

internal -

INTERVIEW WITH FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
MAY 23, 1996
TIME MAGAZINE

INTERVIEWER: WALTER ISAACSON, MANAGING EDITOR, TIME MAGAZINE

WI: (inaudible...Chelsea... Could you describe that a little bit? Because I think it's interesting, when we talk about children and preparing them for the world.

HRC: Well Chelsea was born into politics, in the Governor's Mansion, and then in her father's comeback election in '82 and then he was reelected in '84.. But she, you know, didn't pay any attention to what was going on. She was too young, she wasn't able to read anything or follow the news. But I knew that being six meant that she would start picking up what people were saying. And Bill and I talked about how we could best prepare her for what would inevitably be, no matter how we tried to protect her, um, the mean spiritedness and the slings and arrows that come with political life.

(Comment by Isaacson about Orville Faubus, inaudible)

HRC: It was in 1986, not only was one of Bill's former opponents, the man who had beaten him in 1980, running against him, but Orville Faubus got into the Democratic primary. So we knew that it was going to be just um, kind of a free-for-all on their parts. So we were sitting at dinner, one night, and I started to explain to her how her daddy had to run for reelection and get people to vote for him, and that in an election people had to go out and explain why they deserve to be given the votes of other people. And she asked me, 'Does that mean we get to live here if he wins?' And I said, 'Yea we get to live here,' I was trying out how to make it simple for her. And then I said, 'But you know sometimes in a political campaign people will say mean things and untrue things.' And she got really upset about that, I remember, and said 'Why would people do that?' And I said, 'Well because they want to win, and that's what they do, they get kind of carried away.' So Bill and I'd talked about it beforehand, and I said, 'Now, for example suppose you're your daddy, and you're running for office and you want to be reelected Governor, what would you say?' And she said, 'Well I don't know!' And I said, 'Well just say something.' And she said, 'Well I'm Bill Clinton and I want to help people, so I want to run for this.' And then I said, 'OK now your daddy is going to pretend to be someone running against him.' So Bill said something like 'Don't vote for Bill Clinton, he's a terrible person and he's mean to people.' And you know Chelsea got big tears in her eyes, you know 'Why would anybody say that about you?' And Bill explained about what happens. So from that time, and I can remember it so vividly,

then for a series of dinners we would do this, and of course as she talked to us more she got more into making the speeches and sometimes she'd say, well, she'd learned about Orville Faubus having closed down the schools in Little Rock, and she'd picked it up from the news somewhere, so at dinner all of a sudden she said, 'Vote for me, don't vote for that other person! He shut down the schools in Little Rock so that black children couldn't go to them!' You know, and everything that I had thought might happen, sort of by absorption, she started to pick up things about the campaign, was happening, but she had a way of expressing it well. And ever since then we've talked a lot about what happens in public life, and we've tried to make sure she's never left without information...

WI: What are you doing this time around?

HRC: Well this time around...

WI: It's going to be a tough campaign.

HRC: Oh it's going to be a very tough campaign. A friend of mine... somebody... I can't even remember where I was, and somebody introduced me the other day and they said, 'You know, they've thrown everything but the kitchen sink, but they'll probably throw that.' And I got up to speak and I said, 'Well they'll probably also throw the kitchen, the house, the housing development, whatever can be hurled.' We're just doing what we've always done, um, she follows the news, she's interested in issues, um, her dad and I try to have at least one meal with her...

WI: Can you give me an example of you talking about something that might hurt her and shielding her from it?

HRC: I think we're sort of beyond that. I think she's kind of come to understand about what is said in politics now. You know, I'll give you an example, when we started all this I expected her to hear a lot of mean things about her father. I wasn't quite prepared for having as much attention as I've received in the last four years... But when I was subpoenaed to appear before the grand jury and all that, usually you know it's I who goes in and says, "Do you want to talk about what going on in the news, or have you heard this, or your dad's got this really tough decision and he'll probably get criticized for it, do you want to talk about it?" But this time it was Bill, he said, 'Do you want to talk about what's going on with your mom?' and all the rest... So we just try to anticipate.

WI: And what did she say? (inaudible)

HRC: Oh sure he sat down and talked with her

WI: Did he go through all the details of the case or anything like that?

HRC: No, we just explained the process and, I mean, she obviously shares our view that all of these investigations are politically inspired so they belong in our category of political conversations and she has a pretty good sense of that. But I guess my larger point was, not that everyone will face what we, who are in the public arena face, but I think everyone to some extent or another, should really think about how to prepare children once they get to be a certain age for the realities of life. I mean you know, jobs aren't always secure, um, when we were back in Arkansas, a friend of Chelsea's, a girl that she'd been in her house and played with, father, killed himself, killed his wife, and killed his two daughters, and these were people that she knew. And so trying to pretend that your children don't know what's going on and what's happening in the world around them, I think, causes a lot of pain and unnecessarily so. You have to be aware of the age of a child -- you can't load-down a young child with more than that child can accommodate, but as a child matures I think talking about um what you confront is important.

WI: I read (inaudible) about Mrs. Onassis and her advice

HRC: Oh Walter that was one of the best...

WI: Do you have any other...

HRC: In the summer of 1991 when it was first even talked about that Bill might run, she was one of the first people who came forward who said she wanted to support him. And sent word to us. And I think Bill had met her but I had not. And then the campaign was so rigorous that I didn't get a chance to accept her invitation to come talk with her until, um, what, probably June of '92 I think. I went to her apartment, and we had lunch and it was one of the most delightful and helpful times that I had during the entire campaign because we talked very specifically about how you give your children, in the glare of public life, a sense of personal space, privacy, self-confidence that they're worthy on their own, and all of the issues that I had been worrying about because of Bill's running for President. And she was so kind, and she told me about how she'd looked for ways to have her children accept responsibility. You know I tell the story in the book about the bicycle, but she also told me how she would expect John and Caroline to be on time, to get ready for school and if they weren't ready, the car that was going to take them was told to go ahead. It was something that she said that I did just so that they would know they had to abide by the rules that other people do as well

WI: What do you do with Chelsea on that? Anything particular?

HRC: Well we've tried to do a lot of things starting from the time she was in the Governor's Mansion, um, you know, making it clear that she had certain responsibilities she has to fulfill, um, I remember one time coming down into the kitchen of the

Governor's Mansion and it was breakfast time and she was watching television and she knew that we didn't want her to watch television during breakfast and I said, 'Why is this on?' And she said, 'Well they said I could,' meaning the people who worked around there, and I said, 'I know but we're your parents and we say you can't.' And then I said to the people who worked, who are all wonderful, I said, 'She's a child. We don't let children decide what's best for the.'

WI: But she can't do the chores like you and I did, like take out the garbage at the White House...

HRC: No,

WI: And make the popcorn even.

HRC: Well but she can, I mean one of the things that I did when we moved in, when Mrs. Bush first showed me around the White House, um, I noticed that Mrs. Kennedy had put in a, have you been up to the second floor?

WI: No, (inaudible)

HRC: In the living quarters Mrs. Kennedy took what had been Margaret Truman's bedroom, I don't know who slept there after that, um, and made it into a dining room and a serving/butler's kitchen. And she did it because up until then you had to eat all of your meals down on the state floor. And she had these children she didn't want to transport to the state floor. And so when I visited with Mrs. Bush the dining room is beautiful but it's very formal. And so when I went into the butler's kitchen I said, 'Could we take out some of the serving area and put in a table so that we could actually, when we were just the three of us alone, eat more normally? And so that was done, and so since then, I mean she makes cookies, she makes bread, we occasionally do a little bit of cooking for ourselves, not a lot, sort of an infamous incident when she was sick after we'd been there for a little while and I went in there to make her scrambled eggs the way she likes it and some apple sauce and everybody was rushing around saying, 'What are you doing? What are you doing?' And I said, 'Well I was going to make her some scrambled eggs and apple sauce.' 'Oh we'll do it!' 'No, no I wanna do it.' So we've tried to bring that sense of normalcy as much as possible.

WI: Do you have any second thoughts about the private school versus the public school decision?

HRC: No, and the reasons I don't is because after talking to many many people I had no doubt, with her having been in public schools for her entire career, that she could have gotten a good education. They were public buildings, and there was no way that the press or the public could be asked not to come in and I was particularly struck with great sadness about what happened when Amy Carter first started in her public school and according to

press accounts which I read, by about the third or fourth day she'd gone out to recess with the other kids and there was such a jam of press and onlookers waiting to catch a glimpse of her that the school made the decision, because they couldn't ask people to leave, that she would have to stay in at recess. So for me the privacy and security issues unfortunately were ones we'd never had to face before but I know that we had to face them then.

WI: You were, I think down at Emma Gladney once, speaking was that right, I remember reading that somewhere, where you talked about having considered adoption because it happened to us too. We went through a long period before we had Betsy and even going through Emma Gladney. And Cathy had had a few miscarriages and everything, and then we finally had a child. Did you consider adoption at all before?

HRC: Well, we've talked about it, I must say we were hoping that we would have another child and um,

WI: You were hoping to have a second child?

HRC: Yes.

WI: Are you still hoping to have a second child?

HRC: I have to tell you Walter, with the reality, I would be surprised but not disappointed! (laughter) My friends would be appalled I'm sure but um, I think it would be terrific.

WI: I think so too. I would have loved to have had a second child and I think (inaudible)

HRC: Your faces just lit up, that's the way I feel about it. (laughter)

WI: I know, I know, I think we both have (inaudible). Would you consider adoption now?

HRC: We continue to talk about it, because we really believe in adoption and I have worked hard to promote adoption, particularly for older kids and across racial lines, kids with special needs. We may still think about that. We'd have to think hard about it, especially if it were an older child, the pressures of the White House on a child like that.

WI: But you could do it though, right, I mean there's no, you've actually, why wouldn't you,

HRC: We've thought about it.

WI: That's great. And it would be, you might want to do an older child or something

HRC: We haven't gotten into that level of detail about it.

WI: But you'd probably have to do it, assuming you win a second term, while you're in the White House, it's getting kind of late after that, right, or is that impolite of me to say?

HRC: It's something that we're all facing you know, as of August 19 I'll be married to a 50 year-old man. That's startling.

WI: And um, have you ever talked about having miscarriages or does that bother you, because I know we talked about it a lot when we went through that and people had told us that you had mentioned it. I don't want to put you on the spot here but

HRC: I never, I never had a miscarriage, I just had a lot of difficulties um, getting pregnant, and then with the pregnancy, but I never had a miscarriage.

WI: Oh, by difficult pregnancies you mean lost pregnancies though or just uh,

HRC: No, no just a lot of uh, questions about you know whether I'd be able to carry out..

WI: I'll leave this off too, alright , were you a DES daughter, because that was Cathy's problem, do you know what that was?

HRC: I do know what that was

WI: Yea, when the mother takes the (inaudible)

HRC: I should ask my mother that.

WI: Yea, that was one of the reasons we had.. anyway, um, but I am fascinated about the notion of you all considering adoption and you've been very involved in the adoption legislation, it's not legislation it was adoption... well explain what it is.

HRC: It's several pieces of legislation I have supported. ON of them began the process of eliminating the prohibition that many states had used toward adopting across racial lines. And the President strongly supported that as well And then it is being further refined because there is some thought that still some of the states have not gotten the message that we're really serious about this as national policy. I also support giving some tax relief to people who adopt babies when they're older.

WI: (inaudible)

HRC: It is occurring, I mean it's been passed I believe in the House, I don't know if it's gotten through the Senate but it is something that is really important. It's a good first step, but a lot of adoption advocates point out how difficult it is to adopt an older child or a child with special needs unless you get some continuing medical assistance, like a lot of these kids when they're in foster care, are eligible for Medicaid but if they're

adopted into a family they may not be. So trying to provide some financial support, especially through the medical needs, both physical and emotional, that kids may have is important to me. And then we're also um, you know, looking at ways of encouraging employers to be more supportive. Mr. Thomas, "Mr. Wendy's" has been a big adoption advocate, because he was adopted. So he has provided benefits for adoptive parents that other employers don't, just the whole range of actions that could be taken to move a lot of the kids who are not eligible for adoption into adoptive homes more quickly than we have.

WI: The fact that you're considering adopting, does that inform your thinking about this in any way?

HRC: Well I think it, you know, I've seen a lot of these children, um, and have visited with them, and I believe many people have concerns about adopting, particularly an older child, and in fact I was asked that question at an event that I had at the White House a few weeks ago where we highlighted adopted children other than babies and infants. And a reporter said, 'Don't you worry about the outcome?' And I said, 'Well I think any time you take responsibility for a child you have to worry about the outcome. There are so many things that are not in your control, and so many characteristics that can go one way or the other that any child has, so

WI: When did you all start considering adoption?

HRC: Well considering may be too strong, I think 'talking about it,' and you know

WI: When did you start talking about it?

HRC: We have off and on for a long time.

WI: Are you talking about it more now?

HRC: Yea I think we're talking about it more now. We'd obviously wait to get serious in considering it until after the election, there's just too much going on in our lives right now but, um, I just think that giving a child a chance and sharing what you have with a child is one of the greatest gifts you can give yourself, as well as a child, so I hope that something will come of our thinking about it.

WI: Dealing with the adoption legislation as well, you're very much in favor of, you're sort of split with, I guess it's Ms. Edelman and others, in terms of cross-racial adoption, right? Is that a..

HRC: Well I've never had a conversation specifically with Marian about that, but I believe that finding a home for a child is our first priority and making sure that anyone who does have a cross-

racial adoption is sensitive to the issues that will arise and get support

WI: But might you do a cross-racial adoption yourself, have you talked about that in order to make a statement?

HRC: We haven't gotten into that kind of detail.

WI: Have you talked about whether you'd do it through an agency or other issues like that?

HRC: No.

WI: What's your feeling on orphanages and group homes; they got kind of hit politically when Speaker Gingrich stuck his neck in.

HRC: I think the way that was presented, at least the way it came across, for those of us that listened, was that orphanages were an option for poor parents, and that poverty would be a reason for children to be taken away from their families. I just oppose that with every fiber of my being. I think though that there are situations that both involuntarily and voluntarily could be appropriate for the placement of children um, in well-run and carefully staffed orphanages. But I think it's a very difficult issue to take and make a blanket statement about.

WI: But you were a little bit further along than most people and be willing to sever parental rights as a lawyer.

HRC: Yes, well, I started off when I was at law school, working at New Haven Legal Services on the cases involving children, which is one of the reasons I got interested. And I saw lots of abuse and neglect and I worked at the Yale New Haven Hospital with their pediatrics department and trauma staff in helping to think through what should be the standards for identifying and dealing with child abuse, so I have seen a lot of families have abdicated their responsibilities toward their children and that at some point a child's rights deserve careful attention and some parents do not deserve the continued authority over their children. I know that there's a lot of debate about this and I was criticized during the '92 campaign for my 1973 article about children's rights. But anyone who has dealt with abuse knows that at some point you've got to make a very tough decision and it's not easy. I represented a lot of children or foster parents who were caught in the system and one of the early cases I did in Arkansas was representing couple who had been foster parents and had fallen in love with this little boy and had had him for about four years. And they were told on the one hand by the state that had signed a contract to be foster parents and it couldn't be adoption and then the biological mother showed back up and wanted the baby. And I just kept saying, I said to my clients, 'If at any point I encounter any information or develop the feeling that it would not be in the best interests of this child I will tell you that and I will no longer represent you because what my

principal concern was the best interests of the child. And once you have seen enough abuse and neglect cases, you know you've got to make that decision. The hard thing for us to do in our legal system is to move these cases along because so many of these kids are moved back and forth into situations of violence and drug abuse. The parents aren't helped, they're not really given any chance to be better parents, a lot of them are beyond help. And at some point we have to say, 'Look this child's future means more than that.'

WI: Cathy was counsel for (inaudible) foster care thing, and got so depressed during that whole process. When it comes to um, this also applies to adoptions when the biological parents may change their mind, that can scare people away, which may not be in the best interests of the child too.

HRC: Those cases are really rare but they get so much attention that people do get scared and again we need clear legal guidance and so if a biological mother is counselled and told the consequences of her action and she signs that consent form then she should be absolutely held to it. The problem is, as in the Baby Richard case, when a biological father shows up and claims he didn't know anything. Now that case, it seems to me, could have been handled much more quickly than it was, and if a decision were going to be made that the child was going to be returned it should have been done as soon as possible. But I would still argue, based on all the work that I have done, that that psychological and emotional bond that is developed between responsible and loving caretakers and a child over a certain period of time should not be interrupted except for the most compelling reasons.

WI: What about the parental rights movement that's more on the right about curricula?

HRC: Well I think parents have the primary rights for the upbringing and nurturing of their children.

WI: I'm talking about that legislation.

HRC: But I think that the current legislation as I have tried to understand it would create a right for individual parents to make decisions that not only would affect their own child but would affect other children as well. I believe that there should be like parental "op-outs" and consent, if you don't want your child attending a certain health class about health education, that's fine, I think that a parent should say that goes against my beliefs, I don't want my child to do it and parents should be given that option. But I don't think that gives parents who object to it on behalf of their own children the right to prohibit other parents who think that it is in line with their values for their children to be given such information and therefore to argue that the school shouldn't be able to offer such a course. Or the parents who on religious grounds oppose the

teaching of evolution should have the right to deny their child the access to information about evolution so that the child can make his or her own decision. So I believe strongly in parental rights but I also believe that there has to be some balance in the (inaudible) and implementation of those rights.

WI: The Wisconsin welfare reform plan that the President has given the waver to. What is your feeling about what that could do, to basically say there is no entitlement to cash welfare for children. You can get an earnings credit or you can get wage supplements. Is that dangerous in the long run?

HRC: I don't think we know, an part of the reason the President's granted I think now 38 waivers, is to find out what works, and to give some direction to the national debate. And if you look at any of these states, there are features in each which I think are going to have to be evaluated on their own merits. In Wisconsin as I understand it, and I haven't read the proposal, just the press accounts, recipients are guaranteed employment basically, in either the private or public sector. Now that is very different from just saying there's no entitlement and you're off. So I don't know that we know yet what variations on reforming and ending welfare will work. But I know that there are certain basic features that the President wants to see in any national framework that is adopted by the Congress. But the waivers themselves are turning up some really good information. And we now have, as I recall, about a 1.6 fewer people on welfare than when the President took office. So that we're making some progress and we're seeing some results that I think are very promising.

WI: Does it really make sense, though, to force a mother of a young child to work?

HRC: You know, I've thought about that a lot, and I think about it when I go into a restaurant and I get waited on by a waitress who's working a minimum wage job and has young children at home. Or when I go to a hospital and meet the women who are the orderlies and the nurses' aides who are in the work force with children at home. Welfare was meant to be a transition and welfare is for most people who are on it, a temporary stop on their journey through life. I think the average time is no more than two years. So we have to look at the welfare population and say for most people who are on welfare who come in and out of it, a lot of the changes that are being talked about are not going to be that significant. They need the help and support, the medical benefits that come with Medicaid, but then they find a way off somehow. For a certain population who have been trapped in generational poverty what we have done has not worked. And I think, and I've said this for a long time, and when Bill was Governor of Arkansas he did it, I think getting up and going to work, getting up and going to school, and having to make the same difficult decisions about who cares for your children that every other working mother has to make, is a necessary step toward

learning how to be self-sufficient and independent. Now having said that, I don't think there's enough child care available, that is quality child care that is subsidized for welfare recipients or the working poor, so I think we ought to be moving people off of welfare and yes, I think as many people who are physically able to work ought to work. But I think they ought to have some child care support and they ought to have some benefits to take care of their children medically. Because a lot of the mothers that I see working in the restaurants and in the nursing homes and in the hospitals and on the assembly lines of small plants who are working minimum wage or above, have no medical benefits at all. So we've got to figure out a way to make work pay, not just for the welfare recipient but for the working poor. But I don't think it is fair to subsidize some people and say they shouldn't have to leave their children when millions and millions of women get up every day, and I've stood at plant gates at 5:00 in the morning and I've seen the pick-up trucks with the grandma sitting there and the mother handing off the kids in pajamas so that she can go work the early shift. I just think that we've got to recognize that everybody should have to do their part.

WI: And you don't think it's saying to certain mothers that raising a kid isn't real work, that you have to have real out-of-home work?

HRC: I think that, and I have also advocated this: I think one of the ways we ought to be thinking about reorganizing welfare, is by training women to be early childhood caretakers, and you've got all these women and children, often times in public housing or even in other settings, neighborhoods, intense poverty and welfare enrollment, and nobody's doing anything to kind of help organize them, to help them if you will, help each other take care of their kids. In my book, I write about how angry it made me when these two little kids and suffocated to death, and it made me angry at everybody -- it made me angry at the parents who weren't watching them, at the neighbors who weren't watching them, at the city who didn't have a recreational facility available to them. And I sort of feel the same way about this: there is no more important responsibility than caring for children. At this point in our history, what we're trying to figure out is who is responsible for that and how do we do it well. And everybody should be looking for better ways to do that, and I would spend some time and effort trying to help women who are currently on welfare figure out how to organize themselves better so that they trade childcare duties, so that they support one of their own who is taking care of the children as a way of both of being sure that their children are being well cared for and also providing employment. I was on an Indian reservation I guess a few years ago, and the women there were very upset because the tribal elders didn't see the need for any more childcare. And a lot of these women worked off the reservation, and there was no one for them to leave their children with. And I started talking to them about co-op babysitting, because they

were taking their children off into places and leaving them, and I said, think about how to solve this problem at home -- what would it take to work together so that one of you could stay home and be the child director, and instead of paying a stranger, you'd pay somebody you know? I mean, that's how we need to be thinking about this, I think.

WI: In your book, you quoted a few times and praised Mrs. Edelman. Yet you all had a bit of a rift, and she wrote the open letter to the President. How involved are you with this march, and has there been some separation because you disagree with her on certain issues?

HRC: I don't feel that at all. I don't believe that's the case. You know I was attracted to Marion because of her passion, her commitment, her effectiveness as an advocate on behalf of children, particularly poor children. She does what she does better than anybody in the country, and it's a really important task because it not only challenges all of us to do better but it points out ways that we don't live up to our rhetoric as a nation.

WI: Are you part of the march?

HRC: Yea, I'm going to be I think Friday night at the Kennedy Center we have a big benefit for all of the groups and the sponsors, so I'm doing everything I can to help it and support it. But I have been an advocate, I have been on the front lines, passionately arguing for all kinds of changes, and I have watched very closely my husband, who I also think is a great champion for and of children, taking the realities that you have deal with, and trying always to keep in mind where we should be and what our goals ought to be as a nation but understanding in the political process you may have to take it one step at a time. So I don't feel any separation at all. I see, looking at Marion and looking at my husband, two people in whom I have enormous confidence that they both care deeply about what happens to children, and they both have different roles that perform superbly, in my opinion.

WI: If you could have one piece of legislation get passed right now, just wave a wand or something, and only one...

HRC: Well, one thing I would want to have happen right now is passing the minimum wage, and not just for economic reasons, but for reasons of value, and a way of saying to people who are really working hard, this society values what you do, and we know it's not easy out there. If you look at what's happened to our kids in this really rapidly society, I find that we have the same problems whether I'm in the inner city in Philadelphia, with an all-black student body, or I'm in Corpus Christi with an predominantly Hispanic student body in a poor neighborhood, or I'm in an all-white school outside of Duluth: I hear the same thing: that the severity of the problem and the resources available to deal with them are certainly much more dramatic

where there are jobs or where people are working hard 40 hours a week and they can't get themselves ahead. So anything we could do, starting with raising the minimum wage, which says to people, this is your job as a parent to take care of your children but also we want help you by recognizing that you can't do it if you can't make a decent living the way that you would want to do it. Now there are many other things, since you put me on the spot, that I would do or want to do if I could, but as for what's on the landscape right now, I think that would be such a powerful thing.

WI: With the welfare thing, and the gay marriages, whatever, there's a lot of conflict between what Sen. Dole is saying and what the President is saying. What are the fundamental disagreements between this administration and Senator Dole on welfare reform?

HRC: Let me just back up one minute on that, because my husband has a long record on welfare reform. When he was in the National Governors' Association, he worked with particularly Senator Moynihan and the Reagan White House, in coming up with the Family Support Act, which was a very good piece of legislation. And it was never adequately funded nor implemented under either Presidents Reagan or Bush. So what my husband did was what a lot of governors had to do, and that was to seek waivers from the federal government so that he could get about the business of trying to reform welfare. In arkansas he had a very good success rate of moving people from welfare to work. So I'd say the first difference is he's somebody who's actually done it. He is somebody who has sat across the table time and time again with welfare recipients and asked them what is that you need to do for yourselves that we can give you the support to do to get off. He's listened to the testimonials of people who have found it in themselves to take the educational opportunities, use the child care, find the jobs that his reform program helped provide. The second thing I'd say is that when he came in he said he wanted to end welfare as we know it. He campaigned on that, and he started doing it. If you look at the earned income tax credit, that was as much an economic and tax decision as it was a reforming welfare decision because you cannot make the point about reforming welfare if you don't also say you're going to reward and honor work. And Senator Dole voted against that. And it removed millions of Americans out of being in danger of falling into welfare because all of a sudden there was a floor beneath them. It had a huge impact on our ability to reduce the welfare rolls. He also has a record from three or four days after he took office, he met with National Governors, and he said, 'I don't know when we're going to be able to get welfare reform through, but let's not wait -- you send me waivers; if they're decent, we'll grant them.' So while other people have been arguing about what should or shouldn't be done, his administration has been granting waivers and it's made welfare reform. And I guess the final thing is that he wants to reform welfare in a way that believes will work. And we know that if we don't have some kind

of child care help, it won't work. So I think on a whole range of issues, starting with having done it, having begun to implement when he was doing the earned income tax credit and all the way through the waivers and his consistency of saying yes I'll work with you but here are certain bottom lines I have, I think it's a difference between somebody who talks about it and somebody who actually does it.

WI: Divorce is harder to get. You talked about in the book, staying together for Chelsea, people have done that generation after generation after generation. Should we do something to make divorce as kind of more of a waiting period, I mean is that part of the campaign for children is to say to people, keep families intact if you can?

HRC: I think it has to be. When you're responsible for children I think you have to try to put their interests at least equal with if not ahead of your own. And there is a lot of evidence about the traumas and difficulties that divorced mothers face, whether it be financially or emotionally, and also about what happens to children. Now I do not believe we should prohibit divorce, if that's what people feel they have to do for themselves and their children. I know that there are many instances when a situation is intolerable; I often asked my mother-in-law why she didn't divorce earlier and then didn't stay divorced from Bill's step-father. So I understand the arguments on the other side. What I would hope is that we would do a more honest job of talking about the costs of divorce, and when parents seek, there would be some waiting, or cooling-off period where education and counselling programs would be available, where marital counselling would be available, so that people could understand the consequences of their decisions, as they impacted on the children and as they would impact on their financial well-being in the future. If a divorce occurs, then I think everything that the legal system can do to minimize the disruption in the lives of the children should be undertaken, and I think those are steps that adults who have children should be willing to take.

WI: Does it sometimes annoy you to be lectured about family values by people who have left their wives and children and remarried, like virtually everyone who's lecturing you on family values?

HRC: Well, lecture about family values, regardless of the source, have always frustrated me a little bit, because I don't think we need we need to just talk about family values, we should act in ways that value families and provide, support for parents, not just exhort them to do better but give them tools to do better.

HRC: Are you considering a kids' care like Medicare as a real way to get to health care, focusing on children this time around instead of doing a broad-based

HRC: Well I know that the President has said that in a second term he would look at how we could come up with a realistic effective way of ensuring kids. and I think that would be a very good step for the country to take. Kids are cheaper to insure than us older, creakier(?) people, but when they're sick they're often acutely more sick. Childrens' Hospitals, for example, are more costly than adult hospitals because the technology and the intensity of the care that children need who are injured or ill is greater than what we often need. So I would like to see us come up with some proposals for that and have...

WI: You told that heartbreaking story of that cousins with meningitis

HRC: I met the mothers yesterday. I didn't identify the city because I didn't want to bring any undue attention to them. I met the little girl, Chantelle, who survived, and her mother, and I met I have to say I just don;t understand how anybody can look at these children, who are usually the children of working parents, and not feel that we all have a responsibility to help them get the medical care they deserve. Even at the end of the health care debate in the first two years there were a number of us that said well at least let's look at kids, let's do something we can agree on to move the debate forward. But for political reasons we couldn't get anybody

WI: But that will be part of the second term?

HRC: I hope it will be and my husband has said it should be.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
MAY 1, 1995

CONTACT: LISA CAPUTO
NEEL LATTIMORE
KAREN FINNEY
202-456-2960

**FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON TO KICK-OFF ADMINISTRATION'S
MEDICARE MAMMOGRAPHY AWARENESS CAMPAIGN**

WASHINGTON, DC -- First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton will officially kick-off the Clinton Administration's Medicare Mammography Awareness Campaign on Monday, May 1, 1995. The campaign will feature public service announcements by the President and Mrs. Clinton and a special "Mama-gram" campaign in honor of Mother's Day.

The "Mama-gram" campaign will include pre-printed messages for greeting cards that will be available in card stores nationwide and special cards to be included in Mother's Day bouquets. The aim of the campaign is to encourage older women to utilize the Medicare benefit that provides for regular mammograms and to increase awareness about the importance of regular screenings for all women.

One out of eight women in this country will contract breast cancer at some point during her lifetime. Older women are at a higher risk because the incidents of breast cancer increase with age. Medicare covers mammograms, but the data shows that, over a two year period, fewer than 40 percent of women aged 65 and older take advantage of this Medicare benefit.

Since January, Mrs. Clinton has conducted listening sessions with senior women and doctors at hospitals and senior centers around the country in an effort to encourage older American women to utilize the Medicare mammography benefit. During the previous two years, many older women across the country conveyed their concerns about breast cancer to the First Lady. Mrs. Clinton explored the issue with officials at the Department of Health and Human Services and learned that too few older women were taking advantage of the Medicare mammography benefit.

"The stories I have been told by women have taught me a lot about how this issue of breast cancer is being perceived," Mrs. Clinton said. "As much work as we have done on it in our country, there are still large parts of our population who don't think it applies to them, who believe that early detection won't do any good for them, or who have fears that have to be addressed as we attempt to try to make all of our women healthier. I hope every American will encourage the women in their lives to get regular mammograms."

###

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

May 1, 1995

**Remarks by First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton at Medicare
Mammography Awareness Campaign Kick-off**

MRS. CLINTON: Thank you very much. Thank you so much for being here for this important and, in many ways, unprecedented event. I want to thank Secretary Shalala for her leadership in so many areas, but as she mentioned, when the President announced the National Breast Cancer Action Plan from this room and asked the Secretary to please begin to do all that we could in the federal government to not only get word out about breast cancer, but to begin a really concerted effort to turn all of the forces of the federal government toward research to find a cure to understand this disease -- Secretary Shalala really took that and ran with it, and we're very grateful to you.

I also want to acknowledge Bruce Vladick and Dr. Helen Smiths from the Health Care Financing Administration. That is the agency that pays the Medicare bills, that tries to compile information so that we know what's really happening with people in our country when it comes to health, and they are very much involved and committed to this effort, and I'm very grateful for that.

I also want to thank Dr. Susan Blumenthal and the Public Health Service's Office on Women's Health, which has played a major role in bringing to all of our attention the issues affecting women and our health, and I know this is a very big week for older Americans, because it is the White House Conference on Aging. And Fernando Torres Gil who is here, is the man responsible for making sure that this week happens, and he seems remarkably relaxed, and so I'm glad to welcome him here to join all of us.

We are kicking off the Clinton Administration's "Mommagram" campaign. And that is a very carefully chosen phrase, because it really says what we want it to say. We are concerned about our mommas -- whether we call them mothers, mommies, moms, whatever, we are concerned about all of the women in our country, and particularly older women. And we want this campaign to increase awareness of the importance of mammography among our nation's older women.

The threat of breast cancer, as the Secretary points out, is one that touches every single American. We all know someone -- a grandmother, a mother, a sister, an aunt, a daughter, a friend, or in my case, my mother-in-law, who has suffered or is suffering from this disease. But what many Americans do not know is that the risk of

MORE

breast cancer increases with age. In fact, 80 percent of new breast cancers occur in women aged 50 and older, and half of all new cases occur in women 65 and older.

That is why, thanks in large part to the advocacy of many organizations represented here today, mammography was added to Medicare in 1991 as one of the few preventive or screening services that Medicare offers. And that is why, as I worked on health care reform, I was distressed to learn that fewer than 40 percent of women aged 65 and older on Medicare have used the Medicare mammography benefit.

Over the past months, I looked at studies on barriers to mammography use among older women, and I talked to women all over the country of different backgrounds and races and different regions who had different experiences with mammography and with breast cancer. I believe that through these meetings, which we called "listening sessions," because that's what I was doing, we could gain a better understanding of how we could increase the use of mammography by going to the people who were the experts -- the women themselves.

I learned a great deal from these sessions, from the physicians and nurses and women who took part in them, from the advocates representing organizations, and the entire government did as well. Because we heard that older women, like the rest of us, value the advice of their doctors, and that a great number of older women will get a mammogram if their doctors recommend it.

We learned that some older women don't realize that you never outgrow the need to protect yourself against breast cancer, and that some women mistakenly believe that mammograms are extremely painful or even dangerous, that they, themselves, can cause breast cancer. Some women fear getting a mammogram because they believe that finding breast cancer, even in its early stages, is a death sentence. And we learned that some older women, women who have spent their lives caring for others, simply don't know how to take care of their own health by seeking out such services for themselves.

But we also learned that with information and outreach, older women will get mammograms to help them live longer, healthier lives, and our goal is to provide this support and to increase mammography use among our nation's older women. So we are pleased to announce today this awareness initiative.

In honor of Mother's Day and all of our nation's older women, we are kicking off our initiative with a "Mommagram" campaign. The "Mommagram" campaign will give husbands, sons, daughters, grandchildren, friends and anyone else with a close relationship with an older woman a way to let that woman know that her family and friends care, that part of that caring means wanting her to get

regular mammograms, and that Medicare covers the cost of these mammograms.

I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the administration, to thank all of you who have done and will continue to do so much to make this "Mommagram" campaign a success. This campaign has been a wonderful coordinated effort among government agencies and between the government and the private sector. I would also like to thank the health care professionals and their organizations who will be communicating with their members about the importance of reminding their older women patients to get regular mammograms.

As one of the women in one of the listening sessions told me, she says, "I had five things wrong with me, I have five different doctors, I have doctors for my eyes, I have doctors for my heart, I have doctors for my feet, but nobody ever told me to get a mammogram." And so part of our message is for all doctors who take care of women for any problem remind them, please, about mammograms.

I'd also like to thank the senior organizations and cancer advocacy organizations who will be activating their grass roots networks to get the message out. This is very important, because you're really there on the front lines, talking with women every single day. Many of you have worked very well on your own excellent breast health awareness campaigns, and we appreciate your additional efforts on behalf of this as well.

I'd also like to thank the creative public relations professionals who donated their time and effort to design the "Mommagram" campaign. You can see one great example behind me. And the generous corporations and trade associations who have provided funding or are distributing and displaying the message or the materials that have been developed for this campaign.

And I would most certainly like to thank the women who participated in these listening sessions. Some of them were able to be with us today, and I would like all the women in all the listening sessions to please stand, because it is your help that made this day happen. (Applause.)

I would also add, we had a really good time, and some of what was said and some of the stories that were told, we couldn't publish in the form that they were -- (laughter) -- but I will never forget them. And I hope that all of you know how much we appreciated your taking your time and sharing very personal information with us.

Our efforts will not end with Mother's Day. The "Mommagram" campaign is just the first stage in a year-long Medicare mammography initiative that will include outreach through Medicare carriers and intermediaries -- those are the insurance companies and the other folks who process the bills and do what needs to be done in order to

MORE

get Medicare to work for you, through state health departments, local aging agencies, and we hope many of you here today.

I also know there are many women -- and we have just had very strong evidence of that published in a recent article -- who are living on bare-bones budgets in their later years, and they are finding it very difficult to meet the deductible cost on Medicare and the small copayment for a mammogram. Probably the most difficult and poignant moments in those listening sessions were when women stood up and said, "I was diagnosed with breast cancer, but I didn't have insurance, and I waited until I was eligible for Medicare." Or, women who stood up and said "I have a history of breast cancer in my family, but at the end of the month, I just can't afford, even with Medicare's help, to pay for a mammogram."

I hope this campaign will help us focus national attention on not only the benefit that is available through Medicare, but also the need to make sure that every woman is able to take advantage of that benefit. We applaud the many local programs that I learned about around the country that offer free mammography screening, and I know that the many partners in this effort here today and those unable to be with us, will do everything that we can do together to assist in finding ways to cover the costs that Medicare does not now pick up.

Hopefully, the day will come when the government will be able to meet the needs of all women, or there will be other changes that will permit a service such as Medicare's mammography benefit to be accessed without any financial barriers.

As I think about this campaign, I can't help but also think about the voices we're hearing in Washington today that are trying to tell us that there is nothing the federal government can do for people. I think the Medicare mammography benefit belies that. And I think this awareness campaign does, too. Working together with local government and the private sector, we can use the Medicare mammography benefit to save lives. And that is very important to all of us.

We have here today someone I met in our listening sessions, and whose words and thoughts helped us shape this campaign. I'd like to welcome Zinny Cummings (PHO.) from Church Women United, a brave and determined woman who is one of mammography's success stories.

Zinny, would you please join us here at the podium?
(Applause.)

(ZINNY CUMMINGS SPEAKS)

MRS. CLINTON: I'm so glad you got on that airplane.
(Laughter.) One of the items that Zinny referred to was a video, news

MORE

release that we put together by the Department of Health and Human Services, which gives a bit of a flavor about what we heard in all of these listening sessions. And I think we're going to be able to play it right now and show you on these two screens.

(VIDEO SHOWN)

Thank you, Jackie, for you and your crew doing such an excellent job on that. We started our first listening session in New York, and I was pleased there to hear from a number of women who have been active in various organizations that are advocates on behalf of older women and on behalf of cancer. And one of those women from the Older Women's League is Lou Glass(PHO.) And, Lou, I'd like to introduce you now to our audience. Please join us here. (Applause.)

(JACKIE SPEAKS)

And that's such an important point that Lou just made is the peace of mind that comes from doing this for yourself and finding out there isn't anything wrong, and that's an important point that we want to stress today.

As has already been mentioned, the President and I have a very personal interest and commitment to this issue, because my mother-in-law, Virginia Kelley, died in January of 1994 from breast cancer, and so we were very intimately involved with her and her disease over a number of months. She, as any of you who ever met her would know, she never wanted to have anybody feel sorry for her or in any way stop what they were doing because of her battle with breast cancer, and she was a great inspiration to us in the last years of her life as she was during her entire life.

And in our efforts to try to reach out to women around the country, we thought we would tell our own personal story about this because perhaps all of the talking and all of the statistics and all of the effort that has been put into mammography for all women, particularly older women, may not make the impression on some women that a personal story does. So we have, with the help of some very creative people, done some PSAs that I hope will, in their own way, reach some additional women, and I'd like to show those to you now.

(PSAs are shown)

We hope that other additional ideas for ways of reaching women throughout the country will come forward from this campaign. We want to, in every way we can, to get the word out. Some of the things that you'll be seeing in the Mother's Day part of this campaign are Mother's Day cards that will have inside this special "Mommagram," and so I hope that many, many people buy these cards and send them to

MORE

their mothers and their grandmothers and other women who they appreciate.

We'll be having, with deliveries of flowers on Mother's Day, which I think is probably the biggest day for flowers in the whole country, a mammogram for you which will come with every bouquet and will point out the importance of having a mammogram, and again I think that this is a way that Mother's Day can be celebrated particularly, will have pins that I hope people will wear as --especially those of you in organizations who are working on this will be visiting with women and speaking to groups, many other kinds of brochures that will be put out with our slogan -- "Get a mammogram: a picture that can save your life."

So we are very grateful for everything that all of you have done, and I think each of us has a personal reason for being here today and for being invested in this campaign, and certainly my mother-in-law is my personal reason, along with many of my friends and other women whom I have known.

My own mother couldn't be here. She's much too busy today. (Laughter.) So she's not going to be able to come for Mother's Day until toward the end of the week. And of course, this is, as the President said, our second Mother's Day without his mother. But I think that we need to celebrate all of the mothers who are here, and I asked if there could be one person perhaps chosen to represent all of the mothers, because we'd like to give them a bouquet. And this is really a bouquet for everybody, and this is a total surprise, so I'm sure this woman will say, "Why are you doing this to me," but one of the people from our listening sessions who is here today is LuAnn Richter(PHO.), a 73-year-old breast cancer survivor, and she told us that in her early years, she had regular mammograms but stopped having them because she didn't have any family history of cancer.

Seven years ago, she found a lump through a self-exam, went to a physician, it was confirmed as cancerous, she had a mastectomy. She now has regular mammograms. She is a widow with two children and four grandchildren and a member of the Older Women's League. And LuAnn, if you'll join me, you are our proxy for all of the mothers and grandmothers. (Applause.)

(MRS. RICHTER ACCEPTS BOUQUET)

Well, we are so excited to have all of you here, and I hope that this campaign will be as successful as the efforts that you have invested in it.

I also wanted to recognize another group who is here because of what they had just done, and that's the Inspiration Expedition, a group of breast cancer survivors who climbed the tallest mountain in

MORE

the world, outside of the Himalayas, in South America, and I wanted them to stand, all who were members of this expedition who are here, because we are very proud of you. (Applause.)

So we have much to be grateful for as we approach this year's Mother's Day and we have much to work for as we try to take this campaign to women throughout our country, and I want to thank all of you for making this possible and for being part of such an important effort, and I look forward to celebrating next year as we hopefully see these statistics getting better and better, as we see more and more women taking advantage of these kinds of mammography benefits, and as we move closer and closer to learning about what causes breast cancer and what will cure it for ourselves, our daughters and our granddaughters. Thank you all very much.

###

Arts for Our Sake

By Hillary Rodham Clinton

This is an ominous time for those of us who care deeply about the arts in America. A misguided, misinformed effort to eliminate public support for the arts not only threatens irrevocable damage to our cultural institutions but also to our sense of ourselves and what we stand for as a people.

One of the great successes of the arts in America is that they are not the preserve of any "cultural elite." Through museums, libraries, schools, dance companies and concerts, the arts are truly part of the

form whole communities by bringing the arts and artists to millions who otherwise might never have had the opportunity to explore first-hand our shared artistic heritage.

The President has shown that we can balance the budget over the next 10 years without undermining our commitment to the arts. The N.E.A. budget accounts for less than 0.02 percent of the Federal budget. Eliminating this small but vital agency would have grave consequences for local economies. Federal support for the arts helps attract tourists, stimulate business, expand the tax base and improve the quality of life — a huge return on a small investment.

Despite a 30-year bipartisan commitment to the arts, there are those who argue that public support is a luxury we can no longer afford. They mistakenly suggest that the arts are enjoyed only by a small, wealthy minority. But if public support for the arts disappears, those most affected will not be the richest Americans but the millions of citizens who rely on the N.E.A. to bring the arts to their local schools and communities.

I find it ironic that those who talk the loudest about America's loss of civility, character and values (particularly those arising from Western civilization) are often the first to recommend obliterating the agencies responsible for promoting and arts programs that make Sophocles, Shakespeare, Mozart and O'Keefe available to our children.

They fail to appreciate what every generation of Americans has intuitively known — that the artistic imagination is critical to our civilization and our democracy. They forget the prescient words of John Adams: "I must study politics and war that my sons may have liberty to study

mathematics and philosophy. My sons ought to study mathematics and philosophy . . . in order to give their children a right to study painting, poetry, music."

The power of the arts is not simply to provide pleasant esthetics but to help move us forward as a democracy. Human expression, as conveyed through the arts, enables us to under-

stand better the complexities of life and gives us a bridge to the world preceding and surrounding us. Most important, exposure to our cultural traditions enriches the lives of our children.

Too often, we see children who, instead of discovering the joys of painting, music, sculpting or writing, express themselves through acts of frustration and even violence. The arts offer an alternative to the more disturbing elements of our popular culture, and a safe haven that allows children to explore their creative potential, transporting them beyond the bounds of their difficult circumstances. Their exposure to the roots and diverse richness of human civilization will enhance their understanding of their own heritage and the world in which they live.

Clearly our nation faces difficult choices. But as the rhetoric heats up over the role of government in our society, I hope we will remember that public support for the arts is a down payment on our future. It is an investment in the values we claim to honor and in the cultural traditions in which democracy has flourished for 218 years. Now is no time to turn our backs on that legacy or its promise.

**Cutting support
for the N.E.A.
will hurt children.**

Public domain, accessible to all and
ble of encouraging every per-
s artistic expression and sensi-
bility.

The National Endowment for the
Arts, in partnership with individuals,
corporations, foundations and other
patrons of the arts, has helped trans-

Hillary Rodham Clinton is honorary
Chairwoman of the President's Com-
mittee on the Arts and Humanities.
This article is based on her remarks
at the Metropolitan Museum of Art
earlier this month.



Cathy Reil

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

May 3, 1995

REMARKS BY THE FIRST LADY
INTERACTION CONFERENCE
BETHESDA, MD

MRS. CLINTON:...Thank you for your introduction and for your longtime commitment to these issues. I want to thank Julia Taft for the excellent job she does every day, representing the causes and the interests that Interaction stands for.

And so many of you, who are members of the Board and officers of this organization, as well as the ones that you represent, I'm especially grateful because you have carried a message that is a difficult one for Americans to hear at any time, but has been especially difficult to be heard in these days. And I do think you are being heard. And I want to not only commend you for what you have done so far, but obviously to ask that you continue what you are doing.

I wanted to be part of this forum because I believe very strongly in the substance of your work and in the necessity to build even a stronger constituency, here in our country, and around the world for the kinds of activities that each of you knows so well makes a difference in the lives of people around the world.

As Bill said, I recently returned from a trip to South Asia, that for me, has run out of superlatives. I realized after the nine hundredth person asked me what I thought, and I had said, "Fabulous. Wonderful. Unbelievable. Incredible," that I sounded like a valley-girl. (Laughter.)

So I've tried to be more precise in my language, and not quite so carried away. But that is exactly how I felt. It was a superlative experience for my daughter and me. One that we are still digesting, and will continue to learn from for many years to come.

One of my most enduring memories is of the men and women affiliated with volunteer organizations who are devoting their lives to helping those in their community and throughout their societies. And I want to thank all of you, some of you, who are affiliated with some of the very groups that I have visited, not only during this recent trip to South Asia, but as well in

Indonesia and other places I've been privileged to visit with NGOs and voluntary groups.

We live in, as you know so well, a historic time. We are on the eve of a new century, a new millennium and on the frontier of a new world. It is a world undergoing profound changes. Dictatorships and controlled economies and ancient patriots have given way, all over the world, to democracy, free markets and handshakes. Yet at the same time, as we applaud these new opportunities for prosperity and growth, we see that change has generated new challenges and intensified old ones.

Today we confront the challenge of shrinking resources and greater global competition, the challenge of how to coexist peacefully in the face of ethnic, religious, cultural and political tensions. And most of all, the challenge of putting people's interests and needs first, of making sure that men and women, rich and poor, people of all races and creeds are included as full participants in our society.

The theme of your forum this year, "Rethinking Development in Partnerships for a New Century," speaks directly to both these new opportunities and these challenges. And I hope that as you rethink how you go about the work that you have undertaken, you will help to influence comparable conversations that are taking place in governments, and businesses and NGOs and voluntary organizations all over the world.

In those conversations we face many difficult questions. We are rethinking what we mean by "human rights" and how best to implement human rights. We are thinking about how to create conditions that encourage individual initiative and a vibrant civic life.

Certainly one of the great lessons for me that I bring back from my recent trip is that social development and economic development go hand-in-hand. This is not an either/or proposal. This is a both/and and much more formulation.

You cannot have sustainable markets and trade without investing in people. You cannot have a strong democracy without investing in people. You cannot have a thriving global community without investing in people.

And I was particularly concentrated during my trip on what many of you in this room have discovered long ago, and that is that investing in women and girls and their education, their health and their economic potential, is one of the best investments any nation can make. I have said previously, and I will continue to say it, until someone else says it, (Laughter.) and that is issues such as the health and education of women are often derided as "soft," as traditional "women's issues" that are

marginal to economic growth, that are in some way not really as important as all of the "big" issues that are talked about as being central in the social and economic challenges we face in the 21st century.

But I know, and you know, that in every country I've visited, and in every country in the world, women who are struggling to overcome poverty, and illiteracy, and inadequate health care and long standing forms of discrimination, our epicenter of the vibrancy and excitement of the possibility of building new opportunities for all people. These women are not only transforming their own lives but the lives of their families and communities.

Women represent more than half the world's population, yet they comprise a disproportionate number of the world's poor and illiterate. And that goes for every country, including our own. Yet country after country, they are denied access to education, health care, credit and political and legal rights. It is a set of issues that will not go away if we just 'wait' for nature to take its course or economic development to trickle- down. It is a set of issues that have to be addressed.

There are more than humanitarian reasons for investing in women. Where women remain illiterate, we find that democratic institutions are more fragile and the environment less well-managed. We know that investing in education goes hand-in-hand with economic opportunity. We know that that kind of investment, in the education of girls and women in parts of Asia and South America have lifted whole regions out of poverty.

I remember very well sitting in a village outside Lahore, Pakistan, at a girls school that had been started in this village, talking to the teachers and mothers of the girls who attended there.

And one woman told me that she was the mother of ten children, five boys and five girls. And she was very worried, because she believed, strongly, in educating her daughters and had sent her two older girls to the school in the village. But when they finished that school there was no further opportunity for education because the nearest school was too far from their home for the family to feel comfortable letting the girls go off on their own.

And this woman said to me, "I want my girls to be as well-educated as my boys, because if I were growing up now, that's what I would want for my own life." And focusing on those kinds of aspirations that mothers and fathers have for their daughters, gives us all an opportunity to think clearly about what we want for our own daughters and to provide as much help and assistance as we can for women around the world who feel the same way.

Progress has been made. I saw it with my own eyes. You see it every day as you serve on the frontlines making these kinds of advances possible.

I was very pleased, during my visit, to see the results of American assistance in South Asia. I saw how investment over the years by the United States and family planning services, have helped to lower the population rates in Bangladesh.

I saw the fruits of our aid at a health clinic in Nepal which has helped to produce a safe home delivery kit that will be given to midwives and others who help deliver babies. A simple kit, on the order of ORT kits, the kind that Jim Grant would hand out to anyone who talked to him for more than thirty seconds.
(Laughter.)

A simple kit, consisting of a plastic sheet, a bar of soap, a piece of twine, a razor blade and a wax disk that can literally save hundreds and hundreds of lives in a country where far too many women die during their child-bearing years.

I saw how American aid had helped support a private organization in Colombo, Sri Lanka, that offers shelter and financial and educational counseling to abused women and helps to educate children.

I saw how American aid had supported the top management university in Pakistan, in its building and in its efforts to educate both men and women to assume positions of management and responsibility in both the public and private sectors.

One of the most impressive places I visited, was the International Diarrheal Disease Control Center in Bangladesh. Not only has the Center been instrumental in family planning efforts and treatment and control of diseases like cholera, it has pioneered the use of oral rehydration therapy in treating often fatal cases of diarrhea.

I was surprised to see upon my visit, a doctor from Louisiana who was there doing a rotation because he had determined that in our country where we have 300,000 children admitted to the hospital, for diarrhea that there may be a more cost-effective and efficient way of treating these children, than the literally, half of billion dollars we now spend on intravenous fluids and hospital stays. So he had traveled from Louisiana to Dakar to learn how to do that.

All of these good investments not only help the nations and people receiving the aid, but our country as well.

I know you have already heard from Brian Atwood and Tony Lake, and you know, better than I can express, that we are at a

watershed moment in the United States as we re-assess the needs for assistance abroad and our willingness to respond to those needs.

The President is committed to addressing those needs through bi-lateral and multi-lateral assistance programs. He is also committed to a responsible reduction of the federal deficit. It was his budget that began the downward slope of the federal deficit. It was his budget that has given us three years of a declining deficit, which has not happened since Harry Truman was President.

But it is this President who knows that commitment to reducing the deficit should not and does not need to mean deep cuts in government programs that will cripple our ability to help our friends and allies around the world or to address the needs of those that who least advantaged here at home. Deep cuts in foreign aid will not solve the deficit problem. (Applause.)

Foreign aid only accounts for about one percent, as the button says, of the total federal budget. In fact, we spend less on foreign assistance than any of the other twenty industrialized nations.

Now you know well that that is not the impression conveyed to the American people, who believe that the combined expenditures of foreign aid and welfare run anywhere between thirty and fifty percent, depending upon the particular survey results that you read. Much of the challenge we face is one of getting accurate information out to people. Letting them know what the facts are and demonstrating the successes that have come because of our commitment to assisting people around the world.

At a time of economic anxiety here at home, I know, that many Americans wonder why we should invest in people living in far off places. It is in our national interest to maintain our support for the governments abroad. (Applause.)

It is not only a reflection of the moral values we espouse, it is a practical way to help prevent the spread of crises like those we have seen, much to our distress and horror, in Rwanda, Somalia and elsewhere that are so costly in human lives.

If we support education and literacy and health care around the world, we expand the markets available to Americans. Now some of the development world think that that is a crass argument to make. They would prefer that the discussion stay on the much loftier and moral plane of human rights and humanitarian objectives.

That is a very important part of any discussion, but it is also very important to tell those who are paying the bill for foreign assistance what they are getting in return for that.

And I urge all of you to be willing to make practical arguments using your own experiences in discussing the need to continue our commitment to development assistance with Americans at every opportunity you can. I urge every one of you to book yourself for every civic club speeches you can manage to make in the next three months. And in doing so, bring forth the information, make the world and humanitarian case but make the practical economic case.

It is not wrong to say that stable democracies with better educated people create more consumers for American goods. That is a fact. And we ought to be willing to make that argument on behalf of development. If we strengthen families and children, we help build more stable societies which benefit all of us with respect to the challenges of peace that we confront.

During my trip, I met men and women who remain committed to democracy, human rights and market economies. Often at a great risk to themselves. I met women who have been tortured and imprisoned, or who had watched family members be assassinated for speaking out for the freedoms we take for granted here at home.

Especially now, when our own country is undergoing some soul-searching, we ought to be speaking out on behalf of democracy and freedom and we ought to be pointing out to our citizens what a dear price others have paid all throughout the world to try to obtain the level of freedom we take for granted here in this country.

And that kind of link maybe more dramatically than anything right now, will demonstrate that our investments in people abroad reflect back on our values here at home. They go hand-in-hand. We support people and institutions and systems of governments and ideals that men and women are dying for around the world.

At a time when we are seeing democracy spread, and markets open, we should not permit our success to be turned back. We need to build on the achievements of the past and give all of us to go even further. If we do that, then we are not only maintaining a commitment to development assistance, we are maintaining a commitment to the ideals and what is best about this country.

We are helping, slowly by slowly, step by step, creating a new vision for a world we hope our children will come of age. That vision, which is still not quite clear to many of us, as we struggle with the affects of a post-Cold War world is not a vision that is not the province of any particular group or government.

Instead, it is up to all of us. It is up to every government to do more to invest in the basic rights and opportunities of its people. It is up to every business and corporation to practice socially responsible business practices, so that they too can be part of building a better world for themselves.

It is up to volunteer organizations to search hard for their own past practices, to think about how to be creative and effective in the future. It is up to each of us as individuals - all of us must work together as partners to achieve social change. You have been strong and wise partners.

I know you will continue to speak out and give voice to the aspirations of the voiceless around the world. You are their advocates but you are also messengers to the rest of us about what are the lessons we can learn that can be applied here at home. As the global community strives for a better vision of a world in which all of us have the opportunity to live up to our God-given potential.

Thank you very much.

###

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

September 6, 1995

**Remarks by First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton to the
United Nations Development Fund for Women Panel Discussion
"Women's Economic Empowerment"
Beijing, China**

MRS. CLINTON: Thank you, Noleen. Thank you very much. I want to commend all of you who are here because I think that this is one of the most important panels to hear from—the three people that you will be hearing from in a few minutes,—that will take place at this Conference. I want to thank Noleen and also the United Nations Development Fund for Women, which we all know as UNIFEM. It is a word that in any language translates into hope for women who dream of a better life for themselves, their families, and their nations.

Around the world, UNIFEM has invested in the lives and aspirations of women and has helped to empower women in ways that have not been tried before, which we will be discussing here this evening. I am pleased to announce that the United States is releasing its pledge of one million dollars to UNIFEM for 1995 so that it can continue this work.

We are here today to talk about micro-credit, where it's needed, what it is, what it can do, how it has transformed lives. It's called micro, but its impact on people is gigantic. It takes just a few dollars, often as little as \$10, to help a woman to self-employment, lift her and her family out of poverty. It is not a handout; it's a helping hand.

From the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh or to the Self-Employed Women's Association in India, or to the work in Ghana that you will hear about, to banks and programs modeled on these from Indonesia to the Dominican Republic, to my own country, we have seen that micro-lending works.

Women who have received loans from the Grameen bank, for example, have a repayment rate of 97 percent, and often within one year, and they invest their money well. Some buy milk cows to expand their family's agricultural livestock, some buy materials to make handicrafts which they then sell. Others make bricks, or repair bicycles.

But the fact is: give a woman a seed, and she will plant it, she will water it, nurture it, then reap it, share its fruits, and finally, she will replant it. In this way, step by step, the world's poorest women are leading their families, their communities and their countries to a better future. When we help these women to sow, we all reap.

I met many such women during my visit to South Asia earlier this year. I met women in India, I met women in Bangladesh. Whether it is a milk cow in Bangladesh, or a computer in Chicago, women need help and encouragement and credit to make that first investment.

I will never forget a woman I met in my own country at a program called Mi Casa in Denver that is modeled after these programs you will hear about this evening. It is a program designed not only to provide credit, but also to do something even more fundamental: to help build self-respect and self-sufficiency. The women who came to this program were on welfare, but they saw a better future for themselves and their children. And they just needed a little help—a jump-start—to realize their own potential. But often that jump-start is hard to come by.

As this one woman told me: "Many great ideas die in the parking lots of banks"—because women get only so far, they don't even get in the door, in many cases, before they are turned away. That kind of discouragement has killed the dreams of millions and millions of women.

In the United States we are attempting to build up a micro-enterprise network. It is still very young. But already several hundred programs have enabled tens of thousands of Americans to seek and find economic opportunity for themselves.

This Conference has identified economic opportunity as a critical area of concern, and we have to look for positive, practical ways to implement that concern. Access to credit, particularly through micro-enterprise, is a key priority.

Our country has accepted the challenge of making the World Conference on Women a conference of commitments. And I want to announce, this evening, some of the actions our government will take to further self-employment and microenterprise development in our country. Our Small Business Administration is already making more loans than ever to women. Through the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, we will establish a new Presidential awards program to honor outstanding micro-lending organizations. These awards will provide challenging benchmarks for microenterprise programs throughout the nation and acquaint the public with the prevalence of such programs within our own economy. We believe they will also highlight the important work of programs that provide microenterprises with key support structures such as access to credit, markets, technical advice, and training.

The President also is establishing a mechanism to better coordinate microenterprise programs across a number of our federal agencies to ensure that those programs are doing the job they were set out to do. Additionally, the United States will continue to support microenterprise in developing countries through USAID.

We know that it will take a lot of education to spread the good word about micro-credit. Despite a record that is inspiring, we still meet with skepticism and outright disbelief. There are very few financial institutions anywhere in the world that can

report a 97 percent lending rate that is returned within a year. And yet, time and again, at conferences where microenterprise is discussed, bankers and others don't understand how they could actually do it in economies around the world. So in every way possible in our country we are going to spread the word and to provide such technical assistance as will make more microenterprise programs available.

We are also concerned that capital formation and growth in some economic sectors often is now accompanying higher unemployment, longer hours with less pay, and severe restrictions on access to credit. We cannot allow small enterprises to be marginalized as a result of greater consolidation within the global economy.

I became a believer in micro-credit years ago, when my husband was the governor of the state of Arkansas. It's a poor state, and we were looking for ways to help people who didn't have access to credit. We found our model at the Grameen bank from Bangladesh and the South Shore Bank from Chicago, Illinois. That bank helped steer private investments to neighborhoods that need them, and we worked out a partnership with both Grameen, thanks to Dr. Yunice, and the South Shore Bank, that created a development bank, that created a borrowing fund, and began to make the kinds of investments in that state that we would like to see made throughout our country.

It's been a privilege for me to meet leaders such as those who are on this panel because they have devoted their lives to finding ways of ending poverty, and they have been successful in changing the lives of so many people. They have particularly focused on changing the lives of women.

As Dr. Yunus has told me, when he started the Grameen Bank lending idea, he had the revolutionary concept in mind of providing loans in a fifty/fifty ratio, for men and women. He quickly found out that women were better credit risks, that women would invest the money more in the family, that women would repay the loans. Gradually over time, more and more women became the focus of the Grameen Bank's lending. That was not only revolutionary, but it set a fire that has gone through the developing world as a way of telling people that women are able to become self-sufficient if they are given the tools that enable them to do so on behalf of themselves and their families.

Because of the success of such programs, the World Bank and USAID, along with eight other major donors, have joined together to form a consultative group to aid the poor in order to finance small loans to the world's poor, the vast majority of whom are female. This is the kind of joint effort that we need to support.

I know that when we talk about issues such as lending money to women, whether it is in a conference such as this, or attempting to make the case to financial institutions around the world, there are often eyes that glaze over. Issues connected to women, such as poverty, education, health and children or micro-credit, are too often called "soft" by people who would have us think that these issues are unimportant. Nothing could be

further from the truth.

If there is any message that this Conference could bring about economic opportunity, it is that we must engage in micro-credit in order to build microenterprises. We must open the doors of banks and other existing financial institutions to women who can become self-sufficient and responsible borrowers and we have to do so while there are people like those on this panel who are able to demonstrate clearly that this approach works.

We really don't have a lot of time. The globalization of the economy has meant that many, many people are being marginalized, are being downsized, are being deprived of economic opportunities. We have to now, more than ever, make microenterprise a key element of providing economic opportunity for women and men everywhere in the world.

And I'd like now to introduce you to someone who has done that, whom I have had the privilege of visiting and seeing in action through the Self-Employed Women's Association in India. And so please join me in welcoming Ela Bhatt.

###

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

September 5, 1995

**FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
REMARKS TO THE UNITED NATIONS
FOURTH WORLD CONFERENCE ON WOMEN
BEIJING, CHINA**

MRS. CLINTON: Thank you very much Gertrude Mongella, for your dedicated work that has brought us to this point.

Distinguished delegates and guests, I would like to thank the Secretary General of the United Nations for inviting me to be part of this important United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women. This is truly a celebration -- a celebration of the contributions women make in every aspect of life: in the home, on the job, in the community, as mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, learners, workers, citizens and leaders.

It is also a coming together, much the way women come together every day in every country.

We come together in fields and in factories. In village markets and supermarkets. In living rooms and board rooms.

Whether it is while playing with our children in the park, or washing clothes in a river, or taking a break at the office water cooler, we come together and talk about our aspirations and concerns. And time and again, our talk turns to our children and our families.

However different we may appear, there is far more that unites us than divides us. We share a common future. And we are here to find common ground so that we may help bring new dignity and respect to women and girls all over the world -- and in so doing, bring new strength and stability to families as well.

By gathering in Beijing, we are focusing world attention on issues that matter most in the lives of women and their families: access to education, health care, jobs, and credit, the chance to enjoy basic legal

and human rights and to participate fully in the political life of their countries.

There are some who question the reason for this conference.

Let them listen to the voices of women in their homes, neighborhoods, and workplaces.

There are some who wonder whether the lives of women and girls matter to economic and political progress around the globe. . . . Let them look at the women gathered here and at Hairou. . . . the homemakers, nurses, teachers, lawyers, policymakers, and women who run their own businesses.

It is conferences like this that compel governments and peoples everywhere to listen, look and face the world's most pressing problems.

Wasn't it after the women's conference in Nairobi ten years ago that the world focused for the first time on the crisis of domestic violence?

Earlier today, I participated in a World Health Organization forum. In that forum we talked about ways that where government officials, NGOs, and individual citizens are working on ways to address the health problems of women and girls.

Tomorrow, I will attend a gathering of the United Nations Development Fund for Women. There, the discussion will focus on local -- and highly successful -- programs that give hard-working women access to credit so they can improve their own lives and the lives of their families.

What we are learning around the world is that, if women are healthy and educated, their families will flourish. If women are free from violence, their families will flourish. If women have a chance to work and earn as full and equal partners in society, their families will flourish.

And when families flourish, communities and nations will flourish.

That is why every woman, every man, every child, every family, and every nation on our planet does have a stake in the discussion that takes place here.

Over the past 25 years, I have worked persistently on issues relating to women, children and families. Over the past two-and-a-half years, I have had the opportunity to learn more about the challenges facing

women in my own country and around the world.

I have met new mothers in Indonesia, who come together regularly in their village to discuss nutrition, family planning, and baby care.

I have met working parents in Denmark who talk about the comfort they feel in knowing that their children can be cared for in creative, safe, and nurturing after-school centers.

I have met women in South Africa who helped lead the struggle to end apartheid and are now helping build a new democracy.

I have met with the leading women of my own hemisphere who are working every day to promote literacy and better health care for the children in their countries.

I have met women in India and Bangladesh who are taking out small loans to buy milk cows, rickshaws, thread and other materials to create a livelihood for themselves and their families.

I have met doctors and nurses in Belarus and Ukraine who are trying to keep children alive in the aftermath of Chernobyl.

The great challenge of this conference is to give voice to women everywhere whose experiences go unnoticed, whose words go unheard.

Women comprise more than half the world's population. Women are 70% percent of the world's poor, and two-thirds of those who are not taught to read and write.

Women are the primary caretakers for most of the world's children and elderly. Yet much of the work we do is not valued -- not by economists, not by historians, not by popular culture, not by government leaders.

At this very moment, as we sit here, women around the world are giving birth, raising children, cooking meals, washing clothes, cleaning houses, planting crops, working on assembly lines, running companies, and running countries.

Women also are dying from diseases that should have been prevented or treated; they are watching their children succumb to malnutrition caused by poverty and economic deprivation; they are being denied the right

to go to school by their own fathers and brothers; they are being forced into prostitution, and they are being barred from the bank lending office and banned from the ballot box.

Those of us who have the opportunity to be here have the responsibility to speak for those who could not.'

As an American, I want to speak up for women in my own country -- women who are raising children on the minimum wage, women who can't afford health care or child care, women whose lives are threatened by violence, including violence in their own homes.

I want to speak up for mothers who are fighting for good schools, safe neighborhoods, clean air and clean airwaves. . .

. . .for older women, some of them widows, who have raised their families and now find that their skills and life experiences are not valued in the workplace. . . for women who are working all night as nurses, hotel clerks, and fast food chefs so that they can be at home during the day with their kids. . . and for women everywhere who simply don't have time to do everything they are called upon to do each day.

Speaking to you today, I speak for them, just as each of us speaks for women around the world who are denied the chance to go to school, or see a doctor, or own property, or have a say about the direction of their lives, simply because they are women.

The truth is that most women around the world work both inside and outside the home, usually by necessity.

We need to understand that there is no one formula for how women should lead their lives.

That is why we must respect the choices that each woman makes for herself and her family. Every woman deserves the chance to realize her God-given potential.

We also must recognize that women will never gain full dignity until their human rights are respected and protected.

Our goals for this conference, to strengthen families and societies by empowering women to take greater control over their own destinies, cannot be fully achieved unless all governments -- here and around the world -- accept their responsibility to

protect and promote internationally recognized human rights.

The international community has long acknowledged -- and recently affirmed at Vienna -- that both women and men are entitled to a range of protections and personal freedoms, from the right of personal security to the right to determine freely the number and spacing of the children they bear.

No one should be forced to remain silent for fear of religious or political persecution, arrest, abuse or torture.

Tragically, women are most often the ones whose human rights are violated.

Even in the late 20th century, the rape of women continues to be used as an instrument of armed conflict. Women and children make up a large majority of the world's refugees. And when women are excluded from the political process, they become even more vulnerable to abuse.

I believe that, on the eve of a new millennium, it is time to break our silence. It is time for us to say here in Beijing, and the world to hear, that it is no longer acceptable to discuss women's rights as separate from human rights.

These abuses have continued because, for too long, the history of women has been a history of silence. Even today, there are those who are trying to silence our words.

The voices of this conference and of the women at Hairou must be heard loud and clear:

It is a violation of human rights when babies are denied food, or drowned, or suffocated, or their spines broken, simply because they are born girls.

It is a violation of human rights when women and girls are sold into the slavery of prostitution.

It is a violation of human rights when women are doused with gasoline, set on fire and burned to death because their marriage dowries are deemed too small.

It is a violation of human rights when individual women are raped in their own communities and when thousands of women are subjected to rape as a tactic or prize of war.

It is a violation of human rights when a leading cause of death worldwide among women ages 14 to 44 is the violence they are subjected to in their own homes by their own relatives.

It is a violation of human rights when young girls are brutalized by the painful and degrading practice of genital mutilation.

It is a violation of human rights when women are denied the right to plan their own families, and that includes being forced to have abortions or being sterilized against their will.

If there is one message that echoes forth from this conference, let it be that human rights are women's rights. . . . And women's rights are human rights, once and for all.

Let us not forget that among those rights are the right to speak freely. And the right to be heard.

Women must enjoy the right to participate fully in the social and political lives of their countries if we want freedom and democracy to thrive and endure.

It is indefensible that many women in non-governmental organizations who wished to participate in this conference have not been able to attend -- or have been prohibited from fully taking part.

Let me be clear. Freedom means the right of people to assemble, organize, and debate openly. It means respecting the views of those who may disagree with the views of their governments. It means not taking citizens away from their loved ones and jailing them, mistreating them, or denying them their freedom or dignity because of the peaceful expression of their ideas and opinions.

In my country, we recently celebrated the 75th anniversary of women's suffrage. It took 150 years after the signing of our Declaration of Independence for women to win the right to vote.

It took 72 years of organized struggle on the part of many courageous women and men.

It was one of America's most divisive philosophical wars. But it was also a bloodless war. Suffrage was achieved without a shot fired.

We have also been reminded, in V-J Day observances last weekend, of the good that comes when men and women join together to combat the forces of tyranny and build a better world.

We have seen peace prevail in most places for a half century. We have avoided another world war.

But we have not solved older, deeply-rooted problems that continue to diminish the potential of half the world's population.

Now it is time to act on behalf of women everywhere.

If we take bold steps to better the lives of women, we will be taking bold steps to better the lives of children and families too.

Families rely on mothers and wives for emotional support and care; families rely on women for labor in the home; and increasingly, families rely on women for income needed to raise healthy children and care for other relatives.

As long as discrimination and inequities remain so commonplace around everywhere in the world -- as long as girls and women are valued less, fed less, fed last, overworked, underpaid, not schooled and subjected to violence in and out of their homes -- the potential of the human family to create a peaceful, prosperous world will not be realized.

Let this conference be our -- and the world's -- call to action.

Let us heed the call so that we can create a world in which every woman is treated with respect and dignity, every boy and girl is loved and cared for equally, and every family has the hope of a strong and stable future.

That is the work before you, that is the work before all of us, who have a vision of the world we want to see for our children and our grandchildren. The time is now. We must move beyond rhetoric, we must move beyond recognition of problems, to working together, to have the common efforts to build that common ground we hope to see.

God's blessings on you, your work and all who will benefit from it. Godspeed and thank you very much.

###

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

September 5, 1995

**Remarks by First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton
to the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women
Beijing, China**

MRS. CLINTON: Mrs. Mongella, Under Secretary Kittani, distinguished delegates and guests:

I would like to thank the Secretary General of the United Nations for inviting me to be part of the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women. This is truly a celebration—a celebration of the contributions women make in every aspect of life: in the home, on the job, in their communities, as mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, learners, workers, citizens and leaders.

It is also a coming together, much the way women come together every day in every country.

We come together in fields and in factories. In village markets and supermarkets. In living rooms and board rooms.

Whether it is while playing with our children in the park, or washing clothes in a river, or taking a break at the office water cooler, we come together and talk about our aspirations and concerns. And time and again, our talk turns to our children and our families. However different we may be, there is far more that unites us than divides us. We share a common future. And we are here to find common ground so that we may help bring new dignity and respect to women and girls all over the world—and in so doing, bring new strength and stability to families as well.

By gathering in Beijing, we are focusing world attention on issues that matter most in the lives of women and their families: access to education, health care, jobs and credit, the chance to enjoy basic legal and human rights and participate fully in the political life of their countries.

There are some who question the reason for this conference.

Let them listen to the voices of women in their homes, neighborhoods, and workplaces.

There are some who wonder whether the lives of women and girls matter to economic and political progress around the globe.

Let them look at the women gathered here and at Huairou—the homemakers, nurses, teachers, lawyers, policymakers, and women who run their own businesses.

It is conferences like this that compel governments and people everywhere to listen, look and face the world's most pressing problems.

Wasn't it after the women's conference in Nairobi ten years

ago that the world focused for the first time on the crisis of domestic violence?

Earlier today, I participated in a World Health Organization forum, where government officials, NGOs, and individual citizens are working on ways to address the health problems of women and girls.

Tomorrow, I will attend a gathering of the United Nations Development Fund for Women. There, the discussion will focus on local—and highly successful—programs that give hard-working women access to credit so they can improve their own lives and the lives of their families.

What we are learning around the world is that if women are healthy and educated, their families will flourish. If women are free from violence, their families will flourish. If women have a chance to work and earn as full and equal partners in society, their families will flourish.

And when families flourish, communities and nations will flourish.

That is why every woman, every man, every child, every family, and every nation on our planet has a stake in the discussion that takes place here.

Over the past 25 years, I have worked persistently on issues relating to women, children and families. Over the past two-and-a-half years, I have had the opportunity to learn more about the challenges facing women in my own country and around the world.

I have met new mothers in Jojakarta, Indonesia, who come together regularly in their village to discuss nutrition, family planning, and baby care.

I have met working parents in Denmark who talk about the comfort they feel in knowing that their children can be cared for in creative, safe, and nurturing after-school centers.

I have met women in South Africa who helped lead the struggle to end apartheid and are now helping build a new democracy.

I have met with the leading women of the Western Hemisphere who are working every day to promote literacy and better health care for the children of their countries.

I have met women in India and Bangladesh who are taking out small loans to buy milk cows, rickshaws, thread and other materials to create a livelihood for themselves and their families.

I have met doctors and nurses in Belarus and Ukraine who are trying to keep children alive in the aftermath of Chernobyl.

The great challenge of this Conference is to give voice to women everywhere whose experiences go unnoticed, whose words go unheard.

Women comprise more than half the world's population. Women are 70% percent of the world's poor, and two-thirds of those who are not taught to read and write.

Women are the primary caretakers for most of the world's children and elderly. Yet much of the work we do is not

valued—not by economists, not by historians, not by popular culture, not by government leaders.

At this very moment, as we sit here, women around the world are giving birth, raising children, cooking meals, washing clothes, cleaning houses, planting crops, working on assembly lines, running companies, and running countries.

Women also are dying from diseases that should have been prevented or treated; they are watching their children succumb to malnutrition caused by poverty and economic deprivation; they are being denied the right to go to school by their own fathers and brothers; they are being forced into prostitution, and they are being barred from the bank lending office and banned from the ballot box.

Those of us who have the opportunity to be here have the responsibility to speak for those who could not.

As an American, I want to speak up for women in my own country—women who are raising children on the minimum wage, women who can't afford health care or child care, women whose lives are threatened by violence, including violence in their own homes.

I want to speak up for mothers who are fighting for good schools, safe neighborhoods, clean air and clean airwaves; for older women, some of them widows, who have raised their families and now find that their skills and life experiences are not valued in the workplace; for women who are working all night as nurses, hotel clerks, and fast food cooks so that they can be at home during the day with their kids; and for women everywhere who simply don't have time to do everything they are called upon to do each day.

Speaking to you today, I speak for them, just as each of us speaks for women around the world who are denied the chance to go to school, or see a doctor, or own property, or have a say about the direction of their lives, simply because they are women. The truth is that most women around the world work both inside and outside the home, usually by necessity.

We need to understand that there is no formula for how women should lead their lives.

That is why we must respect the choices that each woman makes for herself and her family. Every woman deserves the chance to realize her God-given potential.

We also must recognize that women will never gain full dignity until their human rights are respected and protected.

Our goals for this Conference, to strengthen families and societies by empowering women to take greater control over their own destinies, cannot be fully achieved unless all governments—here and around the world—accept their responsibility to protect and promote internationally recognized human rights.

The international community has long acknowledged—and recently affirmed at Vienna—that both women and men are entitled to a range of protections and personal freedoms, from the right of personal security to the right to determine freely the number and spacing of the children they bear.

No one should be forced to remain silent for fear of religious or political persecution, arrest, abuse or torture.

Tragically, women are most often the ones whose human rights are violated.

Even in the late 20th century, the rape of women continues to be used as an instrument of armed conflict. Women and children make up a large majority of the world's refugees. When women are excluded from the political process, they become even more vulnerable to abuse.

I believe that, on the eve of a new millennium, it is time to break our silence. It is time for us to say here in Beijing, and the world to hear, that it is no longer acceptable to discuss women's rights as separate from human rights.

These abuses have continued because, for too long, the history of women has been a history of silence. Even today, there are those who are trying to silence our words.

The voices of this conference and of the women at Huairou must be heard loud and clear:

It is a violation of human rights when babies are denied food, or drowned, or suffocated, or their spines broken, simply because they are born girls.

It is a violation of human rights when women and girls are sold into the slavery of prostitution.

It is a violation of human rights when women are doused with gasoline, set on fire and burned to death because their marriage dowries are deemed too small.

It is a violation of human rights when individual women are raped in their own communities and when thousands of women are subjected to rape as a tactic or prize of war.

It is a violation of human rights when a leading cause of death worldwide among women ages 14 to 44 is the violence they are subjected to in their own homes.

It is a violation of human rights when young girls are brutalized by the painful and degrading practice of genital mutilation.

It is a violation of human rights when women are denied the right to plan their own families, and that includes being forced to have abortions or being sterilized against their will.

If there is one message that echoes forth from this conference, it is that human rights are women's rights—and women's rights are human rights. Let us not forget that among those rights are the right to speak freely—and the right to be heard.

Women must enjoy the right to participate fully in the social and political lives of their countries if we want freedom and democracy to thrive and endure.

It is indefensible that many women in nongovernmental organizations who wished to participate in this conference have not been able to attend—or have been prohibited from fully taking part.

Let me be clear. Freedom means the right of people to assemble, organize, and debate openly. It means respecting the

views of those who may disagree with the views of their governments. It means not taking citizens away from their loved ones and jailing them, mistreating them, or denying them their freedom or dignity because of the peaceful expression of their ideas and opinions.

In my country, we recently celebrated the 75th anniversary of women's suffrage. It took 150 years after the signing of our Declaration of Independence for women to win the right to vote.

It took 72 years of organized struggle on the part of many courageous women and men. It was one of America's most divisive philosophical wars. But it was also a bloodless war. Suffrage was achieved without a shot being fired.

We have also been reminded, in V-J Day observances last weekend, of the good that comes when men and women join together to combat the forces of tyranny and build a better world.

We have seen peace prevail in most places for a half century. We have avoided another world war.

But we have not solved older, deeply-rooted problems that continue to diminish the potential of half the world's population.

Now it is time to act on behalf of women everywhere.

If we take bold steps to better the lives of women, we will be taking bold steps to better the lives of children and families too.

Families rely on mothers and wives for emotional support and care; families rely on women for labor in the home; and increasingly, families rely on women for income needed to raise healthy children and care for other relatives.

As long as discrimination and inequities remain so commonplace around the world—as long as girls and women are valued less, fed less, fed last, overworked, underpaid, not schooled and subjected to violence in and out of their homes—the potential of the human family to create a peaceful, prosperous world will not be realized.

Let this Conference be our—and the world's—call to action.

And let us heed the call so that we can create a world in which every woman is treated with respect and dignity, every boy and girl is loved and cared for equally, and every family has the hope of a strong and stable future.

Thank you very much.

God's blessings on you, your work and all who will benefit from it.

###

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

September 6, 1995

**Remarks by First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton
to the NGO Forum
Huairou, China**

MRS. CLINTON: Thank you. Thank you so much. I feel so much at home and so much a part of this group. I only wish that in addition to the enthusiasm and interest among all of the Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs) who are gathered here, the weather had been more cooperative this morning and I greatly regret that we were forced to move this occasion indoors in order to avoid any of us drowning out there. I am very sorry that not everyone who wished to be with us this morning was able to, and I hope all of you will convey my personal regrets to anyone who was turned away or disappointed because of the size of this auditorium.

It is a great pleasure for me to be here, and I want to start by thanking Supatra and Irene for their leadership in this extraordinary and historic enterprise.

But I also want to thank all of you who are here, because I know from looking at the lists of people who have come, from knowing personally many of the Americans who have come, that in this auditorium and at this Forum, there are thousands and thousands of women and men who every day work to make life better in their communities for all people. And that is the greatest contribution any one of us is able to make, and that is why the United States and many other countries so strongly support the efforts of NGOs and have worked very hard to ensure that NGOs could participate in this Forum.

As many of you know, our government and other governments recognize the important role that NGOs play in policy and planning, in development and implementation and monitoring of programs that advance the progress of women.

I have come here, to Huairou, to salute you for your dedication to a cause greater than all of us. I know that many of you went to great efforts to be here. I know many were kept from attending this Forum. I know that for many of you who did get here, getting here was far from easy. Many of you did not even know until the last minute that you would be permitted to travel

here, and others bore great personal expense in order to come.

In addition to the weather, which is not in anyone's control, and is always unpredictable, I know that you have had to endure severe frustrations here as you have pursued your work. And I also want to say a special word on behalf of women with disabilities who have faced particular challenges.

But I mostly want to thank you for your perseverance, because you did not give up, you did not stay away, you are here, and the fact that you are, will make a difference in the days and months and years to come. Because even though you may not be physically present in Beijing at the Conference during these ten days, the wisdom that is accumulated here, the experience, the energy, the ideas are on full display.

Thanks to your resourcefulness, your tenacity, your sense of purpose and your spirit, you are playing an important role in this Conference, and you will be the key players in determining whether or not this Conference goes beyond rhetoric and actually does something to improve the lives of women and children.

As I said yesterday, the faces of the women who are here mirror the faces of the millions and millions who are not. It is our responsibility, those of us who have been able to attend this Conference and this NGO Forum, to make sure that the voices that go unheard will be heard. This Conference is about making sure that women, their children, their families, have the opportunities for health care and education, for jobs and political participation, for lives free of violence, for basic legal protections, and yes, for internationally recognized human rights no matter where they are or where they live.

Time and time again we have seen that it is NGOs who are responsible for making progress in any society. Some of us never knew we were NGOs twenty and twenty-five and thirty years ago. That was not even a phrase that any of us had ever heard. We were people working together on behalf of all of those rights which we care about and hold dear. But when one looks at the progress that has been made throughout the world, it is clear that it is the NGOs who have charted real advances for women and children.

It is the NGOs who have pressured governments and have led governments down the path to economic, social, and political progress, often in the face of overwhelming hostility. Again, NGOs have persevered, just as you have by coming here and staying here and participating in this Forum.

What will be important as we end the Forum and the Conference at the end of this week is that it will be NGOs who will hold governments to the commitments that they make. And it is important that the final Platform for Action that is adopted

be distilled into words that every woman, no matter where she lives, or how much education she has, can understand. I think we should want every woman, no matter where she is, to believe that there are women all over the world who care about her health, who want her children to be educated, who want her to have the dignity and respect that she deserves to have.

When I think of the faces that I have seen in my own country, when I think of the women who did not have health care because they cannot afford it in the United States of America, when I think particularly of a woman I met in New Orleans, Louisiana, who told me that because she did not have enough money she was told by physicians there in our country, that they would not do anything about the lump in her breast, but would merely wait and watch, while if she had insurance she would have been sent to a surgeon. I think about the woman I met in a village outside Lahore, Pakistan, who had ten children, five boys and five girls, and was struggling as hard as she could to make sure her girls were educated and wanted help to get that job done.

I think of the faces of the beautiful women I met at SEWA, the Self-Employed Women's Association, in India. All of them had walked miles and miles, some of them for twelve and fifteen hours to get to our meeting together, and I listened as they stood up and told me what it had meant that for the first time in their lives, they had a little money of their own. They could buy their own vegetable carts. They could buy their own thread and materials so that they could make income for themselves and their families.

I think of the women in a village in Bangladesh, a village of untouchables—women were Hindus—who invited to their village for my visit Moslem women from the neighboring village. I think of how those women sat together under a lean-to—Hindus and Moslems together in one of the poorest countries of the world, but so many of those women telling me how their lives had been changed because they had become borrowers and were now part of the Grameen Bank microenterprise effort.

I think particularly of the play that their children put on for me to see, a play in which the children acted out the refusal by a family to let a girl child go to school. And then further down the road from that village, I stood and watched families coming to receive food supplements in return for keeping their girl children in school.

Those are the kinds of women and experiences that happen throughout the world, whether one talks about my country or any country. Women are looking for the support and encouragement they need to do what they can for their own lives and the lives of their children and the lives of their families. The only way this Conference will make a difference to these women is if the

results of the Conference are taken and distilled to a minimal number of easily read pages which state the basic principles. When that is done, the message can be carried into every corner of the world where women will recognize and exchange shared experiences.

When I came home from Bangladesh, I visited in Denver, Colorado, a program that is modeled on the Grameen Bank, helping American women who are welfare recipients get the dignity and the skills that they need to take care of themselves and their children.

So despite all of the difficulties and frustrations you have faced in coming here and being here, you are here not only on behalf of yourselves, but on behalf of millions and millions of women whose lives can be changed for the better. Let us all resolve to leave this place and do what we can together to make the changes that will give respect and dignity to every woman.

I know that today at the women's conference there is a special celebration of girls. The theme is: "Investing in Today's Girls, Tomorrow's Women, and the Future." We know that much of what we do, we are doing not for ourselves, but we are doing for our daughters, our nieces, our granddaughters. We are doing it because we have the hope that the changes we work for will take root and flower in their lives.

When I was privileged to be in New Delhi, India, I met a young woman who I think spoke for many, many women, and someone asked me yesterday at the Conference if I had a copy of the poem which this young woman wrote. I said that I did and she asked if I could read it today, and I said that I would. This was a poem about breaking the silence, the silence that afflicts too many women's lives, the silence that keeps women from expressing themselves freely, from being full participants even in the lives of their own families. This poem written by a young woman, I think, is particularly appropriate since we are celebrating today the future of girls. Let me read it to you:

Too many women
in too many countries
speak the same language.
Of silence.
My grandmother was always silent—
always aggrieved—
only her husband had the cosmic right,
(or so it was said)
to speak and to be heard.
They say it is different now.
(After all, I am always vocal
and my grandmother thinks
I talk too much)
But sometimes I wonder.

When a woman gives her love, as most women do, generously—
it is accepted. When a woman shares her thoughts,
as some women do, graciously—
it is allowed.

When a woman fights for power,
as all women would like to,
quietly or loudly,
it is questioned.

And yet, there must be freedom—
if we are to speak.

And yes, there must be power—
if we are to be heard.

And when we have both
(freedom and power)
let us not be misunderstood.

We seek only to give words
to those who cannot speak
(too many women
in too many countries)
I seek only to forget
the sorrows of my grandmother's
silence.

That is the kind of feeling that literally millions and
millions of women feel every day. And much of what we are doing
here at this Forum and at this Conference is to give words to
break the silence and then to act.

When I was at Copenhagen for the Summit on Social
Development, I was pleased to announce that the United States
would make an effort to enhance educational opportunities for
girls so that they could attend school in Africa, Asia, and Latin
America. Today that effort, funded with United States' dollars,
is being organized in countries throughout those continents by
NGOs.

There are so many ways we can work together. There are so
many things that must be done. And let me just end with a
postcard that I received from a woman who, with many, many
others, wrote me her feelings and thoughts about this Conference.
I don't know this woman, but she wrote to tell me that she wanted
me to carry this card to Beijing. And she went on to say, "Be
assured of many prayers for the success of the Conference, to
better conditions for women and children throughout the world."

She put on this card a prayer and the prayer was written in
many languages. It's a prayer that applies and can be said by
many, if not all of the world's religions. I want to end with
that because I think that in many respects what we are attempting
to do requires the kind of faith and commitment that this prayer

represents:

Oh God, Creator of the heavens and the earth, we pray for all who gather in Beijing. Bless them. Help them and us to see one another through eyes enlightened by understanding and compassion. Release us from prejudice so we can receive the stories of our sisters with respect and attention. Open our ears to the cries of a suffering world and the healing melodies of peace. Empower us to be instruments in bringing about Your justice and equality everywhere.

That is my prayer as well, and with my thanks to all of you I believe we can take the results of this Forum and this Conference and begin to translate them into actions that will count, in the lives of girls and women who will have never heard of what we have done here, but whose lives can be changed because of what you have done by coming here.

Thank you all very much.

###

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 19, 1996

REMARKS BY FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
TO THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
NEW YORK, NEW YORK

MRS. CLINTON: Thank you so much. I am delighted to be here. I want to extend my congratulations to the council and to Lesley Gelb, Pete and Dwayne and all who have not only kept it going, but have kept it vital, and for this invitation to come and speak with you about women and development.

When a friend of mine found out that I would have this opportunity, which struck him as somewhat odd, he asked what my subject was. And I told him that I intended to talk about women and development. And his response was all too typical. He said, "Well, why would the council really care about that?" And I think it's a great tribute to the council and to all of you here that you do care about this issue, which I believe is among the most compelling, yet most overlooked, in the foreign policy arena. I also believe it has direct consequences for how we attempt to develop our own country.

My ideas on this subject are rooted both in personal observations and experiences here at home and overseas, and in the growing body of research and literature about social development.

Some of you may have wondered how I've spent my time lately. Among the areas that I have spent time working on for the past three years are those that effect women's' development and their children, with particular emphasis on what we as a nation can do both alone and through multi-lateral arrangements.

I have been very fortunate to meet with women literally all over the world. I've met with new mothers in Jojakarta, Indonesia, who gather in their village each week to learn about family planning and better nutrition for their children. I have talked with doctors and nurses in Belarus and Ukraine who are trying to keep alive the children of Chernobyl. I have met with women from Tokyo to London to Ottawa to Santiago, to talk about what we have in common, what we can learn from one another and how we can best utilize our resources to assist in the process of development.

On Saturday, I will be heading for Bosnia, Turkey and Greece -- again to highlight both what we are doing alone and with our partners in the reconstruction work in Bosnia, and the many efforts that are ongoing in Turkey and Greece.

So this is an opportune time for me to share with you a few of my own observations, and I hope you will accept these comments in the spirit in which they are offered. I am not here as a foreign policy spokesman for the White House or the Clinton Administration, or even for my husband, but as a person who cares deeply about our nation's engagement in the world, and who sees investing in women as a realistic, practical and moral approach -- a way to fuse both American ideals and interests.

I have long subscribed to the belief that investments in people, particularly women and children, are just as essential to the prosperity and stability of our national family and global community as investments in open markets and trade. I certainly have seen first hand, having had the privilege to travel on behalf of the United States, what that means in practice.

I remember very well the stop that I made last spring, in Ahmedabad, India, a textile center. On the edge of town is a women's bank, founded by a disciple of Gandhi, named Ela Bhatt. The bank has one room. The teller's counter is an old kitchen table. Bank clerks record all the transactions by hand, on yellow sheets of paper bound in volumes that look like worn-out telephone books.

I was there for only a few hours. But in that time I met women who had walked 12 to 15 hours from remote villages to take out their small loans -- some as small as \$1 -- to invest in dairy cows, or plows, or goods they could sell at market.

Women run the bank. Only women are allowed to make deposits and borrow money. And today this bank has assets of more than \$3 million. Its loan repayment rate, which would be the envy of most commercial banks, is nearly 100 percent. It has 60,000 members -- all women, many of whom are among the poorest, least educated and most ostracized in India.

Against enormous political, social and economic odds, these women have joined together in a trade union and cooperative, called the Self-Employed Women's Association, or SEWA, that provides them with job training, microcredit and mutual support. One after another, these women who had gathered together in a tent behind the small building with their bank, stood up to tell me their stories. There was a sea of saris, mostly reds and pinks; there were translators as these women told me what being part of SEWA and taking out these small loans had meant to them and their families. Their lives had been transformed. They had acquired authority over themselves to an extent that they had

never dreamed possible. And as a result of their cooperation through SEWA, they were beginning to influence local government, police and commerce, all because they were finally recognizing they had a contribution to make and had been given the tools of opportunity needed to make that contribution.

That is but one example of grass-roots enterprises targeted at women that are reshaping local and regional landscapes around the world. Many of the projects that I have visited have received some support from the United States Agency for International Development. And after seeing those dollars at work on several continents, I am more convinced than ever that small amounts of American aid can be a catalyst for untangling the web of poverty, illiteracy, inadequate health care and cultural hostility that today still prevents women and girls from becoming full and equal partners in their societies.

I am also pleased that based on these results -- which we can point to and measure -- the Clinton Administration has doubled the investment in social development through the development banks.

These investments that we make with our tax dollars are not a one-way street. In fact, I have also visited projects here in the United States, projects that have borrowed from what works overseas. Not only from a project like SEWA, but other microcredit enterprise projects, most notably one begun by Dr. Mohammed Yunus, the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh. I have also visited projects run by FINCA, another microcredit enterprise bank in Latin America.

I wish that all of you could have been with me in Bangladesh, to visit the village that was picked out to show me the way the Grameen bank worked in action. It happened to be a village of Hindu untouchables, and once that village was selected, the village down the road a few miles demanded that they too wanted a visit. It was a Muslim village. Because of my schedule there was no way that I could go to both villages, so for the first time ever the Muslim women came to the Hindu village. They worked together to prepare the village for my visit. I met with all of them in their borrowing groups, and listened to them tell stories about the way their being a borrower of the Grameen Bank had changed the way they looked at sending their daughters to school, working outside their homes, cooperating to sink wells. It was one of the most amazing experiences that I have ever had.

And then half a world away, in a barrio in Managua, Nicaragua, I met with women that had borrowed from the FINCA bank. After they finished telling me about their own enterprises, I asked if they had any questions. And one woman said, "I saw you on television, talking to other women very far

away. I think in India. What did you talk to them about? What do we have to learn from them?"

That's the kind of experience that I have also seen beginning to be replicated here at home. We are starting to invest in microcredit efforts. I have visited a program called Mi Casa, in Denver, that helps many women on the model of the Grameen Bank or SEWA, to acquire the same skills and the same access to credit that transformed lives many, many miles away.

I will never forget one woman in Denver who said to me that she had tried for years to borrow enough money to be able to expand a small bakery business because she considered herself the best baker in her neighborhood in Denver. She would go to the bank and the bank would tell her she didn't have enough collateral, she didn't have enough experience. They weren't going to lend even the \$1,000 she asked for, until finally she found this program at Mi Casa. She said, "You know, many great ideas die in the parking lots of banks." I thought that was a telling statement, because in this country, particularly with the way banking has changed, many, many ideas die in the parking lots. And to provide credit to small entrepreneurs, to those who are on the brink of poverty themselves but who have a market in neighborhoods and communities that other businesses shun, is one of the best investments we can make in helping to lift our own people out of poverty.

Certainly, we know that the kind of investments that work in helping people to become self-sufficient -- particularly in an economy as complicated as ours -- will take time and effort, just as it has taken time and effort elsewhere. But we are finally beginning to put into action some of what we have learned. The Small Business Administration is making more loans than ever to women. And through the Treasury Department we are finally seeing the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, recognizing through new Presidential awards, programs to honor outstanding American micro-lending organizations.

Certainly these kinds of cross fertilizing lessons -- that we can learn from because we have helped to seed them elsewhere and to bring them home here -- are a way of demonstrating that our national interest must take root in the values that we profess here and abroad.

There is another example I would like to mention, and that concerns our support for family planning programs to help stabilize populations, to help reverse or ameliorate the environmental degradation and to help reduce abortions in the developing world.

At the moment, roughly 100 million women cannot get or are not using family planning services because they are poor,

uneducated or don't have access to care.

Some 20 million women will seek unsafe abortions. Some will die, some will be disabled for life, some will go through with unintended pregnancies, some will find their lives, their opportunities therefore curtailed. If the United States does not want women here and elsewhere to have abortions, then the United States should do more to support family planning programs, particularly in overpopulated developing nations.

I have visited hospitals where I have seen half of the women admitted being there as a result of the consequences of self-induced abortions. Most recently I visited a hospital in Salvador, Brazil. I saw classrooms throughout that hospital displaying charts and diagrams of information about reproduction and family planning. I also met with the Minister of Health, who told me about what a difference it was beginning to make that USAID was supporting family planning information and services. And he said something that I have long remembered. He said, "The rich women and the middle class women here in Brazil have always had access to family planning. It is only the poor women who have not." And so even there, in a predominantly Catholic country, there is growing recognition that family planning saves lives, and that American aid to such efforts is in our interests as well as those who need help.

Now I'm not suggesting that through microcredit or family planning programs, or through any of the other social investments that I believe make a difference, U.S. foreign aid is a panacea for women or for developing countries. Nor am I starry-eyed enough to believe that every just cause in the world, whether or not it is related to women, is ours to embrace.

But I do believe that as long as discrimination and inequities persist, and are so commonplace around the world -- so long as women are valued less, fed less, fed last, overworked, underpaid, not schooled and subjected to violence in and out of their homes -- the potential of all of us to create a stable, peaceful, and ultimately prosperous world will be far from realized. And that in turn affects stability, peace and growing prosperity that is in our national interest.

If we care, as we do, about opening foreign markets for American goods and services...if we care about making our country secure in the face of new post-Cold War threats...if we care about enlarging the world's community of democracies, then I believe we have to address the conditions and circumstances of the world's women, who after all comprise more than half of the population, but are 70% of the poor and two-thirds of those who are not taught to read and write.

So many of the everyday indignities and tragedies that women

around the world face -- seeing a child die of malnutrition, watching a son go off to school, but not a daughter, being forced into prostitution or indentured servitude, being barred from the bank or the ballot box -- are reversible if enough women have enough education and enough authority over their own lives.

Women remain the primary caretakers of the world's children and elderly, and families throughout the world rely on women for emotional support and increasingly for outside income. In a time when the pressures of consumption and technology place greater burdens on family life in virtually every country on the planet, women will be relied on even more to sustain and protect the family unit. And investing in those women will ensure that they have at least an even chance of being able to do that.

The single most important investment any developing nation can make today is in the education of girls and women. What we are discovering in country after country is that education is not just a means of acquiring knowledge, but that it has positive effect on women's health, nutrition, wages, and level of political participation.

Deputy Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers, who has studied for a number of years and written about the economics of women and development, argues that, "investment in the education of girls may well be the highest return investment available in the developing world."

Today, more than 600 million women worldwide are denied the opportunity for education. I have seen some of the reasons and talked with people about why women fall into that category. It's so clear that for many families, sending a girl to school still makes no economic sense since the girl will be sent away to live with someone else's family. Sending them to school in the face of the daily struggle to survive, planting crops and harvesting them, and fetching water, and doing all of the other domestic chores, makes no sense. Sending a daughter to a doctor when money is scarce, or feeding her when she is hungry but the boys have not yet eaten, makes no sense in the cultures and the reasoning of so many families.

But where we see exceptions to that kind of thinking, we see positive results. Take the very poor state of Kerala, in India. Now, Kerala has the highest literacy rate and life expectancy, as well as the lowest infant mortality rate, in India. "Why?" many people have asked. The answer seems to lie in their tradition of investing in health care and education, and including girls in that investment. We have also seen that a commitment to education is slowly making a difference in countries as far from one another as Jordan, or Pakistan, or Nepal.

In Bangladesh, I saw the struggling efforts of a country to

deal with the problem of girls not attending school. I visited a school run by the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee, a non-governmental organization, that believes education is a precondition for economic development. They also believe that educating girls is essential. Because of that, some of the BRAC schools have been burned, because extremist groups disagreed with educating girls and even with education itself. The schools keep being built.

Also in Bangladesh, I have seen the government working to provide incentives for families in two ways: The food for education program, where very poor families are enticed to send their children, including their daughters, to school in return for food allotments, given out every week. And then, as further encouragement to give girls the chance to go onto secondary school, the government is actually paying families by depositing a small amount of money in a bank account, so long as the girls attend school.

In Sri Lanka, women have had the right to vote for the better part of this century. Not surprisingly, they also demanded and received more education. So again, Sri Lanka, in comparison, has the region's best health care system and lower maternal mortality rates than many wealthier nations.

Outside Lahore, Pakistan, in a very small village, I met with ten women who talked to me about how they view their children's' futures. We were sitting in a dusty courtyard of a school that had been built for girls to receive primary education. One mother of 10 children, 5 boys and 5 girls, said that she had sent her daughters to this school, but now that her daughters had graduated, there was nowhere for them to go. There were no secondary schools nearby, and the family would not send the daughters, unlike the sons, to attend school somewhere else. That woman asked me, and the other mothers echoed her, if I would pass on to the government of Pakistan their interest in having a secondary school for girls built in their village.

Many of the problems that stand in the way of educating girls are ones that will take both government action and the concerted support of non-governmental organizations.

But we can begin to see the results. Chile has made enormous strides thanks to education reform and a return to democracy. I visited a poor area of Santiago where the schools are open on weekends to accommodate parents' work and provide babysitting. I also saw other examples of efforts to involve parents in their children's' education, and to persuade fathers to accept parenting responsibilities.

The United States recognizes the truth of what we are now learning about investing in girls education. And in Copenhagen,

last year, I was pleased to announce a new \$100 million USAID initiative for girls' and women's' education in the developing world. The first distribution has been made to India. This American aid can make a huge difference. And certainly those of us who believe that investing in people, particularly their education, is good for the United States should be supporting such programs.

Sadly, though, there are some in our country today who question the value of our political, economic, military and social engagements abroad. They believe that our commitments to other nations, and even to multilateral arrangements including the United Nations, are undermining our national sovereignty and sacrificing American interests.

I believe that America's global engagement is essential to strengthening our free market interests and spreading our democratic ideals, as well as providing for our security. By contrast, it is isolationism and its corollary, misguided unilateralism, that pose a great threat to our position in the world, as well as to the hopes and dreams of hundreds of millions of women, children and men.

We are at a turning point, as many of you in this audience know far better than I, where we, as a nation, have to decide whether we will remain engaged and then how we will act upon that engagement.

Over time, we have learned that our ideals and interests cannot be divorced from the political, economic and social cross-currents swirling around us. And I hope we have also learned that engagement represents opportunities as well as obligations.

For these reasons, it is troubling to see our bipartisan tradition of engagement and multi-lateralism threatened today. It is troubling to see negative stereotypes fostered purely for narrow political purposes, whether it is the distorted idea that the U.S. military would be under United Nations command, or the public ridiculing of the U.N. Secretary General's name.

This brand of demagoguery is a poor substitute for a forward-looking and forceful foreign policy.

Social development, the investment in people and their potential, is foreign policy, not social work. It is a realistic and moral way for the United States to help expand the global economy, nurture young democracies, and improve our own chances for peace and prosperity.

So as we reconsider today, and as we look forward into the future about what kind of leadership our nation intends to

provide to the rest of the world, I hope we will consider as a very practical part of that engagement social investments in women that will create a dynamic a new source of energy for a growing global economy and civil society.

I believe this development policy must become a central priority of our own foreign policy, and also it must be understood as a part of what we need to do here at home. By following through on such an investment approach we have the chance to bring us closer to a world in which distinctions between men and women are viewed ultimately as complementary parts to a greater whole. And we...really converge to reconsider what is in our best interests both here at home and abroad. Thank you very much.

###

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 8, 1996

**REMARKS BY FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
TO THE PARENT TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
ARLINGTON, VA**

MRS. CLINTON: Thank you so much. I am just delighted to be here. I want you to know just how much I appreciated that introduction, but I want your board to know how much all of us appreciate Joan's representation of you. She has done an excellent job of conveying the positions of the PTA, the concerns that parents and teachers have, to the President and everyone else.

I think that the PTA's leadership and dedication to issues on behalf of children has always been important, but it's perhaps even more important now -- more than at any point in your history. I believe that because we have many forces at work, not only in our country but around the world, many of which are very positive, many of which really do open up possibilities for countless numbers of people. We are learning so much about the way the human brain develops that it will give us so many more good ideas about how to help children and how to teach effectively at home and in the schools. But at the same time that so many good things are happening, we would be foolish indeed if we did not recognize that there are many challenges, many risks and many difficulties as well in the world that we face and that our children are being brought up in. And so a kind of commitment to partnership, to taking stands on behalf of parents and children and education that the PTA has long been known for is especially critical today. I can think of many examples, but I will only mention a few.

On behalf of the President and the Administration, I will begin by applauding you for your leadership in the effort to combat teen-age smoking. The PTA has helped the Department of Health and Human Services promote the "Stop the Sale" program against tobacco smoking targeted at children. And your partnership in the new National Center for Tobacco-Free Kids makes you an indispensable ally in what the President is attempting to do. I think that this battle against tobacco is especially important because we know that 3,000 children a day pick up the habit of smoking. We know that children have been targeted. In my book, which I've referred to, I talk about the

evidence -- overwhelming evidence -- we have about how the tobacco companies have turned their marketing influences on our children. And I think it tells us something that is important to know.

There is always a tension in our society between those who have the right to advocate and sell their products in our free market system and the rest of us who, both individually and together, sometimes have to protect ourselves and particularly our children against certain products and against the consumer-culture emphasis of those products. And there is no clearer example of this than smoking. And I thank you on behalf not only of the President, but on behalf of my daughter and her friends and all of our children today. This will not be easily done.

Joan and I were talking before when we came in about the conference yesterday that the President hosted on youth and violence. And that was particularly focused on illegal drug usage, and we know that that was a great challenge to us. But tobacco smoking we also know is a gateway experience for other destructive experiences such as illegal drug usage. So by focusing on the tobacco industry's efforts to entice children to smoke we are also saying don't use our children for other kinds of dangerous activities as well.

As some of you I'm sure know, the President and the Vice President held a closed-door meeting with executives from the entertainment industry. All networks were represented, all the cable stations, all the major movie studios, to discuss with the industry their willingness to create a voluntary rating system. This would never had happened if the telecommunications bill had not included the V-chip. And for many, many years the PTA, and now a lot of other individuals and groups, have been raising the alarm about the content of television. And many of us have tried in our own homes to control what our children see, but we know that that is often only half the battle. Because even for my friends who are part-time homemakers, they don't watch their children 24 hours a day. They don't follow their children to their friend's homes. They know that their children are being exposed to things that they wish that they were not. So it's a constant effort on the part of parents to reassert authority in our own homes. And to stick behind the entertainment industry to move toward voluntary ratings combined with the V-chip will give parents an enormous tool that we don't now have.

Even before the V-chip can be put into television sets, which won't start for about two years, the ratings system, which is supposed to be available as of next January or earlier, will give parents more information than they've had up until now. We won't have the convenience of the V-chip, but at least we can try to exercise more vigilance because of that.

After the closed-door meeting and the press announcement by the President, the next day the President and the Vice President and Tipper Gore and I met with some PTA members and some children and some experts to talk about how we would actually implement this V-chip and ratings system in our homes. It was a great discussion because many parents have been reading your media guides, have been having meetings about this. Some of the active chapters that have made a real outreach effort, not only through PTA meetings but through community and neighborhood meetings as well, were able to describe what has been done up until now. I think that when we had the conversation, one of the most telling comments that was made was made by a young boy, 10 years old, who came to this event with his parents, and he was very upset because he's worried about younger children. And, you know, he knows what he's supposed to watch and what he's not supposed to watch. And he knows it's not real, but it's these little kids, and I quote, "Just pretend they are Mighty Morphin Power Rangers or the X-Men and then they'll just go around pretending they're killing each other or such things and think nothing of it." And I thought that was pretty astute observation, even though he was talking about those little people, four and five years of age.

But at that same meeting there was a very impressive statement by Dr. Robert Phillips of the American Psychiatric Association, who explained, and it wasn't so much for the Gores or my husband and me because we already believe this, but it was in part to convey this to the media that was covering the event - that children are like little VCR's, they see something once and then they repeat it and they repeat it over and over and over again. I don't think there is any doubt any longer, and I go on at some length in my book to try to make this point so it could be more popularly available to people. All the studies that have been done, they've all concluded the same thing -- that violence does desensitize our children, the repetitiveness of it, the unreality of it.

And in addition we are now getting research that the kind of presentation of family life on television, the dysfunctionality in the comedy series, in the talk shows is also undermining children's sense of what a family should be. So there isn't, I think, any room for argument about the way the content of television affects our children.

I also, though, would like to add a word that I believe the process of television watching is also damaging to our children. We now know that television watching is a much more passive activity than reading, for example. You burn more calories when you read. I'm thinking about a new campaign. You know, "lose weight by reading." There might be something in that. And so we know that the passivity of it has affected children.

We also know that the instant gratification that it conveys undermines children's willingness to stick to hard tasks and to try to learn the things that don't come easily because you can just hit the remote control when you're watching television. And many of my friends who are teachers tell me they feel like they're clicked off all the time because a lot of learning is simply hard, boring, repetitive work. And our children have got to, once again, understand that schoolwork is their work and that it's not television that should consume most of their hours. So I hope that the progress that you have made in raising these issues gives you a lot of satisfaction, because I'm convinced that we would not be able to point to the success of the V-chip and this ratings system, we would not have launched this campaign against tobacco's influence on our children if it had not been for the work that you have done in so many of your efforts, both locally, at the state level and nationally.

Having said that, there is still a lot ahead of us to do. Certainly the work you've done on the critical media viewing project has got to be spread more widely, and I urge you to do all that you can to reach as many parents as possible. Too many parents still don't know what you know about how best to watch television together as a family. Too many parents still don't know what so many of you knew and did with your own children and which you advocate -- the kind of talking to children and reading to children that helped prepare children for school -- things that cannot be done if the television set is on for seven to 11 hours on average in the family home. So the more we can reach out in a helpful way to help parents be the best mothers and fathers they can be, the more likely we are to strengthen families and to help our children become resilient, productive young people.

So on my behalf, and certainly for the President and all who care about these issues, I want to thank you for your leadership. I want to thank you for your support on behalf of these important issues and I also want to ask you to stay as committed as you are, because I think we're finally getting an audience again. I don't know that we had one for a while there. People were not listening. But the PTA is growing again in many areas of the country. Parents are once again understanding what their primary obligations are. Schools are opening themselves more readily to parental involvement. So I see the convergence of a lot of good things that are coming to pass, and we just have to make sure that they continue and grow and give more and more parents and teachers the tools they need to make life better for our children. Thank you very much.

###

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the First Lady

For Immediate Release

November 13, 1995

**REMARKS BY FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
AT NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH EVENT
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

MRS. CLINTON: Good Afternoon. Thank you. Thank you. Please be seated and please be welcomed to the White House. This is a very special day for all of us. And there have been many very important events that have occurred here in the East Room of the White House, but I honestly don't believe there is any that is more important than what we are doing by celebrating National Adoption Month. And November is a particularly appropriate time to highlight the importance of adoption in this country.

It's hard to believe but Thanksgiving and the Holiday Season are a little more than a week away. And during this season we traditionally focus on family. And we recognize how much we need and depend on the love of our parents and spouses and children and other relatives. So for all of you who are gathered here to begin this celebration, that we hope will ignite a fire of enthusiasm throughout the country about adoption, I want to say thank you.

There are several members of Congress here and I am delighted that all of you could join us. Secretary of Health and Human Services, Donna Shalala, a long time advocate of family and children services is here with us because all of us believe that there isn't anything more important than our families and that the families formed by adoption are special and deserve the support of all the rest of us. Because we want to emphasize that there's a need in our country to bring the richness and love and support and guidance and discipline and attention of family life to every one of America's waiting children.

As we go into the Holiday Season, I hope every American will recognize that there are tens of thousands of children waiting for the love of a mother, a father, a sister, a brother, to have grandparents and aunts and uncles, to have a dog or a cat like Socks. Tens of thousands of those children, every single day, are growing up without mothers or fathers to help teach them, to nurture them and to tell them that they are special. We know

they are, but they need someone in their family to tell them that.

Often when we think of adoption, we have a picture in our mind of infants being welcomed into a family. But adoption today involves children and teenagers of all ages, backgrounds and circumstances. In this room today are adoptive families and waiting children who demonstrate the range of adoptive experiences. Adoption has provided a new beginning for school-aged children, for adolescents, for children with physical and emotional and educational disabilities, children of different races and cultures, and brothers and sisters who want to remain together.

Let me give you a picture of the children in America who are waiting. Six out of ten of them are school-aged children. Four out of ten are white. Four out of ten are African-American. The rest, Hispanic, Native American and every other race and color that you can imagine. Two out of three have special needs. Each one of these children has the capacity to love, to bring new joy and energy into a family. Most of you who are here, the families that already know that, are living proof of how adoption can be successful and emotionally rewarding. But we need more of you.

I recently met with Shane Salter, a young man who grew up in foster care without ever being placed in a permanent family. He described what that meant to him. He talked about his continued longing for parents who would not only care for him but who could be grandparents to his own children. Adoption can change lives, not only of those in the immediate family, but through generations.

I know that adoption in America today can be frustrating and emotionally draining and expensive. A newspaper column I wrote about adoption this summer generated more responses than any other I've written. I meet people throughout the country who come up and say they have read my column and they're an adoptive parent. Or they have read my column and they're a foster parent. Or they read my column, and they were adopted. Prospective parents have written to tell me of the immense obstacles, the red tape, and the costs, particularly the legal costs, that have led them to despair of ever being able to adopt a child.

I want you to know that the President is committed to easing and encouraging the adoption process. And I recently convened a group of experts to discuss how to make the government a better partner, and more responsive to the needs of prospective parents and children. In particular, the administration is working hard to ease the adoption of minority and special-needs children. The President is committed to enforcing the Multi-Ethnic Placement Act which prohibits adoption agencies from denying the placement

of a child solely on the basis of race, color, or national origin of a child or prospective adoptive parents.

The administration also championed -- and the first bill the President signed -- was the Family and Medical Leave Act which ensures that parents can take time off when they adopt a child without fearing the loss of their jobs. And the administration has launched a public education campaign about adoption. A campaign in which I am very honored to participate. These are just some of the many initiatives, both in the government and in the private sector, and in partnership between both the public and private sectors, that are designed to support the placement of children in loving homes.

But all of your efforts and all of the administration's efforts to strengthen our families and children could be jeopardized by actions in Congress. The government currently provides essential recruitment and training services for prospective adoptive parents. As well as subsidies to families who adopt special-needs children, those living with Cerebral Palsy, or HIV, or some other disability, since those children have large medical and educational expenses. Many of the children who are special-needs, when they are adopted into families, bring with them such large medical costs, that if Medicaid is cut back substantially, the medical insurance for many of those special-needs children will no longer be available after they are adopted. Which would be a great tragedy, because there are so many parents who just need a little bit of financial help with the costs. Need a little bit of subsidy but then do need continuing medical help to be able to open their lives to these children. So we must all who care about adoption know that putting our nation's economic house in order does not mean sweeping out compassion and caring for our neediest children and families, making it less likely they will ever have a house of their own.

We have to work together to improve our adoption system. In the Proclamation for National Adoption Month the President said that citizens from all communities and organizations from the public and private sectors must join together to renew our commitment to finding permanent homes for each one of America's children. Two of the private foundations doing this important work are the Ann E. Casey Foundation which is active in five states, and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation's Families For Kids, active in ten states.

I wish we could re-double, re-triple our efforts. I believe that if we really put our minds to it, if we could recruit qualified volunteers out of our judicial system and our legal system and our social work system, to be assigned to each child who is waiting to be adopted. We could make it possible for thousands and thousands more children to be adopted by this time

next year. We have to put our minds to it but there is no more important task than trying to do everything in our power to ensure that every child has a family.

Perhaps no person has been a more effective advocate for children waiting to be adopted, than our next speaker. The founder of Wendy's, the star of T.V., Dave Thomas started speaking out on adoption in 1990 when he became the national spokesperson for the White House Initiative on Adoption. As an adopted child himself, he says he would not have become the successful father, husband and businessman he is today, had he not been able to grow up in a supportive family.

The Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption seeks to make adoption more affordable, streamline the adoption process, and educate the public about the potential joys of adoption. Mr. Thomas believes that no child is unadoptable and every child deserves a home and a loving family. But he knows, as we all do, that we have to overcome some misconceptions about adoption. We have to make it very clear that the children who are waiting are children just like yours and mine and every other child who goes to school and plays in playgrounds. They are America's children. And we have to make it clear to America that they would benefit greatly from having one of these children in their lives.

Mr. Thomas has also been a leader in the campaign to encourage corporations to extend maternity benefits to adoptive parents. This is so important. We do a terrible job in our country of ensuring maternity benefits in nearly every instance in most of the businesses in our country. It's important for new parents to be able to spend time with that child. Think how important it is for a new child coming into a strange home, filled with anticipation to have some time where he is the center of that family's attention, and that at least one parent gets a chance to spend that time with the child.

Within Wendy's, adoption benefits are paid leave and financial assistance with adoption costs. Available to employees who have been with the company for at least one year. All of us are very proud of Mr. Thomas' leadership and grateful to him for it.

Following him to the podium will be the Reverend Wayne Thompson, President of One Church-One Child. This is one of the great ideas in America. And I wish every church would join One Church-One Child. Because through One Church-One Child, we have seen literally hundreds of thousands of children being given homes who might otherwise not have been known to anyone. And the church serves as a back-up extended family for the members who adopt children. Through this work, thousands of African-American children have found loving homes and supportive church congregations.

You will also be hearing from the Marshall Family. The proud parents of two beautiful little girls, they have experienced so much love and happiness with their two daughters, that they have spent considerable time promoting adoption in their own community. In fact, they are the family featured in the posters supporting adoption that appear in Wendy's restaurants around the world.

And then finally, we will hear from a young woman who knows exactly what's at stake. Deanna is 13. She lived in a foster home for seven years before moving into a group home in Topeka, Kansas. Though she no longer lives with her two foster sisters, she is still close to them and she is still waiting. She is a cheerleader, an avid reader, and a budding poet -- and a lovely young woman based on my experience with her a few minutes ago.

So these people who will be speaking to you have the experience that we would like to see transmitted to every American. They know what it's like to form a family by choice. To be able to say, I choose you to be my son or daughter. And in return to know what it's like as a child to have the love and support that can only come from one's own family. So please join me in welcoming Mr. Dave Thomas."

Dave Thomas: "Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. I thank you Mrs. Clinton. I asked Mrs. Clinton about, something like about a year ago, if she would help. And she said, "I will." And that's the reason why we're here today so I just want everyone to know that Mrs. Clinton and the President are dedicated to adoption. So let's give them a big hand, because they did it.

Let me tell you why I'm interested in adoption. I was adopted as Mrs. Clinton said, and my mother, my foster mother died when I was about five years old. And I was born out of wedlock and I had nothing to do with it -- trust me. And I had nothing to do about being adopted, it wasn't my fault. But I was adopted and I had six, no not six, I had three more foster mothers and step-mothers and then I left when I was 15 years old. But I do know how important it is, a family. And all through my life I've always been envious of mothers and fathers. Because I've never seen my mother and father. And if you have never seen your mother and father and the nurturing, you know everyone deserves the love and nurturing, when you grow up. I never had it, and I've always been kind of jealous of it.

And my kids, I have five children, fourteen grandchildren, and I probably spoil them for that reason. Now whether that's good or bad, but it's one of the things that, I wasn't spoiled. But I know one thing, I did have a grandmother that did care for

me. She was my foster grandmother and I didn't find out until I was 13 years old that I was adopted, and I was really hurt. So I do know how important it is and I feel so sorry for these children today, in particular, parents who don't take care of their children. I mean I just think it's a crime. I think we need to have an education to educate these parents about responsibility. I don't know how you feel about it but I'm real strong on responsibility.

You know, in foster care, there is almost a half-million children in foster care right now. And there's about 100,000 waiting to be adopted. And when we started the foundation, we said, well, we need to have some goals. And our objective was to make adoption affordable and take the red tape out of adoption, and so that's what we've really been trying to do. And so the first thing we did, we put adoption benefits right with the maternity benefits. And I want everybody to understand it's kind of a no-brainer. If you have maternity benefits, add adoption benefits. And we've done that--

I'm even trying to get the federal government to do the same. Right Mrs. Clinton? Mrs. Clinton said she's going support me. Congressmen? -- Women? -- Senators? Don't forget now, because it's really important. But right now we have, in about thirty-five states, we have adoption benefits. And in cities and in corporations. We wrote all kinds of letters and it's really the right thing to do. We have not said how much, but just to help.

And we also have a bill in the Congress to a tax-credit. And I think it's something for -- adoption is expensive. And we need to help people to adopt as Mrs. Clinton said. And I hope this bill -- Debby -- is going to work out real well. I hope everybody supports it because it's really an important thing.

And then, I think that the next thing that we've been working on, is that we've tried something that we call a computer. Does everybody understand what computers are? And Jan Heffner is the Director of the Dave Thomas Foundation -- stand up Jan -- Jan has been working on this real, real hard.

You know what it is, it's really children with willing parents. Now the children need to be matched with willing parents. And what's happened is IBM, AT&T and Marriot have helped with some government agencies working to make this happen. And the first example case of adoption's waiting children on-line through the National Adoption Center, there was 100,000 inquiries. Am I right Jan? Over 100,000. So Internet is really something that we're really trying to work on.

We're trying to do everything we can to make it possible and remind people about adoption. Because, what happens, these kids are out there, and they go from foster home to foster home. I was in Chicago not too long ago and a little boy, six years old, was in sixteen foster homes. Can you imagine that? I mean that's not fair. So that's what we're really trying to do and if we can get the federal government -- that would really be a good example to put in for all the federal workers adoption benefits. Don't you think so?"

Mrs. Clinton: "I do."

Dave Thomas: "So, I'd just like to say this, I'd like to just say this. I think this is really a great event. I think it's something that we need to work on. And the more awareness and the more we talk about it. And I just keep talking about, and some people like to listen to me and some don't. But I'm going to keep talking because that -- every boy and every girl deserves a loving family. So thank you, and god bless you."

Wayne Thompson: "Thank you Mrs. Clinton for the opportunity to be a part of this historic day, and for your help in raising the awareness of the need for adoptions in our nation. The importance of adoption of children throughout our country can never be overstated. For these children are fortunate enough to have loving, permanent homes, in which they have been nurtured and cared for. They're led into adulthood with the support of parents which every child is entitled to and every child requires.

The family values are embodied by those parents who choose to bring children into their families and experience the joys of parenthood. The mission of the National One Church-One Child is to challenge each and every African-American congregation to adopt one African-American child. We believe that this furthers our need in our community for taking responsibility for our children. Believe me, this plan works.

In our church, we have had over sixteen adoptions since my involvement in this worthwhile program. In fact, there's one little boy who thinks he's pastor. When he was adopted I noticed that -- I always go to the door to greet the members as they leave -- I noticed that my line was shorter than usual, and I became a little bit concerned. I looked around and saw him shaking hands. And he had been adopted by a single-parent, a young woman who was an accountant, so I went over to him and I said, 'Now listen, there are some ground rules in this church. I'm the pastor -- and I shake everybody's hands so if you want to shake hands, come stand by me.' Well the brightness of his eyes

told the whole story. That where he had had no friends, no extended family, no church home, he was rejoicing, because now he had a new family and new friends.

We've had enormous success in placing children in our community in much needed adoptive homes. Many families, however, cannot adopt children without the help of the federal guarantee of financial assistance for every child and especially for special-needs children. This includes the children with Downs Syndrome and Cerebral Palsy and HIV AIDS and crack-cocaine addictive. These children are important too. And children are important to god and so our mission is one that we feel that we must continue to fight until the battle has been won.

The average family could not accept the responsibility for these children without the federal guarantee of financial assistance that is currently provided. This guarantee enables these families to care for children who would otherwise languish in the foster care system. And we are aware that there are welfare reform proposals that are pending now in Congress that would eliminate this much needed guarantee. And so our aim, and our struggle continues as we sound the alarm throughout our communities and from our pulpits, that there are children who are needed to be adopted, but that the government needs to accept the partnership which we offer. We offer it willingly. We offer it gladly.

Two out of three children who are waiting for adoption in this country have special-needs, making this federal guarantee more essential than every before. In the history of One Church-One Child, since 1980, more than 90,000 children have found homes through our congregations across this nation.

We thank god for the vision of Father Clemence many years ago and we thank you, Mrs. Clinton, for the vision you've cast forth today, because with your support and the support of those who represent and make up our government, we know that the prayers of the righteous will be answered. And so we offer, in this partnership consortium, the prayers of many people who want children to have permanent loving homes. Many pastors who work in our programs have themselves, like me, become adoptive parents and so we know that we practice what we preach. And we know that the children are the ones who get the blessing.

Again, thank you for making this a special day for children across this nation. We know that they long and deserve permanent, loving homes. And so that the need for further guaranteed federal protection most come and we believe with the help of god it will come. Thank you."

Mrs. Marshall: "First of all, I'd like to thank Mrs. Clinton, Mr. Thomas and all others involved, for inviting my family to be a part of this special event for a very important issue.

First of all, I would like to say that if only everyone out there knew, how much joy and happiness Kayla and Terry have brought into me and my husband's life, everyone would be lined up at all adoption agencies everywhere to adopt a child.

My husband and I have been married for 12 years. After being married 9 years, we decided we wanted children. I went to the doctor and found out that I wasn't able to have children. I used to always watch a local spot on our local news program called, 'Wednesday's Child'. They highlight on children that are up for adoption and need homes. So we decided to call Franklin County Children's Services and see how we could go through the adoption process.

They invited us to an adoption party in April of 1992. We were there for about an hour and there were hundreds of kids there from the ages of new-born to 7 years of age. We were there and we played with kids, we made balloons, we jumped rope and then all of a sudden, a little girl comes in. She was late. She came in and she had her little friend's hand and I looked at my husband and I said, 'Look at those jaws, I just love her.' When I first saw her, we knew that she was the one.

She talked to us at lunch, she asked for our fruit that we didn't want. She wasn't shy at all. And so we knew that she was the one and we called the next day and said that we wanted to start our class immediately, we wanted to get her as soon as possible. After we adopted Terry, she wanted sisters and brothers and so we said, 'Hey, we're willing to go and adopt another.' So then, Kayla comes into our life and there's not a day that doesn't go by that she just makes us smile and laugh so much. And if we had room in our home we would adopt 1,000 kids, no matter what race, what religion, color. We just love kids, because children are our future.

I remember when one day we didn't have kids, back when we didn't have kids, we adopted 15 children, nieces, nephews, neighbors' kids, and we went to the Ice Capades. We took up a whole row. We came back to our one bedroom apartment, we threw a big pajama party for 15 children. So, I mean, if we had room, we would adopt more, but we don't have the room in our home but we do have the room in our hearts. And we would like to let the kids know that are waiting for families and homes to keep the faith and with a little bit of help, hope and prayer, you'll all have a family and a home some day. Thank you."

Deanna Moppin: "My name is Deanna Lee Moppin. I have been in SRS custody ever since I was five years old. I was removed from my birth home because of sexual abuse. I was then placed in a new home where I remained for seven years, but then we seemed to have some problems so I was removed from that home along with two other of the girls that were in there.

We were placed in a shelter in Topeka, Kansas where we remained for a few nights before moving on to the villages. In the villages, I have two foster parents and there are nine other kids living with me. The foster parents try to help us feel good about ourselves and they try to help us with our problems and they do the best to find us all good homes that we will happy in.

Some of the kids have nowhere to go, so they just have to keep putting one foot in front of the other and hope for the best while making goals for themselves until they reach their destination.

For most of them their destination is adoption. It is also one of mine. The reasons that I want to get adopted is usually if I want to go to the movies, I have to ask my house parents and they have to ask my village social worker who has to ask my social worker -- and then it has to come back the same way. That usually takes awhile. And if I want clothes, I have to ask my house parents who have to ask my village social worker who has to ask my social worker. There is also paper work that needs to be done and that usually takes up to about three weeks.

The other reasons that I want to be adopted is I would have a place that I could call home. I would have a room that I could call my room. I would have a family that I could love and would love me back.

I wrote a poem about waiting for a home and I would like to share it with you now:

My nerves cringe with excitement as I must wait.
I don't know when it will happen, there is no date.

My one wish that I hope to come true.
Will you make my wish come true, will you?

I don't want to be here forever, I want a home.
Please get me out of this system and out of this dome.

Does anyone want me; it feels like three whole years.
I am still waiting for you, I'm so close to tears.

I want to live happy with my spirit so free.
Only you can make it happen; when will it be?

The papers are here, you have finally heard.
I'd fly to you now if I were a bird.

One question left; Do we make a pair?
Are you somebody who will really care?

I hope you're the one for other choices have come.
I'll go through them all for my choice should not be dumb.

I've always been hoping for this day to arrive.
Without a good family I could not survive.

My nerves boil with excitement I no longer wait.
I know when it will happen and I do know the date.

Mrs. Clinton: "I want to thank everyone who's here and all of the participants. I want to invite all of you into the State Dining Room where there will be a reception and some cookies and things for all of the children who have demonstrated extraordinary patience this afternoon. I just want to end with something that really, I think, echoes what everyone said. The primary responsibility for children lies with the parents and parents have the highest obligation to their own children and should do everything in their power to take care of those children. But sometimes for a lot of reasons that go back to the beginning of human history, that responsibility is not accepted. And then all the rest of us, I think, have the responsibility. We are a part of every child's family whether we acknowledge it or not. And so in any way that we can, we should try to accept that responsibility and give the love and attention that every child who was born deserves to have. And so that's what we hope the result of this National Adoption Month campaign will lead to -- more and more Americans accepting responsibility for all our children. Thank you very much."

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary
Lyon, France

For Immediate Release

June 29, 1996

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT
ON THE BOSNIAN WOMEN'S INITIATIVE

Today, I am pleased to announce an initial contribution of \$5 million to establish the Bosnian Women's Initiative fund. A peaceful, prosperous Bosnia will require the full participation of its women.

Many Bosnian women now find themselves sole providers for their families. They have lost their husbands, fathers, sons, and brothers. Despite the hardship they have suffered, these women have displayed incredible strength, endurance, and resourcefulness — qualities that are essential to rebuilding their country.

To do this successfully they need resources. They need training. This initiative means loans for income-generating projects that women can do from home. It means loans to women-owned businesses, or to companies where large numbers of women work. It means training in business management, marketing and accounting, farming techniques for those returning to agricultural communities, and in skills vital to rebuilding their country — like engineering, architecture, plumbing and construction.

The fund will be managed by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) with international and national non-governmental organization as implementing partners.

Even as I am making this announcement, over 500 Bosnian women leaders are meeting in Sarajevo. They have traveled from every part of the region, crossing ethnic lines, to work together on plans to rebuild their country. These plans will be incorporated into this initiative. For it is the Bosnian women themselves who hold the key to their future.

By providing new programs focused on women's reintegration into the Bosnian economy, we will enable them to support their families, to work as full partners in society, and to promote prosperity. I believe that the enhancement of Bosnian women's economic and political participating will help foster stability in the region.

I urge our fellow members of the G-7 and other countries to join the United States in supporting this initiative and contributing funding for it.

###

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary
Lyon, France

For Immediate Release

June 29, 1996

FACT SHEET
BOSNIAN WOMEN'S INITIATIVE

President Clinton announced at the G-7 Summit in Lyon that the U.S. is providing an initial contribution of \$5 million to establish the Bosnian Women's Initiative.

A peaceful, prosperous Bosnia requires the full participation of its women. Many Bosnian women now find themselves sole providers for their families. They have lost their husbands, fathers, sons, and brothers. Despite the challenges, these women have displayed strength, endurance and resourcefulness — qualities that are essential to rebuild their country. This initiative establishes a fund to assist them in their efforts.

The fund will be managed by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) with international and local non-governmental organizations as implementing partners. The President urged members of the G-7 to support the initiative and to contribute funding for it.

The resources will fund:

- Business Development Loans for:
 - women-owned businesses or to companies where large numbers of women are employed;
 - income-generating projects that women can do from home and that are sustainable in today's markets.
- Skills Training:
 - in areas that will enable women to compete in the global economy, such as business management, marketing and accounting;
 - for women returning to agricultural communities, especially those who now find themselves as sole providers for their families;
 - in fields vital to rebuilding the infrastructure of the region, such as engineering, architecture, plumbing, and construction.
- Access for women to productive resources:
 - to provide cooperative day care for children, elderly, and disabled family members, allowing women to work outside their homes.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Lyon, France)

For Immediate Release

June 29, 1996

PRESS CONFERENCE BY THE PRESIDENT

Terrace of Pavillon du Parc
Lyon, France

4:18 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: It's really beautiful, isn't it? Please sit down. Well, the weather has certainly cooperated for our summit.

Ladies and gentlemen, this summit made real progress in the three areas that we came here to address: the fight against terrorism and crime, strengthening the peace in Bosnia, advancing our common agenda for economic growth.

I thank the leaders for sharing our outrage at the cowardly attack in Saudi Arabia, and for agreeing to intensify the fight against terrorism. We resolved to take a range of concrete steps that will extend the efforts we are making at home. These steps will help us to achieve four key objectives: First, terrorists and criminals must have nowhere to hide. For example, we must cooperate to speed up extradition and prosecution of those who practice terror and then leave the country in which they commit their acts.

Second, we must drive the resources terrorists use to fund their violence. Third, we must do a better job of defending our national borders, to keep the terrorist, the criminals, and the illegal weapons out. And finally, we must stop terrorists from misusing the high-tech communications that we all rely on for commerce and cooperation.

Even more can be done. That's why we directed our senior officials to meet as soon as possible to recommend additional measures.

As to the bombing in Dhahran, we will do everything in our power to discover who was responsible, to pursue them and to punish them. We must also make sure we have taken all reasonable steps to protect our own people. To that end, I am announcing today that General Wayne Downing, former Commander in Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command, will lead a full assessment of the facts surrounding the bomb attack in Dhahran. General Downing will also evaluate all policies and measures at other facilities in the entire central command which include the Persian Gulf and the

Middle East regions. He will recommend any further steps necessary to prevent similar attacks. And he will submit his report to the Secretary of Defense within 45 days.

But let me be clear. Just as no enemy could drive us from the field in World War II and the Cold War, we will not be driven from the frontiers of our fight against terrorism today.

We devoted a good deal of time to our work on Bosnia. We shouldn't forget that since our last meeting in Halifax, we've helped achieve something many thought was impossible -- Bosnia has moved from the horror of war into the hope of peace.

Here we lay the groundwork for more progress in the next six months. We committed ourselves to full support for the elections in September, and accelerating the civilian reconstruction that is now underway. Even as we support these efforts, we're also making it clear to the parties in Bosnia that they must live up their obligations under the Dayton Accords, spelling out what steps they must take to prepare for the election and to move the reconstruction along.

Today I'm also proud to announce three new American initiatives to help that peace take root. First, we will devote \$15 million to train demobilized soldiers to clear the estimated \$3 million land mines still in Bosnia. Until that happens, no child will be able to walk in safety and life cannot return to normal.

Second, we're establishing an international commission on the missing in the Former Yugoslavia to be chaired by former Secretary of State Cy Vance. This group will work to resolve the almost 12,000 cases of missing persons, to reduce the anguish of their families and lessen the tension between the parties.

Third, we will contribute \$5 million to the work of the Bosnian Women's Initiative. After a past in which so many men were killed in the fighting, Bosnia's future may depend more than ever upon its women. We will provide training and loans to help women find jobs and create businesses so they can support their families and get their nation going again.

I want to recognize and thank our Ambassador to Austria, Swanee Hunt, for helping to create this initiative. Women today are meeting in Bosnia -- today -- on this issue. Muslim, Croatian and Serbian women are meeting in Bosnia today in a multiethnic cooperative determination to regenerate the capacity of the Bosnian economy through the efforts of its women. This has real potential to make a difference.

Finally, let me just note that the environment of this summit was very different than the first one I attended in Tokyo in 1993. Then we were not in a strong position to lead, and our partners kept telling me that we had to get our house in order. And, frankly, they were right.

When I took office, our budget deficit was at an all-time high, unemployment was more than seven percent, we had the slowest job growth since the Great Depression. But since that time, we have cut our budget deficit in half, and our economy has reduced unemployment to 5.6 percent and produced 9.7 million new jobs. Inflation is near a 30-year low, interest rates are down, and business investment is up by 30 percent. Our country is now the number one exporter and the most competitive nation on Earth, again.

So here I was pleased -- and I know the American people will be -- to see that our partners recognize this and ask for our suggestions about what we could do together to promote more economic growth around the globe, to generate jobs out of that economic growth, and to make those jobs good jobs so that people would have the tools to make the most of their lives and to build strong families.

Finally, there was a lot of very serious conversation about how we can grow the economy and sustain our environment. And we resolved to work harder on that in the year ahead and to make that a central focus of our meeting next year in Denver.

We know we have to work on these problems together. That's the last point I want to drive home to the American people. We know that when we do cooperate, we can make a positive difference for our own people in maintaining our leadership in the world and meeting our challenges and protecting our values. I found that this summit was very helpful in all those regards.

Helen.

Q Mr. President, I like your views on two points -- foreign policy points of tension in the communique. One, are you prepared to reimpose sanctions against Yugoslavia if the Serb leader in Bosnia does not step down from his government functions by, say, Monday? And two, in terms of the Middle East peace process, does the United States have any leverage to persuade Israel to abide by previous agreements on land for peace?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, let's talk about the sanctions issues. Under the Dayton Accords, both Mr. Bildt and the IFOR Commander have the ability and the responsibility to impose sanctions if the accords are violated. We want Mr. Karadzic, in the words of the Secretary of State, out of power and out of influence. And we think that is very important. We want all the other parties to help us achieve what is clearly required in the Dayton Accords and the Paris Peace Agreement. And, therefore, we will support appropriate action by Mr. Bildt.

Although, I have to say, I have no information, Helen, that there is, in fact, a Monday deadline that would operate against Serbia, as opposed to the Bosnian Serbs or anyone else. I do not

know that there will be a Monday deadline. But you should just know that both the IFOR Commander, Admiral Smith, and Mr. Bildt have the authority and the responsibility under the Dayton Accords to reimpose the sanctions. And under the right circumstances, they would be bound to do so and we would be bound to support them.

Q Mr. President, what did Prime Minister --

Q What about the second part of the --

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry -- the Middle East. I apologize. It's been a long three days.

On the Middle East, we all agree that the commitments Israel has made to date should be kept. And Mr. Netanyahu has said that he expects Israel to keep those commitments.

I think it's fair to say that we also all agree that the Israeli government is recently constituted, just getting its bearings and it's going to work; and we believe it's quite important that both sides in the Middle East, the Arab parties and the Israelis, give each other some room here. A little time needs to pass. And we hope that no one, including those of us who are third parties here, will say or do anything which would make the peace process more difficult down the road. We just -- we need to honor the commitments that have been made and then go forward.

In that connection, today we talked a lot about development assistance and the importance of doing more in that area, and I tried to make a strong point that we have seen in the Middle East a substantial increase in the capacity of the Palestinian Authority under Mr. Arafat to provide law and order and to run the daily operations of life in Gaza and the West Bank. And I think we need to support that as much as anything else if we want to preserve the gains of the past and make sure that this peace process continues to have integrity and effect.

Yes, go ahead.

Q Mr. President, what did Prime Minister Chernomyrdin tell you about President Yeltsin's health and his ability to govern, and how concerned are you? And, also, is the fact that Mr. Yeltsin was not here the reason why there wasn't a whole lot in today's communique dealing with relations and aid to Russia in the future?

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chernomyrdin said that President Yeltsin was in good health, but that he had a sore throat -- something I can identify with right before an election -- and that he had determined that he ought to take the day off from any kind of public speaking or public appearance. But he said he'd talked to him yesterday and he was doing fine.

I'm not sure that this communique would have had more in it about Russia even if President Yeltsin had been here, because we

basically talked about the subjects of the meeting here and we tried to have a more limited communique that didn't just go all over every issue.

I want to emphasize that in these G-8 political meetings we consider Russia to be an integral partner here in our deliberations. The Russians are cosponsors with the United States in the Middle East peace process. The Russians are our partners in IFOR. So we value Russian participation for issues that have nothing to do with Russia.

Yes.

Q Mr. Karadzic today was reelected head of his party. He says he doesn't acknowledge the authority of the War Crimes Tribunal. And at some point do you reach a point where, if it's not a deadline this Monday, there has to be a deadline and that the IFOR forces would have to move into Pale and simply escort him out?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I guess the short answer to that is, no, in the way you asked it because there was an exclusive decision made in the Dayton Accords that the mission of IFOR would not be a police mission, that is to actually go in with the purpose of apprehending Mr. Karadzic or anybody else suspected of war crimes.

On the other hand, I can say that the number of patrols has been increased in the region and the responsibility of IFOR is, if they run into anybody who is wanted by the War Crimes Tribunal, they have to apprehend them. So I suppose the chances of his being apprehended, or some others who may be wanted being apprehended have been increased by the fact that the number of patrols has been increased.

But it is not a part of the mandate of IFOR to actually be the police agency to go in and arrest him. That's one of the reasons that Mr. Bildt has been talking about the sanctions.

Q Should there be a deadline?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the deadline, in effect, will present itself in terms of the integrity of the elections. But we'd like to see something done well before then because we want other political leadership to develop among the Bosnian Serbs -- people who believe in the rule of law and don't believe it's legitimate to kill large numbers of other people just because they're of a different ethnic group.

Q Mr. President, regarding the bombing, what can you say to American families about servicemen now serving in that area of the world, in the Middle East, to reassure them? You mentioned that you'd appointed this commission to report back in 45 days, but what about tonight, what about tomorrow, and this week? Are some steps being taken now?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, I think it's fair to say that everybody's on extra alert. But remember, when the warnings came out before this last incident -- to be fair to the people who were involved there -- they increased lookouts, they increased patrols, they increased training of people involved, they put more barriers up. And each and every one of those steps actually contributed to saving lives. The fatalities would have been much greater if those things had not been done.

But the plain fact is that they did not believe that based on past terrorist practice that a bomb that big could be exploded -- could be put together and delivered and exploded at that point. That's, frankly, what happened. So we're -- everybody is assessing what their short-term and their long-term options are, and they're taking all the possible steps they can to see what should be done. But we want General Downing to take a bigger and longer look at this. Meanwhile, we'll be doing everything we can to protect our people, of course.

Yes, Wolf.

Q Mr. President, if I could just turn the subject to a domestic issue. You've been described by your aides as being very angry when you first heard about the FBI file matter in the White House, and you initially said that this was a bureaucratic snafu, a simple, bureaucratic mistake. But now that Anthony Marceca, who is an Army civilian detailee to the White House, has decided to take the Fifth and not testify, are you still sticking by that assertion that this was simply a mistake, a simple bureaucratic mistake?

And the second part, I wonder if you'd care to comment on these other allegations by this former FBI agent who had worked in the White House of all sorts of sordid deeds going on? So just the two part-question.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all on the -- Mr. Marceca testified in the first hearings. I don't know why he decided not to testify in the second ones.

Let's go back over what I said. I value the privacy that every American is entitled to and I have done my best as President to protect the individual rights of the American people -- their rights to free speech, to religious liberty, to association and, certainly, to privacy. Secondly, from my earliest days as a young man being interested in public life, one of the things that has most appalled me is any kind of abuse of public authority that tramples on the liberties of individual citizens. And I believe my career shows a consistent pattern of opposition to that. So I'm concerned about it.

What I said was that based on the evidence we had, there was no evidence that anyone had intentionally acquired the papers wrongly or had used them wrongly once they were acquired. I repeat

that; to the best of my knowledge that's what the evidence showed. Now, I understand there was some testimony yesterday from the Secret Service and from others which may offer an explanation about how the wrong lists were acquired. I was told that the Los Angeles Times had an article about it today, but I have not had an opportunity to read it.

So what I'm saying is, I've told everybody I want to cooperate with the special counsel, I want to cooperate with the congressional committees. I want to get to the bottom of this as quickly as possible. And I would encourage everyone else to do the same thing. Meanwhile, I don't want to prejudge anybody to go beyond what the evidence shows. That's the only thing I said.

As to that other thing, I mean, I hardly even know how to comment on that. I mean, I hardly know what to say. I feel bad for the FBI.

Q This new book by the ex-FBI agent says that Craig Livingstone was hired through the sponsorship of the First Lady. Is that true? And if it isn't true, can you tell us definitively today who brought Craig Livingstone into the White House?

THE PRESIDENT: Can I tell you what?

Q Can you tell us who brought Craig Livingstone into the White House if it is not true that the First Lady did not bring him in?

THE PRESIDENT: The answers to your two questions are no and no. Now, I know for a fact that is not true. But I don't know that anything in that is true. I don't know, but --

Q -- ask who hired this person?

THE PRESIDENT: I have, and I don't think he knows. But let me tell you -- what we decided to do was not to raise any questions about how this thing had been handled, but instead to cooperate with outside forces who are looking into it. I think that's the best way to do it. So we just instructed everybody to cooperate, first with -- we thought the FBI was going to look into it, and then when there was a delay there -- I think if that happened this whole thing would be resolved by now and I'm sorry it didn't. But since the FBI didn't look into it, from our point of view, then we had to wait for the congressional committees and the special counsel. But we are going to fully cooperate with them, and I expect them to be able to answer all relevant questions.

Yes, Peter?

Q Mr. President, getting back to the terror issue at this summit, almost every one of these summits has included tough talk on terrorism -- those that you've attended and those before. Yet the attacks have continued in the Middle East and in Saudi Arabia and even at home. Is there any reason to believe that those you

have described as people who lived to kill are impacted at all by what you all say at these summits?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know if they're impacted by what we say, but they're certainly impacted by what we do. I mean, let me remind you that there is -- the people who did the World Trade Center bombing were arrested and tried. There was an intense effort after Oklahoma City to apprehend the suspect, and there's now going to be -- a criminal justice process working its course there.

We have extradited suspected terrorists in the United States from all over the world. And I can tell you, perhaps even more importantly, we have succeeded in preventing planned terrorist incidents. And I have learned from working in the Middle East so intensely the last three years, that in spite of all the horrible things we read about there, there are still more incidents that are planned that are prevented and averted than there are which are carried out.

So I don't expect our words to have any impact on these people. But if our words are put into action, just as we did in the United States, for example in passing the antiterrorism legislation, we will acquire greater capacity to prevent these incidents and to catch and punish people severely when they do, and to tie them to their sponsors, if they have sponsors, beyond their own little cells.

And those are the three things that I want to do. So I don't expect them to be moved by my words. But they need to know that I'm going to do my best to put our words into action.

Q Mr. President, if Boris Yeltsin is reelected on Wednesday, are you personally confident that he will continue on the path of reform in a second term? And are there specific steps you would urge him to take to confirm from the start that he intends to govern as a democrat and as a reformer?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I do believe he will continue because that's the path that he's followed to date, first of all. And secondly, let me just say, everybody ought to take a deep breath next week and consider that you are literally observing something that has not happened in a thousand years of Russian history. Since what we now know of as modern Russia geographically united, this has never happened. They not only had one election, they are about to have another election which basically confirms their commitment to democracy.

You remember President Aristide said the second election is the most important. So you're -- in the context of Russia and all those affected by them, you're going to witness something when that election occurs that has never occurred in a thousand years. And I think that -- President Yeltsin and I once had a talk, and I don't want to betray any private confidences, but he -- if you go

into the Kremlin and they have these statues of the great czar reformers -- Peter the Great, and Catherine the Great, and Alexander, who freed the Serfs, and Nikolas, who had the parliamentary government before the Russian Revolution -- the difference between what they're doing now and what those other Russian reforms did, and the reason I think reform has a chance to survive now when it always failed before, is that the czars never created anything that was greater than they were. And the whole purpose of democracy is to make sure that none of us are indispensable. That's against my self-interest since I'm facing an election to say that.

But if you think about it, the whole purpose of democracy is to create a system in which the people and the rules and laws under which they live are more important than any one individual. And the ultimate legacy of President Yeltsin and Prime Minister Chernomyrdin and all those who have been part of this is that they have for the first time in Russian history created something that is greater than any individual that supersedes them. And I think they're quite mindful of that, and I think that's one big reason they'll stay on the path of reform.

I also think on a purely human level, they know that there are still a lot of people in Russia having a tough time. And they want all the people in Russia to have the benefits that reform has brought to so many. They won't be satisfied until a lot of the people that won't vote for them this week -- or next week -- feel the benefits that so many feel today.

Q You and the other leaders gather at a time when Europe is facing near record unemployment levels. I wonder if you could tell me what specific actions you took here that will help that. And what actions did you take here that will help Americans who are having a tough time as well?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, actually, what we talked about here on that point was what the Europeans could do to create jobs when they have economic growth. The frustrating thing for a lot of the Europeans is not only that they've had slow growth, but that even when they've had growth, they haven't necessarily been able to create jobs.

And Prime Minister Major discussed that in some length, because Great Britain has of late had some pretty good success in bringing their unemployment rate down. And the highest job growth countries in the G-7 are the United States and Canada, so we talked a lot about what we thought the relationship of low interest rates, and no barriers to small business formation and expansion, and affirmative help for small business could have. Because it's very interesting, even in all the European countries, most of their jobs are being created by small and medium-sized businesses -- the same as in America. But there isn't the same almost obsession that exists in our country both to clear out barriers to small business formation and expansion and to take affirmative steps to accelerate

it. So we talked a lot about that from their point of view.

From our point of view, we talked a lot about how we could reduce the inequality and the wage stagnation that affects some of the people in the bottom half of the wage earners. And we talked about whether -- the extent to which we could integrate into our systems some of the things that work in Europe and still keep our ability to create jobs. And that's what we're trying to do, for example, with the apprenticeship programs, the school-to-work programs, giving everybody access to two more years of schooling after high school, and trying to accelerate the rate at which we retrain the existing work force; and also trying to provide some more security in terms of access to movable retirement and health care benefits.

What we're both trying to do, if you will, is to create dynamic economies in which we can generate jobs that are good jobs, but also give people who are working hard the necessary conditions and tools they need to build a stable life and a stable family life. So in that sense, the Europeans like a lot of the security that a lot of their working people have, but they want to be able to create more jobs. We like the fact that we create a lot of jobs, but we want our people to be able to live with all the upheavals of the modern economy. So we basically decided we needed to try to find out how we could learn from one another.

Q I wonder what your reaction was to General Lebed's remarks about Jews and Mormons, and if you asked Prime Minister Chernomyrdin for an explanation, and what did he tell you.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I had a very negative reaction to the remarks. We've been dealing with these church burnings in America, and I know how dangerous any kind of religious slur can be. So I had a very negative reaction to the remarks. I like some of the things I've seen from General Lebed; he's a very impressive fellow in many ways, but I didn't like that at all. And I said so to the Prime Minister.

But I also noted that President Yeltsin has had a good record on issues relating to religious liberty. And he told me that he expected no change in the administration's positions, the Yeltsin administration's position on religious liberty after this next election.

Q Mr. President, in the aftermath of this tragedy in Saudi Arabia, a lot of commentators and some officials have said that one of the problems and frustrations is that experts end up fighting the last war; and that the next time, as you say, it comes in a little different -- the bomb is bigger than you thought, or whatever. To what degree is that a part of the General's mandate, is to look at, try to predict how the next incident might come and steps that can be taken? And is that something that you and the leaders discussed as well?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, yes, although, that's a lot of the work that the rest of our national security team will be doing, too -- including making sure our intelligence networks are more attuned to that.

I think it's fair to say that -- if you remember, these things have sort of gone in waves, you know. We had this huge wave of terrorism in the '80s; it primarily involved something other than bombs -- although we had that awful incident in Lebanon. And we just learn as we go along. And I'm sure that there will be times in the future when murderous forces outsmart those of us that are trying to stop them. But I believe we will learn something from this and I believe we will be able to continue our mission.

The main thing I'd like to say to you, though, is -- and, yes, it will be part of General Downing's mandate, but it's also a big part of what the Secretary of Defense and the director of our intelligence operations and all our national security operations should be doing.

The main thing I would like to say, though, is that for all those families of the people who were lost and all those who are still laid up in the hospital that were cut up so bad by the glass, we can't make all the problems of the world go away, and our generation's time is going to be increasingly occupied with dealing with the terrorists and the people who try to proliferate dangerous weapons -- chemical, biological, small-scale nuclear weapons -- the drug smugglers and others who try to kill people in this way. It's not the Cold War, it's not World War II, but it's an important part of our struggle to make this a civilized and sane world. And we have to continue to do it. And I'm very proud of those people that served and I grieve for those who died and their families.

Thank you.

END

4:50 P.M. (L)

Governor Life Rally

E. Branstad
pro-life sup-
the tragedy of
17 rally in

is Catholic,
Catholic bish-
politicians and
-life support-
Cathedral for
e, Say No to
sored by the
and the Iowa

ed as a show
e announced
ortion clinics
rea. Planned
er Iowa and
Emma Gold-
ve said they
e area.

to show my
leadership of
port, and all
ate of Iowa,"
important that
and that we
opposition to
respect for

ress to the
nes Bishop
l, "We gather
life, from its
ys to its natu-

inst abortion
and Scrip-
church stands
abortion is
added. "We
ed and con-
tion to what
an altar of

12,241 anti-
e later pre-
Bishop Will-
—CNS



—CNS

INFORMAL VISIT—First lady Hillary Rodham Clinton receives a hug from a child at St. Ann's Infant and Maternity Home and shares a laugh with the Daughters of Charity Sisters and other staff members of the Hyattsville, Md., home.

First Lady Visits Infant Home

First lady Hillary Rodham Clinton brought along Socks the cat for her holiday visit at St. Ann's Infant and Maternity Home in Hyattsville, Md.

In an hourlong stay, Mrs. Clinton toured the home for children and young, unwed pregnant women and new mothers that is operated by the Daughters of Charity just outside Washington. The first lady chatted with staff and residents and gave candy to the children.

"She was very warm and very gracious and outgoing," Sister Josephine Murphy, a Daughter of Charity and administrator of St. Ann's, told the Catholic Standard, newspaper of the Archdiocese of Washington. The pre-Christmas visit was closed to the media.

"She was very unaffected," said Sister Josephine, and "picked up the babies and didn't worry about her dress getting dirty."

The nun said Mrs. Clinton discussed the plight of children and their families with sisters who staff the home. "I was surprised that

some of her views on what is in the best interest of the child were similar to mine," Sister Josephine said.

"We discussed the need to work with dysfunctional families and do what we can to make a more stable future for our children," she added.

Sister Josephine said she and Mrs. Clinton, who supports legal abortion, did not discuss the issue. "She knows my views on abortion, and I know her views on abortion," the nun said, "so we just left it at that."

"I didn't plan to bring up abortion or anything political," she said. "She came for a friendly visit, and you don't argue with visitors."

Before the first lady's arrival, Secret Service agents and a bomb-sniffing dog inspected the facility. Because the dog stirred so much excitement among the children, the agent who handled it remained after Mrs. Clinton's departure so the children could play with the animal.

—CNS

U.S. News Briefs

Tough Assignment

Priest shortages and a multinational chaplain force make supplying chaplains to U.S. troops in Bosnia-Herzegovina complicated work, says Father J. Barry Lonergan, senior chaplain of the 5th Army Europe. As U.S. troops began trickling in to the region before Christmas, he was readying 43 U.S. chaplains for duty. Four of them are Catholic priests. Like U.S. bishops, Father Lonergan is trying to cope with a shortage of Catholic priests. There are fewer numbers to serve in the military. Throughout the 5th Corps, there are only seven Catholic priests. "We're taking a good chunk" of them into Bosnia, he said. Father Lonergan, an Army chaplain for 23 years, spoke to The Evangelist, Albany diocesan newspaper, by telephone from Heidelberg, Germany.

Plea to Clinton

A Catholic congressman urged the Clinton administration to release Chinese women being detained in California after they tried to enter the country illegally to escape forced abortions and sterilizations in China. Ten of the 24 Chinese women in the Lerdo Detention Facility in Bakersfield, Calif., have been on a hunger strike for more than 40 days. Rep. Christopher H. Smith, R-N.J., chairman of a House subcommittee on international operations and human rights, made the appeal at a Washington press conference Dec. 21. Smith said the hunger strikers include Li Bao Yu, who testified before his subcommittee in July about China's policies of forced abortion and forced sterilization. "Li Bao Yu has been imprisoned by the U.S. government for over two years—longer than many armed robbers, longer than some murderers—although her only crime was to escape from communist China," he added.

Hero's Welcome

Friendship Survey

found to give less than Protestant counterparts

Welcome -
Did you see?

Merry Christmas

THE KANSAS CITY STAR

JOHNSON COUNTY EDITION

MONDAY, December 25, 1995



After 10 years in foster care, Deanna Moppin (center) will spend this Christmas with her new parents, Sherada and Bob. The 13-year-old girl moved into her new home this weekend.

MARCIO JOSE
SANCHEZ/
The Star

New family fulfills girl's holiday wish

By ANNE LAMOY
Staff Writer

Thirteen-year-old Deanna Moppin got a Christmas present that money can't buy — a family of her own.

This past weekend, the Kansas City, Kan., girl who had been in foster care for 10 years officially moved into a new home, complete with a new dad, a new mom and her very own pink bedroom.

The national spotlight focused on Deanna in November when she met first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton in Washington.

The youngster told the first lady that she wanted a family of her own, especially as the holidays approached. At the time, Deanna wasn't looking forward to spending Christmas at a group home in Topeka, where she lived this year.

"I'd like to have parents I can call Mom and Dad," Deanna had said.

Unbeknownst to Deanna, as she spoke with the first lady, social workers in Kansas were choosing her new family.

Deanna spent the long Thanksgiving weekend with her parents-to-be, Bob and Sherada, at their Johnson County home. To protect Deanna's privacy, See TEENAGER, A-22, Col. 1

A-22 The Kansas City Star Monday, December 25, 1995

Teen-ager who longed for a family gets mom and dad for Christmas

Continued from A-1

Bob and Sherada's last names are not being used.

During Thanksgiving, Deanna met new aunts, uncles and cousins the best part of finding a home.

"Actually getting treated like you're part of the family," Deanna said from her new home Saturday. "They all came in and gave me hugs and said: 'Oh, we've heard so much about you.'"

Since Thanksgiving it's been a whirlwind courtship between the couple and their new daughter.

They've spent weekends together shopping, watching movies, decorating gingerbread cookies and doing more shopping.

Aside from Deanna's first bedroom, she has new clothes ("not a whole new wardrobe," she said, "but close enough") and a pile of presents under the Christmas tree (Deanna said it was "weird" seeing so many packages for her).

On Saturday, Deanna, a tall, self-conscious young woman, confessed that she's still a little overwhelmed with her new life.

Although her adoption won't be final for a few months, Deanna is looking forward to the day when everything feels normal.

"I just think of myself as another kid."

Her new parents, however, are relishing their roles, focusing much of their energy on Deanna over the last month.

"I keep seeing things (in stores) that Deanna might like," Bob said, "I'm excited."

Bob brags about Deanna's artistic talents, boasting that she almost single-handedly decorated the Christmas tree. There's no doubt that he's proud of Deanna already.

"We want to encourage her to develop her artistic abilities, which are obvious," he said. "She can sing and draw and write."

Deanna's not as confident of her talents, but she smiles shyly with the praise.

For her part, Sherada didn't waste any time turning into the mother of a teen-age daughter. She's part drill sergeant, part big sister.

Without thinking Saturday, Sherada pushed Deanna's shiny

red hair behind an ear. Instinctively, Deanna cringed and wrinkled her nose.

"She's a normal mother of a normal teen-ager," Bob explained. "She embarrasses Deanna, as a normal mother would."

And, like a normal teen-ager, Deanna wants to know how much her allowance will be. That remains under negotiation.

"That was her first question," Sherada said. "If she walks the dogs for me every day, we could be talking large sums of money."

Deanna said she would consider it.

Although Deanna is satisfied with new parents for Christmas, she admitted that she was looking forward to tearing into the packages under the tree.

She even threatened to pounce on Bob and Sherada in their bed if they didn't get up soon enough this morning.

"That's fine," Bob answered. "We don't have any traditions."

"It's our first Christmas as a family with a kid."