozen?

MS. MYERS: I think it will depend on how many he can get a hold of. He has a list of a number that he hopes are persuadable, and he'll work through that as quickly as he can.

Q Will the President stay in Washington as long as Congress does?

MS. MYERS: We'll see. I think he's certainly going to stay in as long as he feels is necessary. I mean, we'll see.

Q If they stay here, working six days a week, might he go to Martha's Vineyard?

MS. MYERS: I think we'll just have to wait and see. I don't think any final decisions on that have been made.

Q Since the President is obviously not taking any questions from reporters through the course of the day as he used to, when will the next news conference be, and is there a time when we can look forward to maybe asking him some of these questions ourselves?

MS. MYERS: No news conference is scheduled, but he said he hopes to have more, and I think you can expect that there will be another news conference relatively soon. But, again, nothing is scheduled.

Q Could we put in a request for one?

MS. MYERS: Sure.

Q I mean, I know nothing is scheduled, but it's now clear that he is not going to take questions as he used to on a -- at least on an infrequent basis. That makes it a little harder to understand exactly where he's coming from, other than in the set speeches that he wants to make. The members who are opposing him are answering questions and talking to reporters. It's a little different --

Q I think the President has taken a number of opportunities to answer reporters' questions. In fact, recent press conference -- he took questions the other night after the crime bill failed, and there will continually be opportunities to ask him questions.

Again, I don't have a date for you on a press conference. I understand you'd like to have one, and he will have another one soon.

Q Does the White House think that Roger Altman still has credibility with Congress? And does the President have an opinion on whether or not he should resign?

MS. MYERS: I think there's been no change in the President's opinion on this, and I think as others have said, this is something that Mr. Altman will have to decide for himself.

Q What was the question?

Q The question was whether or not Mr. Altman still had credibility with Congress, and whether or not the White House wants him to resign.

MS. MYERS: And I said there's been no change in the President's position on that.

Q Can I follow on that? Has he talked to anyone here about -- well, has he submitted a resignation?

MS. MYERS: Not that I know of, no.

Q Is he here, Dee Dee? Is he back?

MS. MYERS: Is Roger Altman here in Washington? I don't know. You can check his office at the Treasury Department. He's not here in the White House that I know of.

Q Can we get the answer to the earlier question -- has he spoken to anyone here about resigning?

MS. MYERS: I don't know. I don't know whether he's spoken to anybody.

Q Can you take that?

MS. MYERS: Sure.

Q Has his successor been picked?

MS. MYERS: There is no vacancy.

Q Dee Dee, there was a wire report that Vice President Gore might be going to Tennessee to campaign for Cooper, the Senate Democratic nominee, even though he's been critical of the administration on health care and was one of the 58 Democrats in the House who voted against the crime bill rule. Is that true, or is the White House going to be campaigning, even as the President criticizes the people who voted against it?

MS. MYERS: The Vice President, I believe -- you'll have to double-check his schedule, but I believe he is going to Tennessee this week to campaign for Congressman Cooper.

Q What kind of message does that send as you attempt to turn around some of these either Democratic votes or possibly Republican votes, if you're going to go out campaigning for the people who voted against you on the crime bill?

MS. MYERS: I think it sends a message that as a senator and a representative from Tennessee, that the Vice President has a long relationship with Representative Cooper, and that this White House would like to see a strong majority in the Senate on order to try get things done.

Q Can I follow up on that? Dee Dee, as far as this crime bill is concerned and the vote on the rule, that's been framed as a very important one for the President, for his presidency, and I'm guessing that the President's going to make that argument as he talks to these 58. Do you think, or does the President and the White House think that there should be some kind of strictures against those who are unwilling to go along with the President next time this comes up?

MS. MYERS: That's not the President's concern. The President's concern at this point is getting the crime bill passed. He's going to do everything he can to see that that happens. He's spoken out on it every day since the Republicans blocked the passage of the rule last Thursday. He's going to continue to do that to work very hard, to work the phones. The Vice President's in the Midwest today. He'll be fighting for the crime bill. The First Lady is going to give a speech on it. Members of the Cabinet, including Secretary Bentsen and the Attorney General will be making calls and doing interviews on this.

I think you can see a full-scale effort from this administration to get the crime bill passed. And that's the President's primary concern. The primary concern is doing what he believes is in the best interest of the American people.

Q -- believe that there should be any penalty --

MS. MYERS: He believes he should spend his energy doing everything he can to get the crime bill passed.

Q Does he believe there should be punishment, though, of people like committee chairmen, two committee chairmen who voted against --

MS. MYERS: That's for the House to decide. The President believes he should fight for the passage of the crime bill, and that's exactly what he's going to do.

Q Any more schedule for this week?

MS. MYERS: Not much.

Q Travel?

MS. MYERS: Nothing scheduled.

Q What days --

MS. MYERS: Tuesday, tomorrow, he'll have a bill-signing -- H.R. 868.

Q Will there be policemen there? (Laughter.)

Q We don't do bill numbers.

MS. MYERS: Sometime tomorrow, he'll likely sign H.R. 868. That is the only public event on the schedule. And then on Wednesday he's scheduled to sign the General Aviation Revitalization Act. That will be -- number on the General Aviation Revitalization -- (laughter) -- that will be sometime on Wednesday afternoon. And on Thursday, I believe the U.S. Soccer Team will be here.

Q Is it crime-related?

MS. MYERS: It's a crime they didn't win the World Cup. (Laughter.) On Friday, no public events currently scheduled. And I think you can expect him to continue to work very hard at the crime bill. I think you can expect there will be members of Congress through here; he'll work the phones, as will other administration officials. And I certainly wouldn't rule out that we would add an event if that, if we decide that that's necessary.

Q Since Friday is his birthday, what about a news conference -- full-scale news conference?

MS. MYERS: Yes. I'll be sure to suggest that to him right away. (Laughter.)

Q Are there any plans for his birthday?

Q -- I think you mentioned that the President has a list of people to call, people that he considers to be persuadable. How many names are on that list? And how does it break down party-wise?

MS. MYERS: Well, I don't think we're going to release the specific number of names. I think the list will change, sort of, as time goes forward. But I think you can expect that it will include, over the course of the next several days, Republicans as well as Democrats, and probably members of the Black Caucus as well as the other Democrats who voted against the bill.

Q When you mentioned also that you didn't want to rule out any reasonable compromises, can you give us any idea what kind of issues fall in the realm of reasonable compromises?

MS. MYERS: Again, I don't think -- I'm certainly not going to stand here and negotiate a deal on the crime bill. I don't think that's appropriate or makes any sense at all.

Q We're not going to negotiate back, so all we need to know is what some of the issues are that you think are --

MS. MYERS: Well, I don't think there are answers to all of those questions, and I think that's what the next couple of days will be about. I mean, obviously, the President needs to pick up eight additional votes in order to get this bill passed. He's going to do everything he can to get those votes and to get this rule passed so that he can bring the bill to the floor of both Houses where there's no question it will pass with large majorities.

Q But, Dee Dee, what did he offer back, for example, to the members of the Black Caucus who voted against --

MS. MYERS: See, you're asking me to negotiate from this podium, which I've said I'm not going to do.

Q I'm just asking for some hint of what may be --

MS. MYERS: That's just not for me to do.

Q Some ancient history -- correct me if I'm wrong. Has anything ever happened to the military official, head of the military office. Is he still in place here?

MS. MYERS: He is. And again, I think Leon Panetta has said that he's reevaluating the staff and will make decisions in the context of that overall review.

Q Have there been any internal changes to the staff that have not been announced or changes of reporting or anything like that?

MS. MYERS: I think there have been, certainly have been a number of procedural changes internally in the way, I think, business is done. I think that Mr. Panetta has moved quickly to try to increase accountability and clarify lines of authority. And I think people have felt the positive benefits of those changes. And I think that as time continues, he'll continue to make adjustments as he sees necessary.

Q Is Chad being forced out? (Laughter.)

MS. MYERS: I can't comment on that.

Q Is Jimmy Hoffa buried in the Rose Garden?

MS. MYERS: Isn't he in the pool? (Laughter.)

Q Any statement on the capture of Carlos the Jackal?

MS. MYERS: Certainly, the United States government is grateful to Sudan for their help in arranging this, and to the French government for their work on this. It's something that the international community has been pursuing for nearly 20 years, and I think is obviously a positive step. And it does prove that when the international community works together, terrorists can be apprehended and caught, and that's important.

Q Did the United States help in any way?

MS. MYERS: There's been an ongoing effort, I think, international effort for nearly 20 years. Certainly the U.S. has participated in that, and because of pending cases in France, we can't comment beyond that.

Q But in the location of him, was the United States involved in that?

MS. MYERS: Again, because of pending cases in France, we can't comment on the specific details.

Q Dee Dee, are you aware of any Syrian cooperation?

MS. MYERS: I'm not. I just don't know one way or another.

Q Can you explain what you mean by pending cases in France?

MS. MYERS: There are some outstanding cases in France that I think restrict our ability to comment.

Q Was the U.S. informed before it was made public?

MS. MYERS: I don't know how we were informed.

Q Can you be more specific?

MS. MYERS: No, I can't.

Q Dee Dee, the Fed is considering another increase in interest rates, as we understand, in a meeting today. Does the White House have any objection to that?

MS. MYERS: Well, the Fed is independent, but we continue to see positive economic signs within the economy -- steady growth with low to moderate inflation. We don't see any inflationary pressures building up within the economy.

Q Dee Dee, some of the Republicans have been making great fuss over the removal of the sexual predator provision, or the watering down, and of a rape provision. Can you tell us, would the White House support having those provisions --

MS. MYERS: Again, I'm not going to get into negotiating the specific details. I just don't think that's appropriate.

Q -- just to make it a stronger bill, just on principle?

MS. MYERS: I think on principle we would not object to anything that would make it a stronger bill. (Laughter.)

Q Are you saying that you're against any increase in the Fed because of the --

MS. MYERS: No, I'm most specifically not saying that.

Q How did I miss Carlos the Jackal being caught?

END

3:10 P.M. EDT

#196-08/15

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 15, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
AT SIGNING OF THE  
SOCIAL SECURITY INDEPENDENT AGENCY ACT BILL

The Rose Garden

10:40 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Thank you, Senator Moynihan, Chairman Gibbons, Secretary Shalala. To all the distinguished members of Congress who are here, especially Senators Mitchell and Dole and the Speaker, and to one who is not here -- Andy Jacobs, who worked so hard on this endeavor -- let me thank you all.

Let me especially thank Senator Moynihan, who identified the need to reestablish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency 11 years ago. I was sitting here thinking, when I saw him up here so full of pride that this day had finally come to pass, of two things: First of all, about eight months ago, Senator Moynihan said to me, "We have a lot of important business to do this year. And we'll have to fight like crazy on all of it. But if you will just come out and say you're for an independent Social Security agency, I think we can do this unanimously. And that would be a very good thing for Congress to do." (Laughter.) And then I was wondering whether, if we waited 11 years we could be unanimous about every issue that comes before us. (Laughter.)

I want to thank Senator Moynihan for his persistence and guidance, and all the others who have worked so hard on this legislation.

When Frankly Roosevelt made a speech to the New York legislature in 1931, he said this: "The success or failure of any government must be measured by the well-being of its citizens." That was the goal that moved him 59 years ago yesterday. On that day, in a ceremony in the Cabinet Room, just behind us, he signed the Social Security Act into law. And that is what guides us today.

With an independent Social Security Administration, we are reinventing our government to streamline our operations so that we can serve the American people better. We are strengthening those things which Social Security ought to do, and taking precautions to make sure it does not do things which it ought not to do. It is proving that government can still work to improve people's lives. And now Social Security, we know, will work even better.

For millions of Americans, that signature 59 years ago transformed old age from a time of fear and want to a period of rest and reward. It empowered many American families as well, freeing them to put their children through college to enrich their own lives, knowing that their parents would not grow old in poverty. Nine years ago, thanks to that effort, for the first time in the history of the United States, the elderly had a lower poverty rate than the rest of the population.

In fighting for Social Security and so much else, President Roosevelt knew that the American people always would have a

MORE

personal stake in overcoming the status quo when the need was great enough. That is something we should all remember as we go into the next few weeks, as we delay the August recess, as we struggle to come to grips with the challenges of this age -- the challenge of crime, the challenge of health care.

These kinds of changes are difficult, but they always have been. In 1935, even Social Security as we know it nearly died in a congressional committee, as senators considered stripping away the old-age pension. Congress almost left town with this and other critical work unfinished. But they found the grit to work on through the summer of 1935, when they didn't have as much air-conditioning as we have today. And they accomplished so much in that period now known as the Second Hundred Days. President Roosevelt said then that that session of Congress would be regarded as historic for all time.

What we do here today maintains that historic commitment. If we keep focus on the work we are sent here to do, what we do here today can be but the precursor of things that we also can do to benefit the American people that will be historic for all time.

Now I'd like to ask the folks here to join me as I sign this bill. In the beginning, I will for a letter or two at least, use the pen that President Roosevelt used 59 years ago yesterday.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

(The bill is signed.)

END

10:45 A.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 15, 1994

REMARKS BY CHIEF OF POLICE DEWEY STOKES,  
MR. STEVEN SPOSATO, MS. JANICE PAYNE, AND MR. MARK KLAAS

The Rose Garden

1:40 P.M. EDT

POLICE CHIEF STOKES: Ladies and gentleman, we are here to address the -- thank you, Mr. President. (Laughter.) You all are standing up. We are here today to discuss a very serious issue to law enforcement in the United States -- the crime bill.

The crime bill was drafted with the input of law enforcement, a law enforcement steering committee over six years ago. This is an important bill for law enforcement, and the for the community, and for the Congress of the United States. They need to stand up, to speak out in unison with us, telling the criminal element, enough is enough.

The assault weapons ban must remain in this legislation. It's a nonnegotiable item. It's off the table as it is a concern to law enforcement and the deaths that we see on the streets today.

The President of the United States, President Clinton, has stood beside law enforcement initially saying that he'd ask for 100,000 law enforcement officers. And through negotiations and through the conference committee, he was successful in succeeding and increasing that from the 50,000 proposed to another 100,000 of which he had initially proposed to hire the law enforcement officers to enforce the laws throughout this country. More law enforcement officers on these streets will make a difference in the terms of fighting crime.

The constructions of prisons are important, and the prevention programs. It's a balanced way to fight crime, and that's what this crime bill is all about -- prevention of crime. We in law enforcement know that if we build prisons, we can fill those prisons. It's getting back to the grass roots in this country and doing something about the problem before it becomes a problem where we spend \$22,000 a year housing criminals. It's prevention. The prevention programs in this bill are good. They've been tried and tested, and the President knows that they have succeeded in some areas of the country and will succeed throughout this country if we only give it a chance.

It's with pleasure today, though, I must move on and introduce to you Steve Sposato. Steve, would you step forward please? (Applause.)

MR. SPOSATO: Last year my wife, Jodie, was brutally killed by a gunman using two assault weapons in an office building in downtown San Francisco. Our daughter, Meghan, only got to know her mother for 10 months of her life. That's indeed a senseless tragedy.

The Republicans say that the crime bill has too much prevention and not enough punishment. Murders like this could have been prevented. The killer had no prior record. His first crime was his last crime, and then he killed himself. He left eight dead and six wounded.

MORE

In 1991, if Congress had passed an assault weapons ban, this terrible tragedy would have been prevented. What is being prevented now is that the Republican leadership, along with the National Rifle Association, is preventing the crime bill from reaching the floor of the House. I've been a Republican for 19 years, and frankly, I am totally disappointed in my party, especially the leadership of my party.

Bill Clinton is our President. I'm working with our President to make sure that the crime bill gets to the House floor for a vote and includes an assault weapon ban. With three-fourths of the entire country in support of an assault weapon ban, how could this type of legislation be blocked? If the American people want it, why can't they get it?

The fact is, this bill did not pass because of a procedural rule, which in itself is a crime. Americans deserve safer streets. I don't want to see any 10-month-old little girls putting dirt on their mother's grave.

The Republicans say the current crime bill is filled with pork. The biggest pork barrel in Washington is the NRA's war chest. The NRA wants one thing -- they want to preserve the billion-dollar gun industry, and that's why they don't want an assault weapon ban to go forward.

The fact is the NRA doesn't give a damn that my wife, Jodie, is dead. The fact is the NRA doesn't give a damn that my daughter, Meghan, will grow up never knowing her mother. Meghan is growing up. Last week she asked me, "Daddy, I want to see mommy." This is the type of senseless punishment that is going on in America. I'd like to explain to Meghan that what happened to mommy won't happen to other mommies, not in this great country of ours.

It's not the crime bill that's being held hostage, it's the American people. I urge you to call your congressman and express your outrage. Pass the crime bill, stop this procedural nonsense. Every day our government waits means more people will die. Partisanship and the interest of the NRA should never come before the safety of ordinary people like you and me. For Jodie, Meghan and I, it's too late. Don't wait until it's too late for you.

And now it is my pleasure to introduce to you a person who has also endured some senseless punishment, Janice Payne. (Applause.)

MS. PAYNE: Hi, my name is Janice Payne. I'm from New Orleans, Louisiana. On April the 29th as a class project, my son James wrote a letter to the President asking him to stop the killing in the city.

He said, "I think that somebody might kill me. I'm asking you nicely to stop it. I know you could, so please do it. I know you could." Then, nine days later, my son's life was taken away -- May the 8th, Mother's Day.

My son never talked to me about how afraid he was of the violence in our city. Just like James, there are other innocent children out there who are afraid of the violence.

Maybe if everyone pulled together and they helped the President get the crime bill passed, we as a community could pull together and do something about the senseless killing of our children. Maybe the parents of innocent children that were murdered senselessly could get together and try to do something about the violence around us.

I'm not letting my son die in vain. There is a song that has been written, "In the Name of James," that should be released by mid-October. There are singers such as Jermaine Neville donating their time and talents towards "In the Name of James." In the song, one of the verses is, "We wish the world would change/In the name of James. No child should die this way/In the name of James. Don't take away our children, our childhood/Just because you're up to no good. Let the children play for goodness sake/ Don't take their dreams away/In the names of James."

My last note on the violence that surrounds us is that, as parents, we should pull together and help save our children's lives. Thank you. I would now like to introduce you to Mark Klaas. (Applause.)

MR. KLAAS: I'm Mark Klaas. It's too late for my daughter Polly. However, it's not too late for your children or the 65 victims of violent crime that will die every day, or the 288 women who will be raped every day, or the 700 people who will be the victims of aggravated assault every day between now and the time the crime bill becomes law.

Unlike the politicians who are debating this issue, I am not running for an office. I am here to do the right thing. I am here because I demand -- and the American people demand -- that our government live up to its most fundamental duty, which is the protection of its citizens. Any government that cannot protect the physical security of its citizens is an ineffective government.

We, the American people, are being held hostage by partisan politics and special interest groups. We deserve better than this. I don't want special interests on either side to influence this vitally important crime bill. The fear of crime is the most important issue facing America today. We deserve to feel protected in our homes and on our streets. The fear of crime makes innocent citizens feel like prisoners in their own homes. Let us remove that fear.

Women and children must be protected from the horror of rape and molestation. Innocent citizens must be safeguarded from the fear of murder and violent assault. Violent criminals must get what they deserve -- long sentences and truth in sentencing.

One of the many necessary items in the crime bill is a well-constructed three strikes law that targets repeat violent felons; a three strikes law that sends a clear message -- you do the crime and spend the rest of your miserable, destructive life in prison where you can no longer wreak havoc on innocent people.

We have left our safety up to the politicians for too long. They are up for reelection in less than two months. They will be asking us to return them to Washington, D.C. If their total disregard for the safety of innocent citizens is an example of the type of representation we can expect from them, then our decision on election day should be quite clear.

This issue is not about money; it's about life and death. There is no more time to lose. I know. Because our lives and the lives of our children can change in the blink of an eye. Many thousands of us are affected by violent crime every day. Please call or write your member of Congress now. Demand that they wage war against violent crime in America now. Demand that they vote for the crime bill now. When you tuck your children into bed and kiss them good night, do it with the knowledge that you have instructed your congressperson to support the crime bill now.

It's too late for Polly. But the rest of the children in this great country can still use your help.

Ladies and gentlemen, I've corresponded and spoken with the President on several occasions now. And I've always raised the issue of children and crimes against children. And he's responded with more than just words. He's responded with a good bill. He addressed it many times in the State of the Union address. And I know that having a young daughter himself brings him much closer to this issue. And it is my very great honor and my very great pleasure to introduce the President of the United States. Thank you.  
(Applause.)

END

1:50 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 15, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
AT CRIME BILL EVENT

The Rose Garden

1:55 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Thank you very much, Mark, Janice, Steve, and Dewey, and to all the rest of you who are here. We have just heard from the real American interests in the crime bill.

Last week, the House of Representatives walked away from Polly Klaas and Jody Sposato and James Darby, and all the law enforcement officials in this country who have worked so very hard for this crime bill. When you walk away from our police officers and from our kids, from our hard-working citizens with their futures before them, or our senior citizens who have given their lives to make this a better country, and you do it on a procedural trick so you can still go back home and pretend that you didn't vote against the crime bill, and you would even have voted for it had it only come to a vote, there's something wrong with the American system of government.

And it finds its way into the lives of people that are still around. Polly's sister, Annie, told me she's still afraid of being kidnapped, so she's built an elaborate alarm system in her room with ropes and bells. There's something wrong when James Darby and his classmates who are still living were so afraid of violence that they had to participate in a special program to help them cope with it. And the worst part of their fears is that there's truth behind them.

Yes, this is the greatest country in the world, and the longest-lasting democracy in the world. And none of us would live anywhere else for anything. But we have to face the fact that we have the highest murder rate in the world and that our children are more at risk here than they would be in most other countries and all other advanced countries, because we have simply failed to act with the discipline and determination necessary to preserve democracy's most fundamental obligation -- the maintenance of law and order -- without which freedom and progress cannot proceed.

The crime bill makes three strikes and you're out the law of the land, puts 100,000 police on the street, builds more prisons to lock up serious offenders, takes handguns away from juveniles and bans assault weapons, and provides investments and prevention to give our kids a better start in life; deals more sensibly with the terrible scourge of drugs that are responsible for so many of the crimes we have. These are things which ought to be done.

How can the House explain to Mark Klaas why the law that might have saved his daughter's life had it been enacted years ago couldn't come up for a vote? How could a politician go to a little child like Meghan Sposato and explain that, well, they just couldn't figure out a way to bring to a vote a law that would have taken the deadly weapon that killed her mother out of the hands of a deranged person? And how could a member of Congress explain to James Darby's

MORE

mother why they won't put police on the street who might have allowed little James to complete his last walk home?

If Washington had acted six years ago, some of these lives might have been saved. If Washington will act this week, a whole lot of lives can still be saved.

Last Friday I met with some police officers in Minnesota. I told them that they had never walked away from us and that Washington should not walk away from them. Well, the parents of this country should have the same pledge. And the children of this country should have the same pledge. You heard Janice say that in James Darby's wonderful letter to me, which I have read over and over and over again since last Mother's Day -- he said, "I know you could do something about this, and I'm asking you nicely to do it."

Well, my fellow Americans, we have asked the Congress nicely long enough. There should be no more excuses, no more tricks, no more delays -- and no more discussion about whether this bill is a Democratic bill or a Republican bill or a Clinton bill. I don't know when I will ever be able to get it across to people here that what we do here is not about us. It is about the rest of America. So let Congress here this: Pass the Darby-Klaas-Sposato crime bill and do it now.

Thank you. (Applause.)

END

2:02 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 14, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
DURING CHURCH SERVICES

Full Gospel AME Zion Church  
Temple Hills, Maryland

1:25 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you so much. If you've been listening to the news the last few days, you know that the President has had his annual loss of voice. (Laughter.) But when I heard the choir today I kind of got my voice back. (Laughter.)

First, Pastor and Mrs. Cherry, on behalf of my wife, my daughter and all of our company here, thank you so much for making us feel at home today. This was a beautiful, wonderful day for us. We've brought some old friends of ours that we've known for many years, and several members of our White House staff. Our good friend, Congressman Albert Winn joined us -- we're glad to see you. Thank you so much, sir.

I came here today of two minds. Usually, on summer Sundays like this, Hillary and Chelsea and I go up to Camp David, and we go to the beautiful little chapel in the woods there. And instead of being in a vast church, we worship at 9:00 a.m. on Sunday morning with about 50 people, and about six or seven people singing in the choir -- (laughter) -- including the President, who gets to sight read the music when he can talk. (Laughter.)

I wanted to come here today for two reasons. First of all, because, as it turned out, I needed to hear the sermon. (Laughter and applause.) Next week, Pastor, I'll try to be a little more like Jehoshaphat. (Laughter and applause.) Maybe I won't have to ask you face all our enemies all at once. (Laughter.)

The second reason I wanted to be here is that this church to me symbolizes what American should be all about right now. And it also, I believe, came about because of all the things that America should not be about right now. I mean, let me ask you, how is it that a church in 1981 could start with 24 members, and in 1994 could have 16,000 members? How could an African American church with all of the cliches people say about the black community in America have 16,000 members and over 40 percent of them be males? (Applause.)

God has worked through this Pastor and his wife and his family and all of you. But why did you have to come into being? Because of this great hole that's in our country now. Because of the breakdown of the families and the communities, and the loss of the things which hold people together inside and out -- not just the spiritual problems, but the jobs, too, and the opportunities and the things which make people believe in the future on this Earth.

And in that great vacuum, look what has usually happened. When people lose hope and lose their families and lose their communities and lose their sense of right and wrong, what has so often happened? Seventy percent increase in America in 10 years in the number of children being born out of wedlock. And let's get the whole record on -- today the fastest growth is among young, white

MORE

women giving birth out of wedlock. Soon, if we don't do something about it, we'll all be equal -- too high.

In 10 years, a doubling of the rate of murder among teenage young people. Sixty-five people in America get killed every day. While we've been in church, another teenager has been murdered. Every two hours a teenager gets murdered in America. And in this great vacuum, you have teen pregnancy and drugs and crime and, worst of all, violence.

I wanted to come here because you are filling that void from the ground up and from the inside out. And I believe that this church could never have come into existence and exploded the way it has if everybody had been in a church, in a family, in a community, in a job, and had hope and direction inside and outside, and structure.

You've filled a vacuum with something good and pure and wonderful. And I thank you for it. It's beyond the reach of any president to do. It is God's work through a religious ministry. But the Bible says that the rest of us has ministries, too.

Do you remember when Martin Luther King said if you're just a street sweeper, just sweep the streets as if you were Michelangelo, painting the Sistine Chapel. (Applause.) Everybody has a job to do. And today, I don't think we have a bigger job in trying to keep our children alive and rebuild our families; and rebuild our communities; and to try to communicate some sense of right and wrong; and to give our kids something to say yes to, as well as something to say no to. It's two sides of the same coin.

And I'll tell you, before I got here, I've been pretty down the last two or three days because the Congress voted that crime bill down. Not because it's the answer to all life's problems; here is the answer to all life's problems. (Applause.) But because this country is literally coming apart at the seams for millions of our young people. And because there are too many streets where old folks are afraid to sit and talk, and children are afraid to play. Because we're not really free anymore and people aren't free to pursue the American Dream anymore as long as we feel like we can just tear each other apart. Because our police officers go out on the streets where the gangs are supposed to -- are better armed than they are. And things are all mixed up now in our country. And so often it seems that petty political things, or superficial divisions keep us from doing what in our heart we know is right.

And I have been so troubled at the thought that at least those of us who have been given this authority by you -- the President, the Congress -- the least we can do is to help you to save the lives of your children. There are children in this church who have been gunned down; I know it. The least we can do is to help you to be protected. The least we can do is to put people on the streets who can not only catch criminals, but prevent crime as good law enforcement officers. The least we can do if people are totally hopeless is to get them out of your hair so they won't be bothering you. And the least we can do is to, yes, give your children more things they can say yes to, not just things they can say no to.

That's what all that debate was about in the crime bill. It really wasn't about whether if you had written the crime bill or I had or anybody else, it would have been just the way it turned out to be. What is a democracy, after all, but people getting together and putting their different ideas and then arguing it out and having a bunch of votes and a majority rules?

Alexis de Toqueville said many years ago, this was a good country, and as long as it was a good country it could be a great country. We're around after 218 years because more than half

the time more than half the people have been right, and God has permitted us to stay and go and flourish. I believe that. Do you?

AUDIENCE: Yesss.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that's what this is all about. We don't have a bigger problem than the violence which is eating the heart out of this country, and the breakdown of the basic fabric of values that says it is wrong to hurt other people; it is wrong to act in an instant for some momentary advantage in ways that will devastate other people's lives; it is wrong to take this kind of advantage. And we have to find a way out of this that punishes wrongdoers, yes, but that also offers the hand of hope, that rebuilds our people from the grass roots up.

And in a political moment, the Congress walked away from that last week. There are people in my part of the country, good people -- they are in their churches today just like we're here -- who say, we don't break the law, and we go hunting every time they open the season, and we don't want any weapons being banned. These 19 assault weapons, folks -- I had a .22 when I was 12; you don't need an assault weapon to shoot a deer or to kill quail. (Laughter.) If you're that bad a shot, you ought to be doing something else. (Laughter.) You shouldn't be hunting. But their fears are all welled up in them and they scare some of their members of Congress.

Then there are people who represent places where all the children can go to the ballpark, where they've got a place to go swimming in the summertime, where they're in church two or three times a week; and they literally cannot imagine what it is like for some of our children. And so they say, oh, these programs to let these kids play basketball at midnight instead of walk the streets are pork.

I tell you, folks, I will have to, like all the rest of you, answer to God for everything I have done, right or wrong. We all will. I have been a governor. I have presided over the execution of criminals. I have built prison cells. I believe in punishing wrongdoing. I think when people go out and deliberately hurt each other, somebody ought to do something to them and stop it. I believe that. And that's what this bill does.

But I also know that there are countless little children out there, and they could go one way or the other. You know what the best thing about this day to me was? When everybody was asked to come up here, there were all those beautiful young people standing here. They've got a chance now. And we have to give more of them a chance now.

I came here because I needed to hear the sermon. I came here because your church stands for what our country ought to be and where it ought to go. I came here because the Bible says that good Christians are also supposed to be good citizens. And I ask you this whole week to pray for me and pray for the members of Congress; ask us not to turn away from our ministry.

Our ministry is to do the work of God here on Earth. And that starts with giving our children and our families a place in which at least they can be safe and secure. It starts with standing up against this mindless violence which has torn the hearts out of people who are this church and nearly every church in the United States. It starts with trying to put families back together. And it is not the province of any one race. It is increasingly not the province of any region or any economic group. But it savages the poor the worst because that is where the families are most broken.

And I ask you to pray, and to speak to your friends and neighbors and to hope somehow we will all find the wisdom and the

judgment to come back and do the will of God in our ministries, which is to make you as safe as we possibly can.

Thank you so much for giving us this wonderful day with you. God bless you all. (Applause.)

END

1:40 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 13, 1994

RADIO ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT  
TO THE NATION

Camp David

10:06 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. As I'm sure you know, a couple of days ago the House of Representatives had a chance to pass the toughest attack on crime in our history. And they tried to take the easy way out. But the terrible threat of crime and violence is too great for us to let them get away with it. The easy way out is not an option.

Two hundred and twenty-five members of Congress participated in a procedural trick orchestrated by the National Rifle Association and intensely pushed by the Republican congressional leadership -- a trick designed with one thing in mind, to put the protection of partisan and special interests over the protection of ordinary American families. They ought to be ashamed of themselves.

The American people have been very clear on this. The most important job is to keep the streets and the neighborhoods of America safe. The first responsibility of government is law and order. Without it, people can never really pursue the American Dream. And without it, we're not really free. And the American people have said over and over again, today they're worried about crime. They're fighting for their personal security.

The House of Representatives has a responsibility to do something about it, but this week the House walked away from that responsibility. They had a vote on law and order, and law and order lost. But that can't be the end of this fight. The hard-working, law-abiding citizens of the United States deserve better.

Yesterday I went to Minnesota, where I addressed the National Association of Police Organizations. This group represents more than 150,000 police officers across the country. They strongly support the crime bill. Earlier in the week, I met with the heads of every major law enforcement group in America. Together, they represent over a half-million law enforcement officers. They don't walk away from their responsibility. They put their lives on the line every day for us. And we can't let Congress walk away from them.

The crime bill we're fighting for is a crime bill America's police officers and law enforcement officials want. Our prosecutors, our teachers, our principals, our parents, our attorneys general, our community leaders -- they've all joined these police organizations in endorsing this crime bill. For six years Congress has bickered and battled over a crime bill when the average violent felon only serves four years in prison.

This crime bill departs from all those labels of the past, from liberal or conservative, or tough or compassionate. This crime bill emphasizes punishment, police and protection.

Some people in Congress say it's time for their August vacation. Well, the crime-plaguing ordinary American is not about to

MORE

take a vacation, and it's only fitting that Congress stay in Washington until they get this job done. They can't walk away on a procedural trick.

I want a crime bill that puts 100,000 new police officers on the street; one that makes three strikes and you're out the law of the land; one that builds prisons to lock up violent criminals where they belong; one that takes handguns away from minors; one that provides prevention programs that police officers demand to help steer our kids in troubled areas away from crime and drugs in the first place. And the bills must be paid for not by raising taxes, but by cutting the federal bureaucracy.

I gave the Congress a plan to reduce the federal bureaucracy by 250,000 and more over the next five years, to bring the federal government to its lowest level in 30 years and to put all the savings in a trust fund to pay for the crime bill. And let me be clear about this: The crime bill must ban the assault weapons that have no place on our streets.

We don't need any more Washington, D.C. games like the House of Representatives played last week. Up until that vote, this crime bill was bipartisan all the way, with Republicans and Democrats voting for everything that must be included. Now the Republicans say, well, there's too much money for prevention in this bill. They call it pork. Well, all I know is, all the police officers in this country know we need to give kids something to say yes to.

I know that 65 Republicans voted for a bill that had even more prevention funds back in the spring, but only 11 would stand up to the withering pressure of their leadership when the bill came back and was ready to pass just this week.

The American people have to make it clear to members of Congress from both parties that even if they disagree with a particular measure in this crime bill, the overall bill is the best, the smartest bill we have ever had in this country, and the American people need it. It's time to put politics aside and finish the job. Help our nation's police officers make our streets safer.

This fight is not over. I am continuing it. I want you to fight with me. Our children, our families, our future deserve no less.

Thank you for listening.

END

10:11 A.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 12, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT UPON DEPARTURE  
SOUTH LAWN  
THE WHITE HOUSE

8:12 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Ladies and gentleman, last night when 225 members of Congress voted with the NRA and the Republican Congressional Leadership, under enormous pressure, they decided that their political security was more important than the personal security of the American people. They said no to 100,000 police on the street, no to getting guns and kids off the street, no to protecting our police forces and our citizens against gangs with assault weapons, no to giving our kids some things to say yes to -- as well as something to say no to -- no to three strikes and you're out, and the toughest punishment laws ever passed by the United States Congress.

We are going out now, the Cabinet, mayors of both parties, citizens of both parties all across this country to say that this crime bill cannot die. Congress has an obligation to the American people that goes way beyond politics and way beyond party. The American people have said over and over this is their first concern. If we can't meet this concern, there is something badly wrong in Washington. And we are going today, starting now, to the National Association of Police Officers Conference to carry this battle back. We are going to fight and fight and fight until we win this battle for the American people.

Thank you very much.

END

## THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary  
(Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota)

For Immediate Release

August 12, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT,  
PHILADELPHIA MAYOR EDWARD RENDELL,  
AND NEW YORK MAYOR RUDOLPH GIULIANI  
TO THE 16TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF  
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POLICE ORGANIZATIONS

Marriott City Center  
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota

1:00 P.M. CDT

MAYOR RENDELL: What happened yesterday in Washington is an outrage. It's an outrage against the people of Philadelphia; it's an outrage against the people of Minneapolis and St. Paul; and it's an outrage against the people of America.

Before I was Mayor, I spent 17 years in law enforcement, nine as an assistant D.A. and eight as the District Attorney of Philadelphia. And for all that time I listened to the debate on crime in Washington. And everybody talked tough about crime; everybody had fancy rhetoric and tough talk. But nobody was willing to put up one nickel to help us, to help us in the street, to help us in the prosecutor's office, to help these policemen do their job.

We have a President who is the first President in recent memory who was willing to put his money where his mouth was, who was willing to do something real to help America deal with its number-one problem: crime in our streets, crime in our houses, crime everywhere. This President ought to be commended.

"This crime bill ought to be passed -- no "ifs," "ands," and "buts."

Let me tell you what this crime bill is not about. It is not about partisanship. On our stage today we have Mayor Rudolph Giuliani, the great Mayor of New York, who happens to be a Republican. You've heard loud and clear yesterday from Mayor Richard Riordan of Los Angeles, who happens to be a Republican. Mayors across this country who know what crime does, how it eats away the fabric of our society and our cities and our towns; mayors understand that this isn't a Republican or Democratic issue. We are united: The crime bill must be passed.

And this is not about pork. Does anybody think that increasing the number of uniformed police officers on the streets of America by over 15 percent is pork? Does anybody think that building \$8 billion worth of new prisons to hold dangerous criminals in is pork? Does anybody think programs that give kids a chance to be trained for jobs and get off drugs is pork?

Well, if they do, they're sadly mistaken, and they're playing Russian Roulette with this nation's future.

So for all of us, for all Americans, for all of our citizens, we must dedicate ourselves today to an all-out effort -- none of us can rest until this crime bill, which will put 100,000 new police on the streets of Philadelphia, thousands more in towns and cities across this country -- until that crime bill is a reality. Police, prisons and prevention. It won't solve

MORE

all of our problems with crime, but it will get us a long way down the road.

Let's dedicate ourselves today not to just talk about it, but to go out and do it in the next several days. Let's get this bill passed -- for our citizens in Philadelphia, for your citizens in Minneapolis and St. Paul, and for all the people of America. (Applause.)

\* \* \* \* \*

MAYOR GIULIANI: Thank you very much. The Mayor of St. Paul was originally from Brooklyn. And the borough president of Brooklyn, who happens to be a Democrat, Mr. President, tells me that one out of seven people actually came from Brooklyn. (Laughter.) It's true, don't you think? Tommy, do you think that's true?

I've spent a good deal of my life in law enforcement, fighting crime. I grew up in a family in which I had four uncles who were police officers. And from the time I was a very little boy, they were my heroes -- and they continue to be my heroes because they're fighting a battle that, unfortunately, is a very difficult one and getting much worse. It's true of big cities like Philadelphia, like New York, like Minneapolis, like Los Angeles, but it's true of all the suburban areas in America and it's true of the rural areas in America -- we have too much crime.

Our people are telling us that. Our people are worried about that. They're concerned about it, and they have a right to be. And it is not a simple problem. It doesn't have a single answer to it. Yes, we need more police. This bill provides more police -- not just for the big cities, but for all of the areas of America. We need more police in all of the areas of America.

But we also need more jails, and we need more prisons. And this bill provides more jails and more prisons. And we need tougher penalties against crime. And this bill provides tougher penalties against crime. And we need the death penalty, and we need it enforced in a more sensible way. And this bill provides that.

But we also need to provide hope for the future. We need young people growing up with more hope than some of the young people who are growing up today, so that we aren't constantly fighting what appears to be a losing battle. And this bill also provides money and programs that try to help young people have hope for their future.

Much more of the money in this bill is provided for cops, for jails, for prisons and for law enforcement. But some of it is provided for programs that are designed to say to young people who are growing up with no hope that maybe they can have a better future. We need to do that for them, but maybe even more importantly, we need to do that for ourselves if want to, in a sensible way, in a decent way and a humane way, provide a better future for all of us.

So I think this is a balanced bill. Sure, there are things in it that probably someone disagrees with, you can find to disagree with or I can find to disagree with. And I am sure there are parts of this the President disagrees with. But it's been a long time in putting it together. And it makes the single biggest step forward in the most sensible way, fighting the short-term and long-term problems of crime than any piece of legislation that we're likely to get in a very long time. It would be a shame if we lost it over procedural possibilities, rules, over partisanship.

MORE

This is something in which just as many Republicans as Democrats supported this. Just as many Republicans as Democrats should be proud to support it. It's a time in which Republicans and Democrats can come together and work for the good of our entire country. We don't get as many opportunities as we should to do that any longer. This is one in which we get the opportunity to do it -- to step beyond partisanship and try to help the country.

So I am very, very proud to say, not only as the Mayor of New York City and as someone involved in law enforcement, but as a Republican, that I support this bill, I believe it's necessary and will do everything I can to help the President to pass it.

And thank you very much, Mr. President, for having the courage to carry on this fight. God bless you. (Applause.)

Since I began by telling you that police officers are my heroes, I get the great privilege and the honor to introduce a sergeant right here in your police department, a representative to NAPO, a police officer who has a long and distinguished career as a police officer, but also a police officer who goes into the schools and teaches young people about the dangers of drugs.

This is one of these programs that people call prevention that some people are disturbed about. These are exactly the kinds of programs that we need, exactly the kinds of programs that we need more of.

And, Sergeant Ganley, will you please come forward, because I'd like to shake your hand and thank you very, very much. (Applause.)

SERGEANT GANLEY: Thank you, everybody. My name is Sergeant Mick Ganley. I'm the president of the Minnesota Police and Peace Officers Association. I'm a 23-year veteran of the Minneapolis Police Department. And as Rudy indicated, I'm currently serving as a DARE officer with the Minneapolis Police Department.

As a working police officer, I can tell you that I represent 6,000 cops, working cops in the State of Minnesota. And we have joined hands with NAPO and represent thousands of officers across the country. And in Washington, D.C., the debate for years has been whether a crime bill should focus on punishment or pro-prevention. I can tell you that as a working law enforcement professional out on the street every day, we need the tools to compete in today's world.

The criminals are arming themselves better and better daily. They use the automatic weapons to ply their trade, and we need support that is in this crime bill. We've been working for several years, attempting to get a comprehensive crime control package passed and enacted so that we can go forward and make some progress.

I know that a lot of people talk about winning the war on crime. I think that a major piece of this is something that my grandmother used to tell me when I was a young kid and Grandma Kirwin told me so many times, it's kind of in my mind. And that is an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. I think we always have to keep that in mind, that our goal really is to keep these kids out of prison. But if they grow up to go into prison, then we have to have the facilities to house them.

It's unconscionable for me to think that special interest groups can derail all of the hard work that has been done over the years to put together this package, this positive law enforcement package. I can tell you that President Clinton

and law enforcement have been working hand in hand to get this package together and make it become a reality.

I have never -- and I've talked to other enforcement professionals -- we have never had the support from the White House that we have today. And I can tell you as I stand here today that President Bill Clinton is one of the best friends that law enforcement has ever had. (Applause.)

At this time I'd like to tell you that I am truly humble, it's a great professional honor and a distinct personal privilege to present to you the President of the United States. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Thank you very much, Sergeant Ganley, for your introduction and for your life of commitment.

I'm glad to be here again with Mayor Sayles Belton and Mayor Coleman in the Twin Cities area. I want to thank Senator Wellstone and Congressman Vento for flying home with me. And I want to thank Congressman Vento, along with Tim Penny, David Minge, Martin Sabo, Jim Oberstar and Jim Ramstad for voting for safer streets and a brighter future last night in the United States House. (Applause.)

I want to thank Tom Scott and my longtime friend, Bob Scully, and the other members of NAPO -- Dennis Flaherty and others -- for their support for all the elements of this crime bill.

And I'd like to thank especially the two mayors who flew here with me today, one a Republican, one a Democrat, both former prosecutors, people who believe in the promise of our country and our future, and understand that unless we do something about crime we're never going to fulfill it. Ed Rendell and Rudolph Giuliani represent what this country ought to be about -- people belonging to the political party of their choice, but when the time comes putting party aside and putting people first. And I thank them, and I wish we had more like them in the United States Congress. (Applause.)

Now, folks, you all know what happened last night. The House of Representatives tried to take the easy way out; tried to walk away from the crime bill. Because of organized, intense and highly political pressure, a majority walked away -- away from the police patrolling our streets, away from the children and the senior citizens afraid to walk on those streets, away from all the hard-working middle-class Americans who were not organized into any group, but who had told us over and over again that crime is their first concern, and pleaded with us to do something about it.

The people of Minneapolis know that taking the easy way out is no longer an option. Two years ago next month, Officer Jerry Haaf was shot in the back in a restaurant by gang members. Today his wife, Marilyn, their two children and their two grandchildren and one son-in-law came to be with me and to meet with me. I'd like to ask them to stand up and be recognized. (Applause.)

Their husband, father, grandfather gave everything he had to the Minneapolis police force for 30 years, and he and his family deserve better than what they got from the House of Representatives last night. (Applause.)

You know, we had a wonderful visit in there. It never occurred to me or to Mayor Giuliani or to Mayor Rendell or to Congressman Vento or Senator Wellstone, who were in there visiting with his family, to ask them whether they were Republicans or Democrats or independents. I don't have a clue.

And I don't care. They're entitled to better than they got from the House of Representatives last night. (Applause.)

Every day, the police of this country, including those in this wonderful national organization who are convening here, put on uniforms and badges and walk on streets, into problems, risking their lives to serve people they're sworn to protect. They don't run from their responsibilities. They don't hide behind tricks. And they don't walk away from their folks. If they did, think what would happen to the United States.

That's why the walk-away last night in Congress is so disturbing. The first responsibility of government is law and order. Without that, freedom can never really be fully alive. Without that, people can never really pursue the American Dream.

The police here know that. That's what their lives are all about. Most ordinary Americans, without regard to their party, know that deep down in their bones. Last night we had a vote on democracy's most fundamental responsibility -- and law and order lost, 210 to 225.

Two hundred and twenty-five members of the Congress participated in a procedural trick orchestrated by the National Rifle Association and intensely promoted by the Republican congressional leadership; a trick designed with one thing in mind, to put the protection of partisan and special interests over the protection of ordinary Americans and still leave what Mr. Scotto called the Jackie Mason trick -- "well, I would have voted for it if only it had been there for me to vote on."

It's the same old Washington game, just stick it to ordinary Americans because special interests can keep you in Congress forever; and special interests can beat you because they're organized and they have money and they can confuse God-fearing, hard-working, ordinary Americans.

Well, goodness knows, I've seen a lot of that in my time, as your President and even before. But the time has come for those of you to say that the only way for Congress to make their seats safe is to make the rest of America safer. (Applause.)

When I ran for this office, and when I went to Washington, I had dreams that many said were naive. I really dreamed that we could govern in Washington the way most mayors and governors do; that somehow we would be able to go beyond the labels that colored our view of the past, beyond Republican and Democrat and liberal and conservative, and whether you were for punishment and prevention in this case.

Those old left-right deals, they make great headlines, but they often don't do anything to solve people's problems. They're great in 30-second ads, throwing those rhetorical bombs over the wall at your opponent, but they don't keep any kids alive, or help any families to get through the day. And we're in a whole new era in which everything in the world is changing, and we cannot afford to be bound by the categories of the past.

The thing I like so much about this crime bill -- Mayor Giuliani's right -- if he sat down alone and wrote it, it wouldn't be just like it is. If I sat down alone and wrote it, it wouldn't be just like it is. But the thing that's so good about it is that it rejects all those false choices that the politics of the past always tries to impose on ordinary people in our complicated lives. It says, no more false choices, let's do what common sense dictates.

And the reason it does is that this bill was largely the handiwork of people in law enforcement. We never had a bill before that was endorsed by every major law enforcement group in

the entire United States. So it puts 100,000 police on the street. It says three strikes and you're out is the law of the land, and makes available more funds for prisons to house serious offenders. It bans handgun ownership for juveniles and bans assault weapons that gangs and thugs use to outgun the police. But it also protects 650 specifically named hunting and sporting weapons, something the American people too often are not told.

It imposes tougher penalties for violent crimes, all right. There is a death penalty for killing an officer of the law in the line of duty. But it also has the prevention funds in there. You heard these people in law enforcement talking about it. It makes my blood boil when I hear people talking about pork. Because, you see, I have seen the eyes of schoolchildren after the DARE officer has talked to them.

I remember when the DARE program came into my child's elementary school and how it affected the way she looked at the whole issue of drugs and her personal responsibility, and how it affected all those kids who never had a daddy at home to say this is right, or this is wrong, who didn't have a job in the home to say, this is the future you can have.

Who are we trying to kid with all of this rhetoric? Talk to people like us, who have been to the funerals of police officers gunned down in the line of duty, and I dare you to find one person who knows anything about this, who's not for tougher punishment and more prevention. (Applause.)

Just imagine what would be happening in America today if Congress had yesterday voted to take 100,000 police officers off of the street, to put 19 more kinds of assault weapons on the street. To get rid of prison space for 100,000 criminals. Well, that's what they did -- no to 100,000 police, no to the juvenile ownership of handguns ban, no to the assault weapons ban, no to three strikes and you're out, no to the prisons, no to the prevention.

You know, this is the kind of political mess Congress has been caught in over this crime bill for six years. Before I ever showed up under two previous presidents is politics -- everybody talk about crime, nothing ever got done for six years. The average violent criminal only stays in prison four years. We let a whole generation go by with nothing getting done.

Now, last night, we gave the Congress a chance a chance to put people ahead of politics, to go with police and punishment and prevention, and until last night, I really thought they would. Until last night, this crime bill was a bipartisan effort to the core.

The first time the bill came up in the House of Representatives, the assault weapons ban wasn't in it, but there was even more prevention money in it, and 65 Republicans voted for the crime bill last April with the prevention money they now attack in the bill.

In May, 38 Republicans voted for the assault weapons ban with the 650 hunting and sporting weapons protected. But when the crime bill came back to the House, it had even more police, more prisons, tougher penalties. And the assault weapons ban they had already adopted.

Then, instead of 65 Republicans, or even 38, only 11 brave Republicans, including Jim Ramstad from Minnesota -- (applause) -- stood up and did the right thing. The rest, including 19 Republicans who voted for everything in this bill, and more than 50 who voted for the prevention programs they now attack, walked away and turned it into a partisan issue.

Yes, they were joined in voting no by some Democrats, a handful of whom were, on grounds of conscience, opposed to the death penalty; most of whom came from places like

my home. They come from small-town, rural America where hunting is important, where the crime rates tend to be lower, where the NRA is very successful, it's scaring people with misinformation.

But you know something -- there were a lot of Democrats who voted against the assault weapons ban who came back and voted for the crime bill last night. There were some Democrats who were deeply opposed to capital punishment, and they still voted for the crime bill last night because they put the safety of the people of this country first.

We need more Democrats, and we need more Republicans to follow the lead of those 11 brave Republicans and the Democrats who put aside their differences with certain specific provisions to put the American people first. That is what we must have -- more people like that. People who believe in you and your future and will not take the easy way out. The walk-away crowd has got to change. (Applause.)

You know that we didn't get you a crime bill yesterday. But we're going to get you a crime bill. We are going to get you a crime bill. (Applause.)

To all the police officers in this country who walk out there for us every day -- Washington cannot walk away from you. And all the ordinary Americans who are just out there watching this unfold, hearing all the rhetorical wars back and forth, who know there's no American association for ordinary citizens up there walking the halls of Congress -- we're not going to walk away from you either.

Yes, it was a defeat yesterday, and I felt terrible about it. But this morning I woke up feeling good because that's a vote I'd much rather be on the losing side of than the winning side. I am glad I will never have to explain to my wife, my daughter, my grandchildren and the people who sent me to Washington why I did something like what was done to the American people yesterday.

Let us turn it around and put the people of this country first.

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

END

1:59 P.M. CDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 12, 1994

REMARKS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT  
IN SWEARING-IN CEREMONY OF  
SUPREME COURT JUSTICE STEPHEN G. BREYER

The East Room

3:40 P.M. EST

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Thank you very much. To the First Lady, I'd like to give my thanks. The President asked me, since he cannot say what he wanted to say on this occasion -- which is so important for our country -- to express some of the sentiments that he would have otherwise expressed in person.

However, we're going to, first of all, have the main event, the swearing-in. Immediately after the oath of office, the new justice will make remarks and at the conclusion of his remarks I will express some sentiments on behalf of the President and our country and myself.

But first of all, let me ask Justice Scalia and Judge and Mrs. Breyer to come forward.

(Justice Breyer is sworn in.)

JUSTICE BREYER: Thank you, Mr. Vice President. Justice Scalia, thank you. Mrs. Clinton, thank you. And really, each and every one of you, thank you very, very much, indeed.

I'm very grateful to President Clinton for appointing me to a position of such great responsibility. I appreciate the personal time and attention that the President gave to the selection process, as well as the able work of the White House staff. And I am also very grateful, too, to the Senate Judiciary Committee; and especially its chairman, Senator Biden; its ranking Republican, Senator Hatch; and, of course, particularly, to the member and former chairman of that committee whose support has meant so much to me over the years and from whom I have learned so much, Senator Kennedy, who is probably the newest grandfather in this room. (Applause.)

As you know, I've had great respect for the Senate Judiciary Committee for years, ever since I was a young staff lawyer -- I hate to tell you, almost two decades ago is when I first started. And that committee has a proud history, a central role in preserving our democracy and defending the rule of law. I thank the committee and the full Senate for their decision to confirm me, and I will do my very best as a member of the Supreme Court to justify the confidence that President Clinton and the Senate have placed in me.

My thoughts today are really very much with my family, whose support and help have meant so much to me. Joanna and Chloe and Nell and Michael have made all the difference in so many things in my life. I have to say not the least during the 22 and a half hours that they sat behind me during the confirmation process.

I also want to thank, really, the many, many, many friends -- many of whom are here today -- who have worked with me and helped me so generously over the years. They include friends from

MORE

abroad; from San Francisco, where I was born; as well as from Massachusetts, my home, whose own long history demonstrates how laws -- those wise restraints -- have made us free. I'm really mindful, too, of the extraordinary example set for me by the four great justices who have recently retired from the Supreme Court: Justice Marshall, Justice Brennan, Justice White, and I see Chief Justice Burger. And, of course, I also mention my immediate predecessor, Justice Blackmun.

Their magnificent careers, all of them, reflect the very best of the Supreme Court's great history and tradition, and demonstrate the awesome responsibility that is being placed on me. That responsibility is different, but in a very real sense it's similar to the responsibility that is shared by everyone -- almost everyone -- I think perhaps everyone I have ever met who works in the law. I mean, every judge's particular obligation is to deal fairly and thoroughly with the legal problems of the individual parties before the court, whether they are poor or rich or helpless or powerful, minority or majority.

To me, I think the most significant thing about a court is that a court is not a bureaucracy and a judge is not a bureaucrat. Court focuses and the judge focus on individuals, and a focus on individuals is so important, I think indispensable, in today's world. So that when every other door is closed, the door of the court will still be open.

I think, too, observers who are in this country are sometimes amazed by the willingness of Americans to ask courts to decide matters of law that really sometimes involve the most contentious issues you can think of in this society. "How can courts do that?" a lot of these foreign observers wonder. Courts, of course, divide on those matters. But the division within the court so often reflects how difficult it is to decide such matters as judges of perfectly good faith seek to find ways for this diverse nation's diverse peoples to live together, harmoniously, under a single law. And, really, the reason that that's possible is because the public trusts the courts.

Well, that brings me to me and the new office. And I have to say I will, I promise to, do all I can to preserve and to enhance that trust. For it is the very foundation of the rule of law. I want to add that lawyers, of course, work within the law in many different positions, many different ways. But whatever position we find ourselves in, our responsibility, all of us, is the same. It's to take that vast array of Constitution, laws of our country, and make them somehow work better for the 250 million Americans whose lives they touch and whom the law is intended to serve.

So what do I think? I think as all of you think, that the rule of law is the crown jewel of our democracy, and I pledge and promise the oath that I've taken: to preserve, to protect and to defend it to the best of my ability.

So thank you very, very much. (Applause.)

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Mr. Justice, those were wonderful remarks. Dr. Joanna Breyer, to members of your family, Chloe and Nell and Michael and other members of your family here, to Mr. Justice Scalia and to Mr. Justice Kennedy. I acknowledged the First Lady earlier and will say another word in a moment. Mr. former Chief Justice Warren Burger and former Justice Brennan.

It is an appropriate sign of the importance this administration and our whole country places on this transition that virtually the entire Cabinet is present, and we are very honored that they are. And forgive me for not acknowledging each of you individually, but it is a mark of respect for you as an individual,

sir, and, of course, to the court. And it is also appropriate that we have such distinguished representation from the Congress in the person of Speaker Foley and Chairman Grandpa Kennedy and Senator Hatch, Senator Biden, Senator Thurmond. Also from the House side Chairman Brooks, Congresswoman Schroeder, Senators Leahy and Heflin, DeConcini and Specter, Senator Simon, Senator Cohen, Senator Pressler.

And distinguished guests, let me say by way of expressing again the President's regret that he could not be here with us today. I would like to say there are very few things that would have caused him to miss this ceremony. He is so proud of you, Justice Breyer, and the contribution that he knows you will make on the Supreme Court to the cause of justice in America.

The President feels so strongly about the circumstances in which our country finds itself, and having traveled around the country with him for a long time in 1992, I know why he feels so strongly and why he wants, on behalf of our whole country, to find a way for the nation to respond to the problem of violent crime much more effectively than we have in the past.

I don't want to sound a single partisan note here today. It would be most inappropriate. I do feel very strongly that we must find a way in America to move beyond partisanship in responding to violent crime, and that 100,000 extra police officers and a stiffening of the criminal justice system and an effort to give children who might otherwise take the wrong path an opportunity to say yes to positive alternatives, is an approach that we hope can attract a bipartisan support to make it law.

Now, I was thinking about this occasion and talking with Justice Brennan, who is such a close friend of my parents, and recalling the times when in an apartment my parents have had next to the Supreme Court for many years, looking out and seeing the long lines of people lining up on First Street, many of whom have never been to a court in their entire lives, some of whom are from foreign countries, but all of whom have heard that in the United States of America any person may sit in the Supreme Court as the nine Justices question the merits of a case before them. And whenever I have passed by those lines I have been struck by just how open our judicial system is.

This October the visitors who have waited outside will see a new face, the man who was just sworn in by Justice Scalia and who just spoke to us with such eloquence and force. The standard we must use to choose all of our judges, and especially a Justice of the Supreme Court, is a very simple one. Above all, that person must have a record of distinction and brilliance in the law, a vision of America as a nation of law, and an unswerving commitment to the Constitution and all the freedoms it affords. These are standards of excellence and they alone should guide the choices we make where our judiciary is concerned. No one meets these standards of excellence better than Justice Breyer and I am honored to have joined with the First Lady in participating in his swearing-in today.

The distinguished history of the seat on the court that he is taking has reminded us that the tradition of excellence has helped to sustain our republic for more than two centuries. Many of our most influential justices have held this particular seat, including Stephen Breyer's judicial hero, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and the great jurist from the 19th century, Joseph Story. Both, incidentally, were also from Massachusetts, Senator Kerry and Senator Kennedy.

Since then, other giants have occupied this seat: Benjamin Cardozo, Felix Frankfurter, and Justice Breyer's own judicial mentor, and the man for whom he clerked, Arthur Goldberg.

Most recently, of course, Justice Harry Blackmun, whose passion for justice left his nation a more fair and humane place, served with such distinction in this seat.

Stephen Breyer will conform to this tradition in every way. His sheer excellence, his unmatched understanding of the law, and his genius for building consensus have created a remarkable record. His achievements as a jurist, a scholar, a teacher, and a public servant have been magnificent. His nearly unanimous confirmation by the United States Senate and the strong bipartisan support he has drawn demonstrate the respect his abilities have generated.

He began his career as a clerk for Justice Goldberg 30 years ago this year. He learned how laws are written and how they affect people as special counsel, and later chief counsel, to the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate. As a charter member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission, he helped create for our nation a more rational system for sentencing criminals.

In 14 years on the Court of Appeals his powerful and persuasive decisions on almost every significant issue of our time have made him an unquestioned leader of the judiciary. And he has been a professor of law for nearly 25 years, helping young minds grasp the complexity and the humanity of the law.

It is obvious that through it all he has enjoyed the love and support of a very close and talented family. Dr. Breyer, Joanna, his wife, a clinical psychologist who helps ease the pain of children undergoing treatment for cancer, has been such a major part of his success, along with his wonderful children who I acknowledged a moment ago.

Justice Breyer has already given much, but his greatest challenges lie ahead. The court he joins will no doubt face questions of great difficulty and consequence. We will all need his wisdom to help shape America's future into the next century and beyond.

In his endeavors, however, he need only look for direction to those principles that he has trusted to guide him his entire life: that we must listen to each other, that we must search for consensus by building bridges where others have built barriers, and that we can best sustain our democracy and the values we share by honoring in every way the rule of law.

Justice Breyer has been selected to join the ranks of great legal minds in a great decision-making process. He will be part of that process, we trust, for many years and part of an intellectual journey that complements the journey undertaken by the President today.

It is one that will help Americans realize our dreams of justice under the law. All Americans, whether those in law libraries scrutinizing Justice Breyer's opinions, or police officers guided by those opinions as they keep our communities safe, or simply those citizens lining up early in the morning outside the marble steps on First Street.

Ladies and gentlemen, you are invited to join Justice Breyer and his family and his colleagues in the dining room for a reception. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

4:00 p.m.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

---

For Immediate Release

August 12, 1994

The following letter was sent this afternoon.

August 12, 1994.

The Hon. Bob Dole  
The Hon. Newt Gingrich  
The Hon. Strom Thurmond  
The Hon. Alan Simpson  
The Hon. Orrin Hatch  
The Hon. Bill McCollum  
Congress of the United States  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Senators and Congressmen:

I am responding on behalf of the President who received your letter on the crime bill moments before he spoke to the National Association of Police Organizations in Minneapolis this afternoon. NAPO is one of several police and law enforcement organizations supporting the President's crime bill.

President Clinton said in Minneapolis that fighting crime is neither a Republican nor Democratic issue, it is a matter of government fulfilling its first responsibility to provide for the security of all of its citizens. He shares your belief that Congress should immediately pass a strong, bipartisan measure aimed at fighting the menace of crime in our country.

Such a bipartisan plan is before you -- it is crime legislation that was adopted by the Senate last November with the support of 42 Republicans and 53 Democrats. Similar legislation was adopted in the House of Representatives in April 1994 with the support of 65 Republicans and 219 Democrats. Ten Republican Senators and 38 Republican House Members also supported the ban on assault weapons contained in this bipartisan plan.

What disappointed me, and what disappointed the President, is that the very spirit of bipartisanship you wrote about today was torn asunder in the House when fifty-five of your Members who voted for a similar bill in April voted to deprive the American people of a vote on this significant anti-crime legislation.

The bill rejected last night gave the American people what they had been promised for six long years -- more police, more prisons, more opportunity for young people to resist the lure of the streets, and fewer guns. Now is the time for the Congress to deliver on that promise, without delays, without partisanship, and without interference from the NRA or other organized special interests. Now is the time for deeds to speak as loudly as words.

August 12, 1994  
Page Two

At this time, the President urges you to work directly with the Leadership of the House and Senate to determine how you can enact the crime bill as soon as possible. The President has directed me to cooperate with all Members of the Congress who are willing to expedite this important legislation. The citizens of our country, and the police who protect them, deserve and demand its passage. For them, we can do no less.

Sincerely,

Leon Panetta  
Chief of Staff

**THE WHITE HOUSE**  
**Office of the Press Secretary**

---

**For Immediate Release**

**August 12, 1994**

**PRESIDENT CLINTON NAMES ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR MULTILATERAL AFFAIRS BUREAU FOR THE U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY**

President Clinton today announced his intention to nominate Dr. Lori Esposito Murray as Assistant Director for the Multilateral Affairs Bureau, for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA).

Dr. Murray is currently Director of Russian Analysis at the International Republican Institute, where she directs strategic planning and evaluation of democracy programs for Russia and the Newly Independent States funded by the Agency for International Development. Prior to this, she served as Senior Legislative Assistant for Senator Nancy Landon Kassebaum (R-KS). Dr. Murray pursued her Doctoral Research on arms control as part of the Visiting Scholars Program at The Brookings Institution. She also was Professional Associate, Committee on International Security and Arms Control at the National Academy of Sciences, an Analyst on the Strategic Affairs Staff at the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and a reporter, covering Congress and the State Department for Defense and Foreign Affairs Publications.

Dr. Murray graduated cum laude from Yale University with a B.A. in 1977, a Masters of International Affairs in 1981 from John Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, and a Ph.D. from John Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, 1990.

**THE WHITE HOUSE**  
**Office of the Press Secretary**

---

For Immediate Release

August 12, 1994

**PRESIDENT NAMES THREE FEDERAL JUDGES**

President Clinton today nominated three individuals to serve on the United States District Court: David A. Katz for the Northern District of Ohio; and Robert J. Cindrich and Sean J. McLaughlin for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

"These nominees will bring exceptional legal talent to the federal bench," the President said. "I know they will serve our country with distinction."

**David A. Katz**, 60, has been a partner with the Toledo firm of Spengler Nathanson since 1963. Katz has served as President and Trustee of the Toledo Bar Association Foundation and Chairman of the Lawyers' Roundtable of Toledo, a cooperative venture between the Toledo Bar Association and the Toledo College of Law to provide scholarships to minority law students. Katz received his B.S. and J.D. degrees from the Ohio State University. He and his wife, Joan Katz, have three grown children and live in Toledo, Ohio.

**Robert J. Cindrich**, 50, has been in private practice since 1981, most recently as a founding partner of the Pittsburgh law firm of Cindrich & Titus. From 1978 to 1981, Cindrich served as U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania; from 1970 to 1972, he served as Assistant District Attorney for Allegheny County. He also was a law clerk to Judge Ruggero Aldisert of the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. Cindrich earned an A.B. degree from Wittenberg University and a J.D. degree from the University of Pittsburgh School of Law. He and his wife, Bonnie Cindrich, have three children and live in Pittsburgh.

**Sean J. McLaughlin**, 39, is a partner with the Erie law firm of Knox McLaughlin Gornall & Sennett, P.C., where he has practiced since 1981. Previously, McLaughlin served as a law clerk to Judges William Knox, Gerald Weber and Maurice Cohill of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. McLaughlin earned both an A.B. degree from Georgetown University and a J.D. degree from Georgetown University Law Center. McLaughlin and his wife, Ann Phalon McLaughlin, have one child and live in Erie.

**THE WHITE HOUSE**  
**Office of the Press Secretary**

---

**For Immediate Release**

**August 12, 1994**

**PRESIDENT CLINTON NAMES ROBERT EDWARD SERVICE AS AMBASSADOR  
TO THE REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY**

President Clinton today announced his intention to nominate Robert Edward Service, of California as Ambassador to the Republic of Paraguay.

Mr. Service, a career member of the senior foreign service, has served overseas in Nicaragua, Brazil, Mexico, Chile, Spain and Argentina, most recently in Brasilia as Deputy Chief of Mission. In 1993 he headed the State Department's "reinventing government" team under the National Performance Review.

Mr. Service was born in China in 1937. He received a B. A. from Oberlin College and an M. P. A. from Princeton. He also attended Stanford University and the National War College. Mr. Service is married to Karol Christine Service of Oakland, CA, an economist who graduated from the University of Berkeley and worked for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. They have two grown children, Jennifer and John. Mr. Service speaks Spanish and Portuguese.

-30-30-30-

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

---

For Immediate Release

August 12, 1994

STATEMENT BY THE PRESS SECRETARY

Today, the Departments of State and Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Council are delivering to the office of Representative Benjamin Gilman over 3723 unclassified or declassified documents related to U.S. policy toward El Salvador from 1979-1991. Courtesy sets of documents are being provided to the Chairmen of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The agencies have also made arrangements to enable appropriately cleared Congressional staff to review certain material which remains classified. The Department of Justice will similarly be delivering documents in its possession as soon as its declassification and review process has been completed.

These actions fulfill a commitment President Clinton made in January in response to requests by Representatives Benjamin Gilman and Christopher Smith. At that time, he directed the Administration to review its documentary holdings with the aim of declassifying and releasing as many documents responsive to the areas of interest as possible consistent with national security, statutory and related considerations.

# # #

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

---

For Immediate Release

August 12, 1994

**PRESIDENT NAMES TORKELSON DEPUTY ASSISTANT FOR MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION**

The President today named Jodie R. Torkelson as Deputy Assistant to the President for Management and Administration, effective September 1.

Torkelson, 36, is currently Associate Director for Administration at the Office of Management and Budget. She previously served as Director of Administration at the Committee on the Budget in the U.S. House of Representatives and as Administrative Assistant to Rep. Leon E. Panetta.

As Deputy Assistant to the President for Management and Administration, Torkelson will direct the management and administrative functions of the Executive Office of the President (EOP). She will oversee the White House Office of Administration, the White House budget, the Military Office, and other administrative offices in the White House and EOP.

Torkelson received her B.A. degree from Moorhead State University. A native of Minnesota, she resides in Virginia.

#

JODIE R. TORKELSON

2701 Park Center Drive, #B1610  
Alexandria, Virginia 22302  
(202) 395-3060 - office

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

- January 1993 - present      Associate Director for Administration, Office of Management and Budget
- o Administer a \$56 million federal agency with over 540 employees
  - o Responsible for development and implementation of agency's reinvention effort - OMB2000 - resulting in increased integration of the management and budget functions of the agency
  - o Developed new agency policies on Alternative Work Schedules and Compensatory Time
  - o As a result of agency downsizing, analyzed space needs and vacated entire floor of office building, saving over \$800,000 per year
- January 1989 - January 1993      Director of Administration, Committee on the Budget, U.S. House of Representatives
- o Responsible for administration of the Committee including budget development, travel, payroll and personnel
  - o Developed and administered leave, travel, office hours, and pay policies
  - o Coordinated all full committee and task force hearings
  - o Responsible for committee records management and publications office
  - o Networked committee's computer system during three year information technology upgrade
- March 1988 - January 1989      Administrative Assistant, Rep. Leon E. Panetta, (D-CA)
- Overall responsibility for office including supervision of legislative and support staff, management of office budget, and coordination of activities between the Washington and district offices

November 1986 -  
March 1988

Acting Executive Director, Life Underwriters for  
Lutheran Charities and Assistant to the Director,  
American Lutheran Church Foundation

Responsible for fiscal management of both non-profit operations, as well as staff supervision and project coordination. Set up new office including space rental, equipment purchases, and staff hires.

January 1981 -  
November 1986

Office Manager, Rep. Leon E. Panetta (D-CA)

Assisted in management of office budget and staff supervision.

May 1980 -  
January 1981

Staff Assistant, Rep. Richard M. Nolan (D-MN)

Researched and drafted legislative responses to constituent inquiries. Responsible for front office operations.

#### **EDUCATION**

B.A., Moorhead State University, Political Science, 1980

#### **PERSONAL**

Birthdate: May 13, 1958

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 11, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
IN ANNOUNCEMENT OF WHITE HOUSE COUNSEL

The Rose Garden

4:00 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon. I am delighted to announce that Chief Judge Abner Mikva of the U.S. Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia will become the new White House Counsel, effective October 1st.

I am very pleased to have a man of Judge Mikva's stature, integrity, judgment and experience join us in our efforts. He's had a long and distinguished career in public service and he will make a vital contribution to the operations of this White House. A World War II veteran, and a member of the Illinois legislature for 10 years, Judge Mikva was elected to the Congress in 1968. He served with distinction on the House Judiciary and Ways and Means Committees, and built a reputation as a remarkably thoughtful, fair, and progressive public servant.

In 1979, Judge Mikva went to the Federal Bench on the highly regarded Court of Appeals here in Washington, where he has served as Chief Judge for the last two years. During the time that he served on this court, he's come to be regarded, justifiably, as one of our nation's leading jurists.

With his new post Judge Mikva will have served his country now in all three branches of our national government. I expect that his broad experience, his deep understanding of our country, our people and our institutions will make him an extremely valuable member of the White House team.

He is a man of great decency who loves his country very much. And I am very grateful that he's willing to give up his lifetime appointment to the Federal Bench to serve the White House as Counsel.

The White House Counsel advises the President on matters of law and justice, ranging from the appointment of judges to the application of law throughout our society. He must ensure that the White House meets the highest standards of ethics and trust. Judge Mikva, a man of uncompromising integrity and judgment, is the right person for this job.

Let me also say a special word about the man whom Judge Mikva will replace. Lloyd Cutler came to the White House five months ago for the second time in his distinguished career to serve for a limited time as my Special Counsel. Once again, he has served his nation magnificently. Mr. Cutler is a wise counselor, and I and all of us have benefitted immensely from his contributions here at the White House. I thank him for all he has done here, and I look forward to his continuing good advice in the years to come.

It's a measure of the seriousness with which we view this office that we have turned to Abner Mikva as Lloyd Cutler's successor. And so I want to say to Judge Mikva, welcome to the White House.

MORE

Before I call Judge Mikva up, I'd like to make a special note of the debate now underway in the House of Representatives on the crime bill. As you know, this has been very hard fought. And there are many interest groups arguing that the members of Congress should vote against the so-called rule to keep the crime bill to coming to a vote in the first place so that they can kill the crime bill without getting credit for killing the crime bill.

The choice is still the same: Are we going to put another 100,000 police officers on the street? Are we going to ban assault weapons? Are we going to ban ownership of handguns by minors? Are we going to make our schools safer? Are we going to give our young people something to say yes to, even as we make punishment stiffer and build more prisons?

The average violent criminal goes free in four years. This crime bill has been taking shape and has been up to the gate and thwarted for six years. There is something wrong with our national institutions when we can't do that. And I want to urge the House to pass the rule and the bill, and do it today.

Judge Mikva, the microphone is yours. (Applause.)

JUDGE MIKVA: Thank you very much, Mr. President. I am deeply honored by this appointment. I have a great admiration and respect for you and for your administration, and for the concept of government that you are reinventing.

I'm aware that I have a very big pair of shoes to fill and that you are the most important client that a lawyer could ever dream of serving, Mr. President. But I'm looking forward to this new life with great enthusiasm and excitement. Thank you, Mr. President. (Applause.)

Q Mr. President, can you tell us about the baseball strike, which is about to start? As a fan, is there any reason why these negotiators should not be sitting down and at least trying to resolve this? They're not even meeting. Would you call upon them to at least sit down and have some talks?

Q And don't go away, Mr. President. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: I've got to go away, because I've got to get back on the phone. If I don't -- I'll have lots to talk about if we pass the rule today, but if I don't make some more calls, then I'll always wonder.

Let me make one comment about the baseball strike. First of all, I think that you should know that since the Secretary of Labor first contacted both sides, we have been in continuous contact with both sides and have done what we could to make some constructive suggestions about how to avoid the strike. It appears that both parties are determined to let the strike proceed. We will do what we can to be of help and to get things back on track if there is anything we can do.

Today I would like to speak on behalf of the country because this is an unusual situation. You know, when a company goes on strike, the right to strike is protected and the workers go on strike because they and the management can't reach agreement. But they always have to consider in the end their customers and what will happen if they lose their customers. In a great event like the baseball strike, I think there's an assumption that the customers are always there. But the only thing I'd like to say to both sides is that there are a lot of little kids out there who don't want to see this season come to a close. And there are a lot of not so little kids out there who know it's the most exciting baseball season in 40 years.

And I hope that in the days ahead they will search for a way to get back together, finish this season, extend it by a few days so that all the games can be played, and the feelings of the American people that this could be one of those seasons that occurs once every four or five decades could be vindicated. I think the people really ought to be taken into consideration here, and I hope they will be.

END

4:06 P.M. EDT

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

MORE

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