

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE FIRST LADY

phone 202-456-6266
fax 202-456-6244

TO

Lina

FROM

June

FAX #

PHONE #

OF PAGES (including cover)

5

COMMENTS

I'm faxing this to you, just
in case...

FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
REMARKS TO UAW LEGISLATIVE-POLITICAL CONFERENCE
WASHINGTON, D.C.
APRIL 21, 1996

Thank you President [Steve] Yokich [YOH-kitch]. Thank-you so much for giving me this opportunity to speak to all of you in the UAW who are working so hard to keep the American Dream alive and attainable for all families who are willing to work for it.

On behalf of the President, I want to thank each of you, members of this great union, for all you're doing to improve the lives of working men and women and their children all across our country. From civil rights to Medicare to the minimum wage, the UAW has always been there, fighting for America's workers, for the elderly, for the disadvantaged. For more than half a century, you have been at the forefront of economic and social progress.

On the eve of the 21st century, America is the great nation it is today because of your hard work. But, unfortunately it seems that there are some in our country who are threatening to take our country one hundred years backward, to undermine all that you and all of us who believe in economic justice have achieved on behalf of families.

You've come to Washington at a very crucial time for working families. What happens in Congress and in the political debates in the coming months will profoundly affect families, and their ability to thrive in the 21st century.

Three years ago, you sent a President to the White House who promised to put people first, to reinvigorate America's working families, and to restore in them a sense of economic well-being that had been slowly slipping away during the previous administrations.

You sent a President and Vice-President to Washington to generate growth and jobs, to increase incomes, to shrink the underclass and grow the middle class. That President and Vice President have made a great start.

In the last three years, 8.5 million new jobs have been created. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years. And we've halted the long decline in median hourly wages. This is the record to build on, not to retreat on. We have to do more, especially for our families and children.

Tonight, I want to talk about families. About the UAW's priorities for workers and their children. About the President's

achievements on behalf of families. And about what we all need to do to help families survive and thrive in a rapidly changing world.

The fight to save the American Dream and support America's families must begin with the fight to save America's workers, their incomes, and their jobs.

We are living in an exhilarating -- yet sometimes bewildering -- time. Technology is advancing at breathtaking speed. And as our world becomes more complex, it is also becoming smaller. American workers are being asked to perform more sophisticated tasks and to compete with their counterparts all over the world.

We won't succeed in this new world without your continued hard work and leadership. Because of the partnership between labor and management, the United States auto industry was number one in the world last year for the first time in 15 years. In four years before the President's election, the auto industry lost 49,000 jobs. Now three years into his presidency, 47,000 new jobs have been created.

American labor is coming back and coming on strong. When the President first took office, he got rid of his predecessors' anti-worker, anti-union executive orders. Last spring, he signed his own executive order which forbid companies that do business with the government to permanently replace striking workers. Recently, the President directed the Justice Department to take all appropriate steps to overturn a recent court decision blocking that executive order.

The President will veto any effort to weaken Section 8(a)2 of the National Labor Relations Act. He vetoed legislation that would have given corporations the green light to raid workers' pension funds.

He is fighting to preserve working people's hard-earned wage protections. The Davis-Bacon Act and the Service Contract Act are the foundations for decent living standards for many Americans. Some in Congress want to take them away, but the President will resist those efforts. He will help you protect the standard of living you have fought so hard and long to maintain.

The President is committed to policies that reward work. That's why he expanded the Earned Income Tax Credit to give a tax cut to more than 15 million working families with incomes under \$28,000. And that is why he supports an increase in the minimum wage to make it a living wage.

If Congress doesn't act this year, the minimum wage will be at its lowest real value in 40 years. And yet, there are a lot of single parents and quite a few families who are struggling to raise their children on \$4.25 an hour.

For years, both parties have agreed that the minimum wage should keep up with the cost of living. This year, however, the Congressional majority has walked away from this tradition, and tried to block an increase in the minimum wage.

One member of a group of moderate Republicans who broke with their party's leadership said it best: "This is not a complicated issue. It should not be a partisan issue. It's timely. It's right, and I think we should do it."

An increase in the minimum wage honors family and work. Congress should stop blocking an increase in the minimum wage and pass it -- with no gimmicks, no political games, and with no controversial amendments. That's the way to help our people make the most of their lives. We must do what we can to help these hard-working families and to close the gap between richest and poorest working citizens of our country.

Beyond wages, we must also be concerned about a worker's health and safety in the workplace. I find it terribly ironic that those who purport to care about the health and safety of Americans are also trying to gut health and safety standards in the workplaces. They have introduced legislation that would cut OSHA's enforcement budget by a third and effectively relieve employers of their duty to provide safe working environments.

How can workers take our country forward into the 21st century when so many are trying to take working conditions back to the 19th century? I thought we settled this ages ago: American workers should not have to put their health and safety in jeopardy just to feed their families. It's not right.

It is time we accepted a fundamental lesson: Treating working people in a decent, fair, humane, enlightened way gives you a stronger American economy, not a weaker one.

That doesn't mean we don't have to adapt to new times and change some of the ways we do business. Change is inevitable and ultimately there are some types of jobs that will go the way of the Edsel and the horse-drawn carriage. Under the President's new G.I. Bill for American workers, men and women who lose their jobs to corporate layoffs and downsizing will receive vouchers to pay for the retraining they need -- whether it's college or an apprenticeship -- to become employable again.

Economic security goes hand-in-hand with health security.

One of the first things my husband signed was the Family and Medical Leave Act so that workers could take time to care for sick family members without being afraid of losing their jobs. Families today are much stronger because of that bill.

I want to take a moment to thank you for your support these past few years in our efforts to reform our health care system. We may not have been successful in passing health reform, but we sure made it clear that something must be done. The President is pushing hard to pass the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill to make sure that Americans who lose or change jobs do not lose their health insurance as well.

And we must protect Medicaid and Medicare. These programs are the safety net for millions of Americans, from the seniors who worked so hard to make America the great country it is today to the children who will make it even greater tomorrow.

More than one in five children in this country is eligible for Medicaid. And all of those children, whether they are related by blood to us or not, are our children. They are our future. Do we want them to be in jail twenty years from now, or in school or in the workplace? I don't know about you, but when I retire, I'd rather have them out there as healthy, well-educated, working members of our society.

Education will be the key to the survival of the American worker in the 21st century. That's why we must remain committed to funding Head Start, to computerizing the classrooms and to keeping our schools safe and drug free. The Clinton Administration is committed to making college available to every one who is willing to study hard. The President has expanded Pell grants and made student loans more accessible.

The next millennium will be here sooner than we know it. We are moving from an industrial age to an information age. We have moved from the bipolar world of the cold war to a global village full of endless possibility and daunting challenge.

We have to harness this change to benefit the average working family. We must do it in ways that are consistent with the values that made America great and make life worth living, values that your movement embodies -- a commitment to opportunity for every American; to the dignity of work; to strengthening families, nurturing children and honoring parents; and to working together, regardless of race, income or religion.

This country was built by people from all corners of the world who shared a common faith in democracy and the American Dream. They were people who were never afraid of change or challenge. We can't be, either. There is still so much we can

and must do together, as one American family. Thank-you for doing your part.

###

137TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1996 Reuters, Limited
Reuters World Service

April 10, 1996, Wednesday, BC cycle

LENGTH: 617 words

HEADLINE: Clinton set to sound bright note on Japan car pact

BYLINE: By Donna Smith

DATELINE: DETROIT, April 10

BODY:

President Bill Clinton is set to unveil on Friday a review of the car trade pact reached with Japan last year showing a dramatic rise in U.S. sales.

A 46 percent jump in sales to Japan last year by the "Big Three" U.S. automakers gives Clinton a chance to set aside the frictions that normally dominate U.S.-Japan trade relations ahead of next week's meeting in Tokyo with Japanese Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto.

American Automobile Manufacturers Association (AAMA) President Andrew Card expects the report to show significant progress in three of the four areas covered by the agreement: sales of U.S.-made parts to Japanese car makers, deregulation of the replacement parts market and sales of U.S. brand cars.

AAMA represents Chrysler Corp., Ford Motor Co. and General Motors Corp.

"The glaring exception to that progress is in the area of dealerships," Card said. "There is still significant concern from the U.S. manufacturers that the number of high volume vehicle outlets that are carrying our product is not progressing to the point where it will meet our expectations.

"We hope there will be more resolve on the part of the Japanese to allow their consumers to have lasting access to American made products," he added.

Card also expressed concern about the dollar's recent strength against the yen, which he said could make U.S. cars and parts less competitive on price.

The 97,380 Big Three sales in Japan last year included cars made in Europe. Sales of cars made in North America by the U.S. makers totalled 58,469, up 29.5 percent over 1994.

Japanese manufacturers are also quick to point out that they account for a large share of car exports from the United States.

Exports of Japanese cars made in the United States, excluding sales to Canada, totalled 174,000 in 1995, down from 191,000 in 1994, but up from 121,000 in 1993, the Japan Automobile Manufacturers Association said.

U.S. car manufacturers hoped the agreement would help them sign up at least

Reuters World Service, April 10, 1996

200 new dealerships in Japan by the end of 1996. So far they have signed up 30 new dealers.

Despite lack of significant progress on signing up new dealers, manufacturers are still hopeful. Ford recently signed up a Nissan dealer, who also serves as head of the Japan Automobile Dealers Association.

"The recent developments are encouraging, but we need considerably more," said Ford spokesman Albert Chambers.

Chrysler recently said it was signing up four new dealers in Japan which will give the company an additional 54 new sales outlets.

The agreement to open Japan's car market to more U.S. cars and parts was struck in Geneva last June just hours before the United States was set to slap punitive import tariffs on Japanese luxury cars.

The high profile fight with Japan over cars played well politically for Clinton in Michigan, a key battle ground state in his year's presidential election campaign.

But Hashimoto, who as the then trade minister negotiated the car deal for the Japanese, was seen by some critics as gaining the upper hand in the final agreement by refusing to accept numerical targets demanded by the Americans.

Trade analysts said that lack of targets made the agreement unenforceable. But for the most part, U.S. officials and industry leaders have expressed optimism.

Card said that by the time Clinton meets with Hashimoto next week, Japan will have met its obligations under the agreement to untangle some of the red tape in the repair market that kept U.S.-made parts out of Japanese repair shops.

The agreement calls for Japan's Ministry of Transportation to review further deregulation of the replacement parts market and issue a report by September.
17:42 04-10-96

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: April 11, 1996

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

April 12, 1996

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT THE RELEASE OF THE JAPAN AUTOMOBILE PROGRESS REPORT

The East Room

2:40 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Mr. Vice President, Ambassador Kantor, Senator Levin and Congressman Levin, all the distinguished leaders from the auto industry and Mr. J.C. Phillips from the UAW, and to Jim Hill, all the people here from the agencies that are part of our nation's economic team that really worked so hard to achieve these results:

I want to thank you for what you said, Jim. I am a car guy. I was six years old the first time I crawled underneath a 1952 Buick in my father's tiny dealership in Hope, Arkansas, population 6,000, and I never quite got over it. And one of the things that I promised myself I would do if I ever got a chance to have an impact on it was to give the American automobile industry the chance to be rewarded for its willingness to compete. And that is what we have worked hard to do in this administration.

I just saw something -- Mickey Kantor and I walked outside, along with the Vice President, Mr. Panetta, and I saw something I never thought I would live to see. And just four years ago, if you had told me that I would see it, I'm not sure I would have believed it -- right-hand drive American models made by American workers in American plants bound for Japan.

A Ford Taurus, a GM-built Cavalier, a Chrysler Neon built for the Japanese market where consumers are now freely buying tens of thousands more American cars than ever before. These new exports, as others have said, are the results of efforts by our car makers and our economic team. We have worked to expand our trade on fair terms not only with Japan, but with others throughout the world. These exports show what we can do when we truly would together and when others work with us in a spirit of cooperation and mutual benefit.

The boost in sales is tremendous news for American workers, for our auto and auto parts manufacturers, for our strong relationship with Japan. I also want to say it is good news for the people of Japan. When I first went to Japan in 1993, I said to the Japanese people what I will

have the opportunity to reiterate in just a couple of days -- we have no more important bilateral relationship. We are bound together in our support for democracy and freedom and for the security of freedom loving peoples in Asia -- and now elsewhere as Japan has shouldered bigger and bigger burdens to help us all pursue the goals that we share.

We also know that if we have a free and open trading relationship with them, it will help their economy, it will give their consumers more choices, and it will help both nations to be more competitive as we hurdle our way forward into the 21st century.

Just three years ago our ties were strained by a trading relationship not beneficial to our nation. The trade wasn't working, but the ties weren't working either. Today our relationship is working better for both of us. There's a lot to be done. In a big and complex relationship like ours there will always be a lot to be done. But we are strengthening and deepening our relationship. It is now a powerful force for creating opportunity, for advancing democracy, and for improving the quality of life in both our countries.

I also want to say that, as Ambassador Kantor said earlier, I believe that the right kind of trade is critical for our nation's future. I believe the position of the United States must always be that we favor open trade. We are not afraid to compete. We believe we can win. But if we're going to live in a world where we want others to raise their standard of living to our level, and we no longer control anything like the percentage of the gross national product we did at the end of World War II, then, fine, we'll compete, and we'll help others to advance. But we expect the same access to foreign markets that we give foreign producers to ours. It is a simple rule and one we have followed. It is a critical part of our economic strategy.

When I became President job growth was slow, the deficit was exploding, more than twice as high as it is now. We did two things. We put in place an economic strategy, lowered the deficit, cut it in half in four years, get interest rates down, increase investments in education and training, in research and technology, reform and shrink and make more effective the national government; and expand trade on terms both free and fair. That strategy has been implemented by a national economic team -- the first time we ever had a fully functioning National Economic Council to parallel our National Security Council, to integrate, plan and implement the economic strategies of this country and to work in full partnership with the private sector.

We now have 8.5 million more jobs than we had just three years ago. And I might say, of the G-7 countries, that's more than 8 million more than the other six nations combined. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years. And trade has been critical to that; as Ambassador Kantor said, 200 separate agreements -- 20 with Japan alone, now 21. Our exports are at an all-time high, our auto producers now leading the world.

Even more important, we have a framework agreement in our

relationship with Japan which establishes a comprehensive system for dealing with problems that inevitably arise between two great nations. As a result, our exports there are up over 30 percent; in the areas covered by the agreements, up 85 percent. Today, exports to Japan support more than 800,000 good paying American jobs, including 150,000 new ones since 1992. Most of these are good, high-wage jobs because jobs tied to exports on average pay 15 percent above the national average wage.

We are, therefore, in expanding our trade to an all-time high -- a full third in the last three years -- slowly helping to change the wage picture that has bedeviled so many American workers who think that they'll work harder and harder and never get a raise.

In 1992, six percent of our new jobs were in high-wage industries. In 1995, almost 60 percent of our new jobs were in high-wage industries. This strategy will work. It is not a miracle, it will not work overnight. It plainly depends for its success primarily on the willingness of American workers and American business leaders to work together, to be competitive, to be productive. But it will work. This report shows the difference this approach will make.

Last year we reached a landmark agreement that increased our access to the Japanese market for autos and for auto parts. One of the many legacies of our friend, Secretary Ron Brown, was the establishment with Ambassador Kantor, of a team to monitor and to enforce the agreement. This report shows that since the agreement was signed sales of American-made autos have increased by more than a third. Sales of American-made cars, trucks and vans rose more than 225 percent between 1992 and 1995, including over 58,000 Big Three cars exported from the U.S. just last year. In the first two months of this year, our people sold one-third more autos to Japan than in the same period last year. So the movement is all in the right direction.

In auto parts, exports over the last three years up 60 percent, to \$1.6 billion last year. Now, to give you one example of the evidence that this agreement and its faithful implementation and your work has made, Tennaco Automotive of Houston spent 25 years attempting to break into the Japanese market. Now their Monroe shock absorbers will be sold in almost 7,500 Japanese shops.

These developments are part of the rebirth of our auto industry, and industry that lost 49,000 jobs in the four years before I took office and has gained about 80,000 in the three years since. Because of the partnership between labor and management, for the first time in 15 years, last year the United States auto industry again was number one in the world. So again, let me thank the representatives of the Big Three, the many auto parts producers, and all the workers who have worked so hard to make our belief in this economic strategy a reality.

The Big Three will be introducing 17 new right-hand models for the

Japanese market in the next two years. To those of us who have any memory of this, it seems almost inconceivable. But you always believed you could compete with anybody, anywhere, as long as you had a level playing field. I still believe that. I know we're right. And I know all Americans will be very proud of these results.

Let me just say one other thing about the trade issue, I'm happy about the debate in America on trade today, but I sometimes think it falls into two camps which don't reflect the real world. There are people who say, well, America has got a lot of folks who haven't gotten a raise in a long time, and we may be creating a lot of jobs but there are people who are losing jobs. Well, that's true.

But it is also true everywhere in the world. It is not true that the answer is to put a wall up around America and walk away from our obligations and our opportunities to compete and win. If we did that, we would pay a terrible price. Then there are others who say, well, we ought to be for free trade, but we shouldn't worry so much about all these specific agreements and all these details. We shouldn't have governments negotiating this, we ought to just sort of get out of the way and see what happens and hope for the best. We tried it that way and it didn't work out very well.

Both of those arguments are wrong. Neither reflects an understanding of how the real world works. The right policy is to be for free and fair trade. The right governmental action is to support a genuinely competitive marketplace, help to create it and then get out of the way. That is the proper policy. If we put up walls, what would happen to the jobs of the people who make cars in plants like the Chrysler plant in Belvidere, Illinois, or Fords in Atlanta or Chevrolets in Loraine, Ohio, that produce those right hand drive vehicles we just saw?

On the other hand, if we didn't want to hold others to the same standards we expect to meet in world competition, what would happen to all the jobs of the people who would not be able to stand against the kinds of unfair practices we have seen practiced in the past?

We made a good start in the auto industry. The Japanese have proceeded in good faith. I think it's been good for them, as well as us. I hope that we will see the day when these policies will be the law of the world, when the World Trade Organization, because of GATT really will have an integrated world trading system. I hope we will see the day when we will see these kind of benefits in dealing with all of Asia, all of Latin America, all of Europe, all of Africa, all of the countries that were formerly part of the communist block.

But I know this: These people in the auto industry have proved that our policy works. I thank you, Senator Levin and Congressman Levin, for your work. I want to thank all the people in our administration, the economic team and, most of all, I want to thank the workers and the managers in the auto industry for proving that we're doing the right thing.

Now, before I close let me just make one more announcement. We could not have done what we did here if we hadn't had a vision not only of the economic policy we wanted to pursue, but also of how we wanted to pursue it. We put together an economic team for the first time in the history of this government that really functions. I can't imagine why it had never been done before, but it hadn't.

There were a lot of different power centers in the federal government allegedly making economic policy. We decided to change that. We had a good strategy, good teamwork, and good players. We didn't have a better player than the late Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown. Nobody was more determined that American workers and companies would get a fair shake around the world, and his extraordinary efforts are a model for us all.

He memorized -- as I said at his memorial service the other day, he made every Department of Commerce memorize a one-sentence mission statement that ought to be the mission of everybody in our government: Our mission is to ensure economic opportunity for every American.

Well, we still have to do that. And I don't want to miss a beat. And I am determined that we will continue on the work that Ron Brown was engaged in the last day of his life. So today I am proud to announce that I intend to appoint Ambassador Mickey Kantor to be the next Secretary of Commerce. And I will send his nomination to the Senate promptly.

This is not an easy time for the people at the Commerce Department, but they will do fine. And I think that we need to send a clear signal to the rest of America and to the world that we don't intend to miss a beat. We have got a strategy, we have got a team, it's working, and we're going forward with it.

No Trade Representative has ever amassed a record of achievement that surpasses Mickey Kantor's in the last three and a half years -- GATT, NAFTA, 200 separate agreements, enforcement, the consequences that flowed from it. But, frankly, it hasn't been easy. If you think that you have been to something tough, you ought to sit in those trade negotiations day in and day out, and then when you finish one, be told to get on an airplane to fly halfway around the world and get in the middle of another one.

I have heard Mickey say a thousand times he was six-foot-four and blond-headed when he came to work here. (Laughter.) He and Ron Brown used to joke, you know, that they were the Alphonse and Gaston of our economic team. Mickey was the bad cop, Ron was the good cop. I thought we ought to give him the chance to be a good cop for a change. (Laughter.) And I want to thank him for his service.

I also want to announce that I will ask his principal deputy, Charlene

Barshefsky, who has been a brilliant negotiator for our country, to serve as acting U.S. Trade Representative. She has been a deputy there since I took off. She has been our chief trade negotiator in Latin America and in Asia. She is not here today because she is on her way back from a trade mission. And I have gone to many places and had world leaders ask me who she was because they virtually got tears in their eyes after four or five hours of trying to outmaneuver her. (Laughter.) So I want to thank her in her absence.

Finally, I want to make one more announcement. In just a few days we will have another very important vacancy in our economic team, one that has been critical to the success of our plans to being able to cut the deficit in half and continue to invest in America's priorities. And that is the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. I have been very blessed to have two outstanding Directors, and I gave them both other jobs.

Leon Panetta is now serving with great distinction as the White House Chief of Staff and longs for the days when he used to have that other job. (Laughter.) Alice Rivlin will soon be moving on to become the vice chair of the Federal Reserve Board, and therefore the object of our complaints whenever the economy is not growing as we think it should. (Laughter.)

And so there is, or soon will be, a vacancy at the Office of Management and Budget. And I am pleased to announce today that I intend to nominate as the next director, Franklin D. Raines.

Frank Raines has had extensive experience in government and in the private sector. He worked at OMB and on the domestic policy staff under President Carter. Since 1991, he has served in the very important position of vice chair of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Fannie Mae. He knows the world of finance, he respects the bottom line. He also understands, I know from our work in the transition and from a conversation we had just yesterday, the very real, human impact the work of the budget has on the American people, and the opportunities they will or will not have to make the most of their own lives. So I am very proud to ask him to join our team.

I, frankly, was a little surprised that he was willing to leave that incredibly lucrative position -- how shall I say it. (Laughter.) So I told Frank when he came here that he was about to join the ranks of Bob Rubin and Mickey Kantor and a number of other successful people who came into this administration to help save the middle class, and when they leave they'll be part of it. (Laughter.)

As you might imagine, this has been a profoundly moving and difficult week for all of us in our political family. Mickey Kantor and I were particularly close to Ron Brown; we loved him very much. I am doing what I think is the right thing to do today for the economic interests of America's business and for the future of all those workers who deserve the opportunity that is set out in the Commerce

Department's mission statement. I've known Mickey Kantor a very long time. Except for the color of their skins, the careers that he and Ron Brown had are remarkably parallel over a long period of time. And if he does as well at Commerce as he did at the Trade Office, we are in very good hands, indeed.

I also want to thank Frank Raines for proving once again that this country is full of patriotic Americans who love their country, who are willing to serve, and who are willing to make real, tangible sacrifices to serve, because the work of democracy, the work of citizenship is what makes the rest of this country move and go.

I thank them both, and I'd like to ask if each, in their turn, they'd like to come up and just make a few remarks. First, Mickey Kantor. (Applause.)

AMBASSADOR KANTOR: Mr. President, you honor me with your confidence and you honor me with your friendship of so many years. Mr. Vice President, thank you for the same. I couldn't have two better friends in the world, and I appreciate it very, very much.

I have three -- with all due respect to you, a little more important people off to my right. Almost everyone gets off to my right once in a while. (Laughter.) My wife, Heidi Schulman; my son, Doug, who is a graduating senior at Yale Law School; and his wife, Allison. Thank you for being here. I love you. (Applause.)

I talked to Alma Brown just -- oh, about an hour ago, and she was gracious enough and loving enough to say that Ron would have loved this moment to see me standing here. We stood shoulder to shoulder to make sure we grew jobs and raised standards of living, and did what the President said, and that is provide economic opportunity for every American. It's what we did before we came here; it's what we did when we came here. And I will continue that legacy. That is my pledge, that is my goal, that is what I am going to do. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

MR. RAINES: Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, I'd like to thank you very much for giving me this opportunity, an opportunity to serve our country at a very important time. It's something I was taught throughout my life to be something important. You don't grow up with the initials F.D.R. -- (laughter) -- without having some appreciation of the role and the positive role that government can play in the lives of people throughout this nation and throughout the world.

I am very happy that in the nick of time some people very important to me were able to be here -- my wife, Wendy; daughters, Laura, Andrea and Sarah. (Applause.) I'll have to explain to them later exactly what is going on here. (Laughter.) But it is a great honor for me to have the opportunity to assist the President and Vice President in carrying out the very important work that they have been carrying for the last three years, and that is to establish a fiscal policy that makes

sense for this country and for the world.

I think we're at a historic moment. I did serve in the Budget Office previously. In those time we would invent exactly what are targets were in terms of what we were trying to do in setting up a budget. And you could always resolve the problem by compromising by saying, well, let's just add another \$10 billion or \$20 billion and say that we reached an agreement.

But that is not a fiscal policy. A fiscal policy has to be tied to what you want to achieve in the economy. But more importantly, we're at a time when we can match a fiscal policy with an expression of the values of the country. And I think the important debate that is going on now is one that we will all look back on as being historic, and that is, can a country this large and this complicated, with a budget as big as the budget we have is, not just talk about line items and talk about interest groups, but say how does this match up with what we as a nation are trying to achieve.

Mr. President, as you know, there is a big debate going on about growth and the potential for growth. And we all know that if we can get a little more growth in the economy we can solve a lot of our problems. But the economists are debating how fast can the economy grow. But that argument is a little sterile because it always assumes that you're just going to leave the economy as you find it and you're not going to try to change anything.

Well, business leaders know they don't just take the company as they find it and see, well, what's the best I can do if I don't change anything. You change the inputs. You change the throughputs. And part of this values discussion that the President has led has been one that says let's do something about education. Let's do something about training. Let's improve productivity so we can have more growth, more wealth, more ability to improve the living standards of people throughout the nation.

And that's what I view the charge of this job to be -- to help the President carry out that mandate which is to make this economy more vibrant, not by wishing, not by hoping, but by doing, by changing the ability of American workers to create wealth that they can share in so that people throughout the nation will see a higher standard of living.

So, Mr. President, I look forward to this opportunity. I don't look forward to telling my colleagues at Fannie Mae that I won't be with them any longer because we've had a wonderful experience there in the largest company in the country, one that's serving the public purpose, expanding home ownership.

But this task is one that I hope I can have a significant effect on, that I can be an assistant to you, as well as to assist members of Congress in coming together on a broad agreement that will provide the economic basis for continuing one

of the longest expansions in history and to turn it into the longest expansion in history with the greatest increase in well being for the average American.

Thank you. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: We're adjourned. Thank you. (Applause.)

END

3:11 P.M. EDT

**FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
UNITED AUTO WORKERS
SHERATON WASHINGTON HOTEL
APRIL 21, 1996**

Thank you, President [Steve] Yokich. I am happy to be here tonight. I want to thank you for all you're doing to improve the lives of your members and of working families across the country.

It is especially a pleasure to talk to you today, at a time when American labor is coming back and coming on strong. Unions helped build the middle class, by bringing higher wages and better working conditions to generations of Americans. We all know that union membership means higher wages, safer jobs, and good benefits -- like health insurance and pensions.

Bill Clinton ran for President in 1992 to fight for America's workers -- to give them a sense of security and economic well-being that had been lost. He called his plan "putting people first" -- something the labor movement has always done.

He wanted to put government back on the side of average, hard-working people. In this era of momentous economic change, he wanted to ensure that the American Dream of opportunity would continue to be available to all who were willing to work for it.

For three years, President Clinton has sought to make government reflect the values working people have struggled for over the course of this century as they built the American labor movement -- values that your movement continued to represent at the dawn of a new century. Fair treatment on the job. The chance to make a decent living, support your families and build your communities.

Since President Clinton took office, 8.5 million new jobs have been created. Unemployment has stayed below 6 percent for 18 months. Inflation and interest rates are low. And the long decline in median hourly wages has stopped.

But we must do more. We must continue to focus on the concerns working Americans have about their own economic security at a time when the country is undergoing and economic transformation every bit as momentous as the exodus from farms to factories a century ago.

That's why President Clinton fought for passage of the Family Medical Leave Act. He expanded the Earned Income Tax Credit and gave a tax cut to 14 million working families with incomes under \$28,000.

One of the first things President Clinton did after taking office was to get rid of his predecessor's anti-worker, anti-union executive orders. He signed an Executive Order last spring saying in no uncertain terms that this administration will not allow companies that do business with the government to permanently replace striking workers. And recently, he

asked the Justice Department to take all appropriate steps to overturn a recent court decision blocking that Executive Order.

The Congressional leadership wants to roll back the progress we've made over the past few decades to ensure that our workers will be safe and that their families will be provided for. But if Congress succeeds in passing an OSHA-gutting bill, a company union bill or Davis-Bacon repeal, President Clinton will veto them as soon as they reach his desk.

President Clinton has stood firm against proposals that would hurt our people. He is proud to have cut the budget deficit in half. And he has proposed a balanced budget. But we do not need to undercut Medicare, Medicaid, education or the environment to balance the budget. Last year, President Clinton vetoed a Republican plan that violated our values. And if necessary, he would do it again.

Now we are calling on the Congress to pass an economic security agenda, so that all Americans can be winners of economic change. President Clinton is working to make sure that workers can keep their pension, even if you change your job. He vetoed legislation that would have given a green light to corporations to raid their pension funds. He's fighting for a new G.I. Bill for America's workers, so that when someone loses a job, he or she gets a voucher to pay for a training program to get a new skill.

And he's fighting to increase the minimum wage. If Congress doesn't act this year, the minimum wage will be at its lowest real value in 40 years. For a mother, working full-time to support her children, a 90-cent increase would buy seven months worth of groceries. For millions of hardworking parents it's very simple: You can't raise a family on \$4.25 an hour. The minimum wage must be a living wage.

For years, both parties have agreed that the minimum wage should keep up with the cost of living. This year, however, the Republican leadership has walked away from this tradition, and tried to block an increase in the minimum wage.

One member of a group of moderate Republicans who broke with their party's leadership said it best: "This is not a complicated issue. It should not be a partisan issue. It's timely. It's right, and I think we should do it." [*Amo Houghton*]

An increase in the minimum wage honors family and work. Congress should stop blocking an increase in the minimum wage and pass it -- with no gimmicks, no political games, and with no controversial amendments. That's the way to help our people make the most of their own lives.

Another issue should not be complicated or partisan is the guarantee that if you lose or change your job, or if someone gets sick, you won't lose your health insurance. The Kennedy-Kassebaum bill will make it easier for as many as 24 millions of Americans to get and keep health insurance. In this new, more dynamic economy where we're creating more

jobs than we have in a very long time, but where people are also feeling pressured by changes, Americans need the security that is provided by the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill.

This week, the Senate beat back an effort to put a special-interest provision that would have derailed this important legislation. Congress must finish their job on this critical legislation -- and send it to the President right away.

I want to conclude by reminding you just how high the stakes are. The election in 1992 was about change in the status quo. This year's election is about two different kinds of change. It's about the President's vision and what he has tried to do for the past three years. And it's about the Republicans vision and what they tried to do once they won the Congress. So there is not a status quo option here. You know it, your members know it -- that's why you are spending unprecedented resources on this year's election.

This is an age of real possibility for our country -- a time when more of our people can live out the American dream than ever before. But to make that promise real, we must be true to our values and stand up for our families and our children. This administration will continue to fight for America's workers. And we know that with your support, the challenges we face today will be overcome.

elected representatives answer to the people and not to the big-money lobbyists who line campaign coffers and haunt the halls of Congress.

We have to make our democracy work as effectively as it can. That means we also must demand more of ourselves. Women, in particular, have a crucial role to play in the next and in every election. Because of the diverse roles we already fill in society -- in the home and in the workplace -- we bring special insights into the task of building a better country.

And yet, today, 75 years after winning the vote, many of us do not feel enough of a stake in the political process to exercise this hard-won right. Fifty-four million women chose not to vote in the last election. That is an abdication of responsibility -- and a missed opportunity for women who deserve to have a say in the direction of our country.

I think about that every time I travel and meet women around the world whose life choices are so limited because they are still living without this basic right.

Please, reach out to the women in your lives and encourage them to use their power to vote and shape our common future.

California has always been a land of pioneers. It is a state built by Americans from all corners of this continent and all parts of the world who shared a common faith in democracy and the American Dream. Californians have invigorated our culture and led the country with new ideas, new methods and new strategies of keeping the American Dream alive. The nation has long looked to you for leadership. We continue to look to you now, in this momentous time in our nation's history. On the eve of the 21st century, there is still so much we can and must do together, as one American family. Thank you for doing your part.

###

growth in jobs in auto industry
Auto Industry
Republicans
on the ball



FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
REMARKS TO UAW LEGISLATIVE-POLITICAL CONFERENCE
WASHINGTON, D.C.
APRIL 21, 1996

Thank you President Yokich [YOH-kitch]. Thank-you so much for giving me this opportunity to speak to all of you in the UAW who are working so hard to keep the American Dream alive and attainable for all families who are willing to work for it.

On behalf of the President, I want to thank each of you, members of this great union, for all you're doing to improve the lives of working men and women and their children all across our country. From civil rights to Medicare to the minimum wage, the UAW has always been there, fighting for America's workers, for the elderly, for the disadvantaged. For more than half a century, you have been at the forefront of economic and social progress. You have helped make our society more just.

On the eve of the 21st century, America is the great nation it is today because of your hard work. But, unfortunately it seems that there are some in our country who are threatening to take our country one hundred years backward, to undermine all that you and all of us who believe in ~~justice for all~~ have achieved on behalf of families. *the American Dream civil justice fair union fair wage*

~~So~~ you've come to Washington at a ~~very~~ crucial time for working families. What happens in Congress and at the ballot box in the coming months will ~~have~~ profound effects on families, and on their ability to thrive in the 21st century.

Three years ago, you sent a President to the White House who promised to put people first, to reinvigorate America's working families, and to restore in them a sense of economic well-being that had been slowly ~~chipping~~ away during the previous administrations. *slipping*

You sent ~~the~~ President and Vice-President to Washington to generate growth and jobs, to increase incomes, to shrink the underclass and grow the middle class. They've made a good start. *at President & VP have*

In the last three years, 8.4 million new jobs have been created. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years. And we've halted the long decline in median hourly wages. ~~But~~ this is a record to build on. We have to do more, especially for our families and children. *not to retreat*

Tonight, I want to talk about families. About the UAW's priorities for workers and their children. About the President's achievements on behalf of families. And about what we all need to do to help families survive and thrive in a rapidly changing world.

The fight to save the American Dream and support America's families must begin with the fight to save America's workers, their incomes, and their jobs.

We are living in ^{an} ~~an~~ exhilarating ^{and yet} ~~and~~ bewildering time. Technology is advancing at breathtaking speed. And as our world becomes more complex, it is also becoming smaller. American workers are being asked to perform more sophisticated tasks and to compete with their counterparts all over the world.

That's why the President has been working hard for all American workers to compete with their international counterparts on a level playing field. Like you, the President truly believes that American workers can compete with anybody, anywhere, any day, so long as their competitors play fair.

^{persuade} Just last year, the President told you of his efforts to ~~force~~ the Japanese to open their auto market to American products.

^{the President wants you to know} Today, ~~I can report to you~~ ^{in Japan} that since the agreement was signed, sales of American-made autos have increased by more than a third. Sales of American-made cars, trucks and vans rose more than 225 percent between 1992 and 1995. ^{58,000} Big Three cars were exported from the U.S. just last year. In the first two months of this year, America sold one-third more autos to Japan than in the same period last year. In auto parts, exports over the last three years are up 60 percent.

As you know, I've just come back from accompanying the President on a state visit to Japan, where I saw proof of these developments. There was a time in the not too distant past when it would have been inconceivable for a U.S. automaker to have any presence Japan. But lo and behold, last week, the President and I found ourselves visiting a Chrysler dealership that was selling right-handed Neons and Cherokees[check].

These developments are part of the rebirth of our auto industry. And because of the partnership between labor and management, for the first time in 15 years, the United States auto industry was number one in the world last year.

None of this could have happened without your hardwork and leadership. The President realizes this. That is why when the President took office three years ago, he got rid of his predecessors' anti-worker, anti-union executive orders. Last spring, he signed his own executive order which forbid companies that do business with the government to permanently replace striking workers. The President has directed the Justice Department to take all appropriate steps to overturn a recent court decision blocking that executive order.

The President will veto any effort to weaken Section 8(a)2 of the National Labor Relations Act. He is fighting to preserve

working people's hard-earned wage protections. The Davis-Bacon Act and the Service Contract Act are the foundations for decent living standards for many Americans. Some in Congress want to take them away, but the President will resist those efforts. He will help you protect the standard of living you have fought so hard and long to maintain.

The President is committed to policies that reward work. That's why he expanded the Earned Income Tax Credit to give a tax cut to more than 15 million working families with incomes under \$28,000. And that is why he supports an increase in the minimum wage to make it a living wage.

The minimum wage today is at a 40-year low. And yet, there are a lot of single parents and quite a few families who are struggling to raise their children on the minimum wage. We must do what we can to help these hard-working families and to close the gap between richest and poorest working families. *at least 6 years of our country.*

we must also be concerned about
~~There is something that is even more fundamental than wages, and that is a worker's health and safety in the workplace.~~ *Beamed*
I find it terribly ironic that those who purport to care about the health and safety of Americans are also trying to gut health and safety standards in the workplaces. They have introduced legislation that would cut OSHA's enforcement budget by a third and effectively relieve employers of their duty to provide safe working environments.

How can workers take our country forward in the 1990s when so many are trying to take working conditions back to the 1890s? *21st century*
I thought we settled this ages ago: American workers should not have to put their health and safety in jeopardy just to feed their families. It's not right. *19th century*

It is time we accepted a fundamental lesson: treating working people in a decent, fair, humane, enlightened way gives you a stronger American economy, not a weaker one.

move
Education will be the key to the survival of the American worker in the 21st century. The Clinton Administration is committed to making college available to every one who is willing to study hard. The President has expanded Pell grants and made student loans *more accessible.*

That doesn't mean we don't have to adapt new from and change since the ways we do business.
Change is inevitable and ultimately there are some types of jobs that will go the way of the Edsel and the horse-drawn carriage. Under the President's new G.I. Bill for American workers, men and women who lose their jobs to corporate layoffs and downsizing will receive vouchers to pay for whatever retraining -- whether it's college or an apprenticeship -- they need to become employable again.

Economic security goes hand-in-hand with health security. One of the first things my husband signed was the Family and

Medical Leave Act so that workers could take time to care for sick family members without being afraid of losing their jobs. Families today are much stronger because of that bill.

we sure made it clear
I want to take a moment to thank you for your support these past few years in our efforts to reform our health care system. We may have not been successful ~~last fall~~ in passing health reform, but ~~everyone agrees~~ *pushed hard* that something must be done. The President is pressing on in his efforts to pass the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill to make sure that Americans who lose or change jobs do not lose their health insurance as well.

And we must protect Medicaid and Medicare. These programs are the safety net for millions of Americans, from the seniors who worked so hard to make America the great country it is today to the children who will make it even greater tomorrow.

Dowe want new to
More than one in five children in this country is eligible for Medicaid. And all of those children, whether they are related by blood to us or not, are our children. They are our future. ~~In twenty years, depending on how we take care of them now, they're either going to be in jail or in school or in the workplace.~~ *20 years from now* I don't know about you, but when I retire, I'd rather have them out there ^{up} healthy, well-educated, working, ~~making lots of money, and taking care of me.~~ *doctor members to our society.*

That's why we must remain committed to funding Head Start, to computerizing the classrooms and to keeping our schools safe and drug free.

The 21st century will be here sooner than we know it. We are moving from an industrial age to an information age. We have moved from the bipolar world of the cold war to a global village full of endless possibility and daunting challenge.

Somehow we have to harness this change to benefit the average working family. We must do it in ways that are consistent with the values that made America great and make life worth living, values that your movement embodies -- a commitment to opportunity for every American; to the dignity of work; to strengthening families, nurturing children and honoring parents; to working together, regardless of race, income or religion.

This country was built by people who came from all parts of the world who shared a common faith in democracy and the American Dream. People who have never been afraid of change. There is still so much we can and must do together, as one American family. Thank-you for doing your part.

Use as outline

Aired April 1

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT

VIDEO TO THE UNITED AUTO WORKERS
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONVENTION

Thank you President Yokich. I'm sorry I can't be with you in person, but I'm very glad to have the opportunity to speak to you about the issues you and I care so much about.

The UAW's Collective Bargaining Convention is one of labor's great democratic institutions. I salute you for it. Collective bargaining built the middle class and brought higher wages and better working conditions to generations of Americans. And because so many U.S. workers depend on a robust auto industry, all Americans benefit from your dedication to making collective bargaining work for your members and their families.

I also want to thank you and the leadership of your great union for all you're doing to improve the lives of your members and of working men and women and their children all across our country. For over half-century the UAW has been at the forefront of economic and social progress for our nation. From civil rights to Medicare to the minimum wage, the UAW has always been there, fighting for America's working men and women, for the elderly, and the disadvantaged.

A little more than three years ago we began a journey together -- a journey to restore America's working families, to give them a sense of economic security and well-being that was being lost. We called our agenda "putting people first" -- something the labor movement has always done.

We wanted to put government back on the side of ordinary Americans. In this era of momentous economic change, we wanted to ensure that the American Dream of opportunity would continue to be available to all who are willing to work for it.

We've sought to make government reflect the values for which working people have struggled over the course of this century -- values that your movement continues to represent at the dawn of a new century: Opportunity. Responsibility. Fair treatment on the job. The chance to make a decent living, to support your families and build your communities.

You sent me to Washington to generate growth and jobs, to increase incomes, to shrink the under class and grow the middle class. We've made a good start.

In the last three years, 8.4 million new jobs have been created. Unemployment has stayed below 6 percent for 18 months. We've managed to keep inflation and interest rates low. And we've halted the long decline in median hourly wages. But this is a record to build on, not

to sit on. We have to do more. We must continue to focus on the concerns working Americans, the concerns they have about their own economic security at a time when the country is undergoing an economic transformation every bit as momentous as the exodus from farms to factories a century ago.

All of you know as well as anyone that we have a lot to do to make sure America keeps working for, and not against, working families. That's why I fought for passage of the Family and Medical Leave Act. That's why we've expanded the Earned Income Tax Credit, to give a tax cut to more than 15 million working families with incomes under \$28,000. That's why I support an increase in the minimum wage. *expand*

That's why I'm fighting to make sure that if you lose or change your job, or if someone gets sick, you won't lose your health insurance. I'm working to make sure you can keep your pension, even if you change jobs, and why I am fighting for a new G.I. Bill for America's workers, so that when someone loses a job, he or she gets a voucher to pay for a training program to get a new skill.

Right after I took office, I got rid of my predecessor's anti-worker, anti-union executive orders. Last spring, I signed an executive order which said in no uncertain terms that we won't allow companies that do business with the government to permanently replace striking workers. I've directed the Justice Department to take all appropriate steps to overturn a recent court decision blocking that executive order. *A*

My administration is pro-family, pro-worker, and pro-union. Unfortunately, for the past year you and I have been fighting a defensive battle in the Congress. But we've more than held our own. Thanks to the grass-roots efforts of the UAW and others, we've managed to stall or defeat practically every major attack on America's working families and on the unions that represent them.

I'll veto any effort to weaken Section 8(a)2 of the National Labor Relations Act. And I'm fighting to preserve working people's hard-earned wage protections. The Davis-Bacon Act and the Service Contract Act are the foundations for decent living standards for many, many Americans. Some want to take them away. But I believe our country can't afford to support policies which increase the inequality that has grown so much over the years already, and that threaten the living standards that you have fought so hard to maintain.

Some people in Congress have even decided that worker safety and health fringe benefits are things our people don't need. They introduced legislation that would effectively take away an employer's duty to provide a safe workplace, and cut OSHA's enforcement budget by a third. American workers should not have to put their health and safety in jeopardy just to feed their families. It's not right.

You and your families, and the millions and millions of working families like you -- you're the heart and soul of the American Dream. We have to keep working together, not just to preserve what's been won, but to continue the fight for better jobs, stronger unions, higher wages, and more justice.

The 21st century can be the next American century. Our children and our grandchildren can enjoy more freedom and more opportunity than ever before -- if we do the right things. If we stand up to those who would take this country backward -- if we stand up to those who would keep working people down and who would divide us, we can expand hope and opportunity in our country and thereby rebuild America's faith in the future.

You're more than doing your part, and I am determined to be your partner. Thank you, and God bless you.

* * * * *

Russian forces were not under NATO command and control or there was some type of dual key arrangement wouldn't work. Is that still the U.S. position?

President Clinton. Our position is that we're going to have an operation that works. We want Russia to be involved in it. We made some progress today consistent with both of our objectives, with neither side giving up the things that were most important to it. We made some progress today on that. And we recognized that some of the things that needed to be decided neither of us could in good conscience decide without giving our military leaders the chance to work through that. So we agreed that this week—this week—our military leaders would keep working.

That is all I can tell you; the more we say about it, the worse it will be. We are moving toward peace. The first and most important thing is, make peace in Bosnia. That has not been done yet. If that happens—and we hope it will, and we've agreed on that completely, how we will approach it—then we have the responsibility to work together to make the peace work. And we will do that.

President Yeltsin. I want to add, you are underestimating the Presidents of two such great powers. Maybe something didn't quite reach you. Maybe you can't quite figure out how we can solve it, but it came to us; it reached us.

NOTE: The President's 104th news conference began at 3:44 p.m. on the front steps of the Franklin D. Roosevelt home. In his remarks, he referred to Russian Minister of Defense Pavel Grachev. President Yeltsin spoke in Russian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Joint Statement With President Yeltsin on Nuclear Materials Security *October 23, 1995*

Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin noted the importance they attach to ensuring the security of nuclear weapons and nuclear materials, maintaining effective control over them, and combating illegal trafficking in nuclear materials. They underscored their strong support for the efforts underway in the Russian Federation and the United States to

achieve these objectives, including the rapidly growing range of cooperative activities being pursued jointly by US and Russian experts. The Presidents noted with satisfaction that bilateral and multilateral cooperation in these areas has grown rapidly over the past year and includes joint activities on law enforcement, customs, intelligence liaison and on-the-ground cooperation to improve nuclear materials security at ten sites, protecting tons of nuclear material. The Presidents also welcomed cooperative efforts to improve the security of nuclear weapons in transport or storage in connection with their dismantlement.

The two Presidents welcomed the joint report on steps that have been accomplished and additional steps that should be taken to ensure the security of nuclear materials, prepared by the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission in implementation of the May 10 summit declaration on nonproliferation. This report outlines current and planned U.S.-Russian programs of bilateral cooperation that will result in broad improvements in nuclear materials security, including several important sites with weapons-usable nuclear material, increased security for nuclear weapons in connection with their dismantlement, and construction of a safe and secure long-term storage facility for fissile material from dismantled weapons. The Presidents endorsed speedy implementation of these plans and directed that they be expanded and accelerated to the greatest extent possible.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this statement.

Remarks to the AFL-CIO Convention in New York City *October 23, 1995*

The President. Thank you very much for the wonderful welcome. Thank you, Tom, for the great introduction. I wish I'd been here to hear it. [Laughter] But I appreciate it.

You know, I've taken so many controversial positions in the last 3 years, I thought I'd come here and tell you what you ought to do in this election. [Laughter] You should elect—listen to this—you ought to elect an Irish-American from the Bronx who comes

out of the Service Employees Union. [Laughter] I just want you to know that whatever you do, I intend to be there with you every step of the way. And I know how important this is. [Applause] Thank you.

Let me say before I get into my remarks, I have just come, as I think all of you know, from Hyde Park and a meeting with President Yeltsin of Russia. We made a lot of progress today in agreeing to work toward peace in Bosnia, something that concerns every citizen of the world whose conscience has been shocked by all the children and other innocent people who have been killed there.

We also agreed on working together, very importantly, to control the spread of nuclear materials, something that is a very serious problem in the aftermath of the cold war, to minimize the prospect that terrorists will ever be able to get small amounts of nuclear material and make bombs out of them.

And finally, President Yeltsin agreed with me that we should go for the strongest possible comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty next year. And that means we will probably get it, and the world will be much safer as a result of it.

I know that you have—all of you—and I came here more than anything else just to thank you, because I know that you have waged a strong and passionate grassroots campaign for a year now to oppose the cuts in worker safety and job training, in education and health care, being considered in the Congress. The White House mailroom is jammed with postcards from union retirees. [Applause] Thank you. This may be the high-tech age, but you have got the Capitol Hill switchboards groaning with calls from your members. And I say, send more. And I know that those ads you're running have gotten some Members of Congress suffering with heartburn. And we just need to pour it on a little more. I thank you for that.

I come here today with a simple message: This is a very great country. You helped to make it that way. We're on the edge of a new century. We're living in a time of great change. No one can perceive clearly all the implications of that change.

We know that we've moved from an industrial age to an information and technology

age, which, as all of you know in your own experience, even industry and agriculture is infused today with more technology. We know we have moved from the bipolar world of the cold war to a global village in which we have dreamed of new possibilities but also a lot of new vulnerabilities because of the changes that are going on.

And we know we've got to somehow harness this change to benefit ordinary people in our country and throughout the world. We have to do it consistent with the basic values that made America great and that make life worth living: values that your movement embodies: a commitment to opportunity for every American; to the dignity of work; to the commitment that the family should be strengthened and children should be nurtured and parents should be honored; a recognition that we have to go forward or backward together and therefore it is crazy for us to be divided by race, by region, by income and any way that in any way saps our strength; and the determination to keep this country the strongest nation on Earth. Those are the things which have animated the labor movement in the later half of the 20th century. And those are the values that will take us into the 21st century.

Three years ago, you helped the American people to send me to Washington to uphold these values and to turn our economy around. I had a commitment to make the American dream real for all Americans in the 21st century and to make sure that our country would remain the strongest country in the world. I had a simple strategy to harness change to benefit all of us. I thought we needed to be faithful to the mainstream values I just mentioned. I thought we needed a middle class economic strategy to grow the middle class and shrink the under class. I thought we needed a modern Government that would be less bureaucratic, more entrepreneurial, but still strong enough to take care of the business that the people need done.

The lion's share of the credit belongs to you and the rest of the American people, but we're moving in the right direction. And I know that our policies had something to do with it. We've got 7½ million new jobs in this country, after the slowest job growth in

the country since the Great Depression, in the 4 years before I took office. We've got 2½ million more homeowners, 2 million new small business people, the lowest combined rate of inflation and unemployment in 25 years. Our country is safer and stronger. For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there's not a single solitary nuclear missile pointed at the people of the United States of America. And I'm proud of that. And by the grace of God, from Northern Ireland to Haiti, to the Middle East, now to Bosnia, the United States is a strong partner in pushing for peace.

Maybe most important of all, this country seems to be slowly coming together around its values again. It's hard to turn a great country around, but when we get going in a certain direction, we can make a real difference. In almost every State, in this great city where you're meeting, the crime rate is down; the murder rate is down; the welfare rolls are down; the food stamp rolls are down. Believe it or not, the poverty rate is down, and the teen pregnancy rate has dropped for 2 years in a row. America is coming back and moving together.

And we proved you could do it together. Instead of just condemning the Government the way my predecessors did, we made a partnership with the Federal employees, and in a balanced and fair and disciplined way, we tried to downsize the Government so that this big Government attack is a myth today. But we left our Government strong enough for the employees that are there to do their jobs. And we just didn't throw anybody on the street; we gave them good buyout provisions. We tried to protect their retirement. We treated them and their families with decency and the honor and the respect they were entitled to after the years they had served the United States of America. And that's the way this ought to be done everywhere.

Let me tell you what the Federal employees are doing—just a few things. I could talk all day about it. But Federal employees working in the Commerce Department, in the Export-Import Bank, in other areas, have helped to create good jobs, many of them union jobs, in America by increasing our exports 4 percent, 10 percent, and 16 percent

this year, in the last 3 years. A lot of that was done because of aggressive actions by people who work for the United States Government.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency—we've had as many natural disasters to deal with in the last 3 years as any time I can remember. And it is probably the most popular arm of the Federal Government because the Federal employees have been there in a timely, aggressive, effective fashion when they were needed, whether it was for floods in the Middle West or fires and earthquakes in the West or anything else. And I am proud of that.

And let me tell you something I'm especially proud of. Business Week magazine, which is hardly an arm of the Federal Government or the Democratic Party, every year gives awards to businesses that perform at the highest level of efficiency in a number of categories. And one of their categories is for customer service over the telephone. So the businesses that compete, for example, are Southwest Airlines or L. L. Bean or, you know, anybody that you call on the telephone. You know who won this year? The Social Security Administration of the Federal Government won that award.

These Federal employees operate a Medicare program that has a 2 percent administrative cost, lower than any private insurance program in the United States of America, something you rarely hear about in the debate going on in Congress today. They have implemented a crime bill that's putting 100,000 police on the streets of America, and they're doing it on time and under budget. They have implemented the motor voter law, the family leave law, both those things that you helped to get.

They have been able to be much tougher in capturing large quantities of drugs before they come into this country. Without going into a bunch of immigrant bashing, they have been able to in a disciplined way strengthen our ability to reduce the problems of illegal immigration in the United States. And they have fought discrimination, something that was out of fashion for the Federal Government to do until this administration came in. And I thank them for it.

And guess what? We've been able to prove you can grow the economy and be decent to working people, something that the people who were there before and the people who are in the Congress today in dominant positions apparently don't believe. If you look at what's happened—and I'm sure Tom mentioned a lot of this—but when we repealed my predecessors' anti-union Executive orders that denied American workers their rights from private industry to public service, it didn't hurt the economy. The economy got better, not worse. When we said in no uncertain terms that you ought to have a fair, decent, effective NLRB, and we did our best to provide that, the economy got better, not worse. It didn't undermine the American economy.

When we refused to go along with repealing Davis-Bacon and the service contract law, the economy didn't collapse; it helped to create more high-wage jobs, not fewer. And when we began to crack down on sweatshops where unscrupulous employers make illegal immigrants work in prison-like conditions, depriving them of the minimum wage, overtime pay, a safe workplace and the right to organize, it will make us stronger, not weaker.

And when we have refused to go along with the attempts of some people to weaken our ability to provide a safe workplace, it has not weakened the economy; it has helped to make the American economy stronger. It is time we accepted a fundamental lesson: Treating working people in a decent, fair, humane, enlightened way gives you a stronger American economy, not a weaker one.

Audience members. Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

The President. Thank you.

Now, we do have some real challenges before us. You and I know that this recovery's benefits have not been spread evenly to all Americans. We know that we've been in a time of increasing inequality. By the way, this is what usually happens when you move from one economic model to another. When we move from the agricultural age to the industrial age, the labor movement grew up because there were so many people who were being exploited, not benefiting from the benefits of the new industrial age. So whenever

you change in a huge way the way people work and live and relate to each other and the rest of the world, some will be well-positioned and do well; others will not be.

That's why people need to come together, because you know in the end you cannot sustain progress unless everybody can benefit. That's one of the big reasons we had the Great Depression, because people did not understand that everybody had to have a stake in the future in order for free enterprise to flourish.

And so we have that happening today, where people who are well-positioned tend to do well; others work harder for less and become more insecure. There are some fundamental things we have to do about it. First and most elementally, it is high time we raise the minimum wage. It is wrong—[applause]. Thank you. If we do not do that, next year the minimum wage will reach a 40-year low in purchasing power. That is not my idea of the 21st century America I want our children and grandchildren to live in. I want us to go up together.

It also will be good business. People will have more money to consume, and people who are presently out of the work force will be attracted to get back into it. There is no evidence, no evidence, and I have read all the studies—at least I've read fair summaries of all the studies. I don't want to—[laughter]—there is no evidence that the minimum wage, a modest increase in the minimum wage, will cause unemployment. There is every evidence that it will strengthen America and bring us together.

The second thing I think we need to do is to make some changes that recognize that there is a fundamental difference in the nature of unemployment today and unemployment 30 years ago. The unemployment compensation system, the whole setup was designed for people who were laid off when there was a slowdown and then picked right back up by their employers when the economy picked up again. It was designed to give people a way to just get by until they got called back.

As recently as 30 years ago, 80 percent—85 percent of the people who were laid off and collected unemployment were called back to the same job from which they were

laid off. Today, over 80 percent of the people who are laid off are not called back to the same job from which they are laid off. All of you know that. Therefore, I have proposed having the Labor Department, working with the Education Department, create a "GI bill for America's workers," which consolidates all of our training programs, puts more money into it, and gives every person who loses a job a right to get a voucher to take to the program that you want, whether it's a union apprenticeship program, a union training program, the local community college. Whatever is best needed for the people that are unemployed, they ought to have it. And I think we ought to do it immediately.

The second thing that we ought to do—if we're going to have a tax cut we ought to target it to working families and what they need the most, which is help raising their children, paying for their child care, and getting an education. So I think we ought to have a tax deduction for the cost of all education after high school. Now, that would help working people a lot. That would help.

The third thing I will say is—and I know we have sometimes disagreed on this—I believe that we win when we expand trade. So it's not enough to have more free trade, which I favor, we also have to have more fair trade. That's what the Japanese auto agreement was about. And thank you, Owen Bieber, for supporting us and for finally giving us a chance to crack some of those markets that have been denied American workers for too long. And we're going to keep doing things like that all the way down.

Against that background, this is how I think you ought to see this balanced budget fight. What has worked for us the last 2½ years? Mainstream values, work and family and responsibility and community and treating people with dignity, all people, without regard to their race or their region or income; believing that you have to lift working people up if you want other people to do well: That has worked for us. What's worked for us? Middle class economics, help the small business people, help the entrepreneurs, also help to grow the middle class working people and shrink the under class: That's what works. That's what is at stake in this budget battle.

This is not—I want to say this, and I want you to go home and tell everybody you know this—this is not a battle about balancing the budget. That has nothing to do with what is going on in Washington today. I gave the Congress a balanced budget. You'd be better off if we could balance the budget. When we quadrupled the debt in 12 years before I showed up, what happened? We had to spend more and more money on interest on the debt. We had less and less money to invest in worker training, in new technology, and the kinds of things that will grow the economy, raise incomes, educate our children.

It would be a good thing to do. But we have to do that, like everything else, consistent with our values and our objectives. That is what is at stake. It is, what kind of America are we going to live in?

I've given the Congress a balanced budget. It cuts all kinds of spending. It eliminates hundreds of programs. But it increases our investment in education, in technology, in research. It protects instead of hurts the old, the poor, the disabled, the little children on Medicare and Medicaid. It supports investment in worker safety and in a clean environment and in the kinds of national treasures that we share together. That is the kind of balanced budget we need.

And that is what I want to talk to you about. I am not about to do something that I think will prevent us from doing what I ran for President to do: giving every American a shot at the American dream and making sure this is the strongest, finest country in the world in the 21st century. I am not going to do that. And you shouldn't put up with it. You shouldn't put up with it.

Now, here's what I mean. I'm going to give you the 10 greatest hits or so of this present budget. This is not the Letterman show, and so it won't all be funny. You may have to laugh a couple of times to keep from crying, but here's what this is really about. Here's what the real contract is.

We all say we believe in honoring our parents for what they have done for us. And Medicare is a way of honoring our parents. We have to slow the rate of growth of medical inflation. We have to secure the Medicare

Trust Fund. I presented a budget which will do that.

We have to recognize that health care is changing. I have no problem with giving seniors the option to join managed care plans if they can get lower costs or better services. I think we should do that. I'm sympathetic with doctors and hospitals and their need to have some changes in the law so they can work together to compete with insurance companies to provide managed care. I'm not against that. But I'll tell you what I am against. I'm against this budget that was passed that, believe it or not, makes it easier to commit waste, fraud, and abuse. When the Federal Government says up to 10 percent of the money may be wasted, they passed a budget to make it easier to commit waste, fraud, and abuse but harder for the poorest, the oldest, and the sickest seniors to make sure their health care needs are met. That is wrong. I don't like it. I won't support it. And if it passes, I will veto it. It is wrong.

I want to talk to you about the Medicaid program. There's a lot of AFSME workers here who work in health care institutions that depend upon Medicaid. New York City has a whole health care network that depends not just on Medicare but Medicaid. Most people think Medicaid is the welfare health program. Let me tell you—70 percent of the Medicaid money goes to the elderly and the disabled for nursing home care, for in-home care, for physician care. Thirty percent of the Medicaid money does go to poor people, not all of them on welfare, some of them even working for very poor wages. And most of that money goes to take care of the little children. Over one in five children in the United States of America is eligible for Medicaid help for health care. And all those kids, they may not be in your family, but they're your kids. And 20 years from now, they're either going to be in jail or in school or in the workplace. And they're going to be a big part of our future. And I don't know about you, but when I retire, I want them out there working, making lots of money, taking care of me. And I want to take care of their health right now.

So my idea of the 21st century is not a Medicaid program that takes away the money that helps the poorest seniors to pay their part of the Medicare program. That's right;

they get rid of it, \$10 billion. We help the poorest old folks pay their copays. We help them pay the fees they owe under Medicare because they don't have any money. There's a lot of old folks out there. There's folks still living on \$300 a month. This budget takes it all away. And there's been a study which estimates that it may take at least a million elderly people out of the Medicare program.

I was in Texas the other night at a fundraiser, and a doctor came up to me. A doctor came up to me, and he said, "You keep fighting on this." He said, "I've been a doctor a long time. I remember when I did not have any older patients, before Medicare, before Medicaid, when I had no older patients, because older people were too proud to come to the doctor if they couldn't pay their bills. So a lot of them just stayed home and got sick and died." It is wrong. I will not put up with it. It is not right. And you shouldn't put up with it either. It is not right. It is not right.

I want to tell you one more thing about this Medicaid plan. It says, "Oh, we're going to block-grant this to the States. We're going to get these terrible Federal rules and regulations out of the State's hair." I was a Governor for 12 years. I used to sing that song. *[Laughter]* I believe in that.

Our administration—don't you let anybody tell you this is about State's rights—our administration has given more waivers, more freedom to get out from under Federal rules to State governments to experiment with moving people from welfare to work or serving more people, getting health insurance to more people, than the last two administrations combined. More in 2½ years than they did in 12 years. This is not about giving the States flexibility.

But let me tell you the kind of things they want to let the States do and what they don't want to let the States do, and it will tell you what's really behind this. They've adopted their Medicaid programs. And among other things, they say that the State ought to get Medicaid block-granted and they ought to have the right to get rid of the so-called spousal impoverishment rule. That's Government language. You know what that means? That means if an elderly couple lived to be 78 years old and they've been married 50

years and they're living on their Social Security and one of them gets so sick that he or she needs to go in the nursing home, they want to give back to the State governments the right to tell the one that doesn't go to the nursing home, "You want your wife or your husband to get any help? You've got to sell your car, sell your house, clean out your bank account, give it to us, and then we'll give you a little help. We don't know how you're going to live." I don't like that. That is not my idea of the 21st century I want to live in.

But you know what? In the next breath, do you know what they did? They took away from the States—they say, "We're going to give you lots of flexibility and a little less money. And we want you to run it however you want to, but, oh, oh, there's one thing you've been doing we're not going to let you do anymore. Right now you can bargain with the drug companies to get the lowest possible price for drugs for elderly people and little kids. And we're not going to let you do that anymore, because the drug companies don't want us to. So I'm sorry, you will have to do more with less money, but here's something you can't do." I don't know about you, but I don't get driving up the price of drugs and driving old folks into the poor house. I don't think that's right. That's not the America I want to live in. And I'm going to do everything I can to stop it. And I want you to help me.

Now, I want to talk to you about education. Everybody's for education. You ask anybody in the Congress, are you for education? They say, absolutely. But you've always got to ask the next question; the first question is never enough. I'll tell you—you know the best story I know about that—you know, there's a—this minister was sort of a—not a very effective minister, and people would go to sleep in his sermons. And he was overcome, and he prayed day-in and day-out for inspiration so he could finally give a barn-burning sermon and everybody would stand up. And their hearts would be purified, and their spiritual zeal would be great.

So he worked so hard on this. And he showed up, and he gave the sermon of his life. And people were stomping and clapping and even in this staid church were shouting

amen. And he got to the final line of his sermon; he said, "I want everybody that wants to go to heaven to stand up." And the whole congregation stood up, except one woman that hadn't missed church in 45 years. And he was crestfallen. He said, "Sister Jones, don't you want to go to heaven when you die?" And she leapt up, she said, "I'm sorry, I thought you were trying to get up a load to go right now." [Laughter]

So you always got to ask the next question. Everybody's for education. Our budget balances the budget and increases our investment in education by \$40 billion—by \$40 billion over 7 years—by making choices and setting priorities. Why? Because if 22 percent of the kids in this country are poor enough to be on Medicaid, they need a little extra help through Head Start to get off to a good start in school, because a lot of schools are too poor to have the class sizes they need or the computers we want them to have; because a lot of kids are in danger going to and from school, and we need to give schools more help to remain safe and drug-free; because we want to make it possible for everybody to go to college.

When I ran for President, I came here and I made a specific commitment. I said if you will vote for me and get me elected, I'll do everything I can to cut the cost of college loans, to improve the repayment on college loans, and then to be tougher on people who default. We cut the default rate in half, but we also cut the cost of college loans. We made repayment easier. And to boot, we added more scholarships.

And enrollment is going up, but nowhere near what we need. I want every middle class family in this country and every poor family in this country to be able to send their kids to college. And I don't want anybody ever from now on to have to walk away from a college education because of the cost. That's my idea of the 21st century.

So when the Congress presents a budget that says, no, it's all right if several thousand more kids—20, 30, whatever it is—more kids don't get to go to Head Start and we have to remove them; it's all right if we don't help as many schools with safe and drug-free programs as we were; it's all right if a whole lot of schools now can't use that money for

their poor kids for the smaller classes and the computers; it's okay if because the people that lost money on the direct loan program, the special interests, want their money back, so we're just going to kill this program that the Government's running that's got lower cost college loans and better repayment terms. We're going to get rid of that, and to boot, we'll get rid of somewhere between 150,000 and 380,000 scholarships. I don't know about you folks, that is not the kind of America I want for the 21st century. And I'm going to do everything I can to stop it. It is wrong. And it's bad for our economy. It doesn't make sense.

And we're getting a little closer to home now. You say to people, are you for family values? Why, of course we are. Who could be against it? Most of those who were there last time—they're in the majority now—when we asked them to stand up for family values by adopting the family and medical leave law, they said no. And we said yes. And there are families that are stronger today because of the family and medical leave law because they don't lose their jobs when there's a kid sick or a parent dying or one of them gets sick. It's a better country. It's a stronger country. And it's a stronger economy because of that.

So what do we mean? Well, family values to me means safe streets, a clean environment, economic opportunity, fair taxes, secure pensions; let's just start there. Well, at least one House of Congress wants to eliminate our program to put 100,000 police on the street and to give communities—the only block grant they don't like is the one we passed to give communities the power to do what they can to prevent crime, to give our children something to say yes to instead of something to say no to, the one all the mayors love, all the Governors love, everybody thinks is great—they don't like that. Well, making us less safe is not my idea of family values.

Then they want to put 315 of our national parks and other national facilities up for sale, including Franklin Roosevelt's home where I was today. I know you find some of this unbelievable, but it's true. That's on the list. They have proposed to do all kinds of things to make it harder to preserve clean air, clean water, safe food. That's not my idea of family

values. In economic opportunity, there's not a company in America that if they could avoid it in 1995 would cut research, technology, or training. But this budget cuts research, technology, and training. That's not my idea of how to build strong families. And worst of all, there's \$148 billion of hidden taxes and fees on working families while they propose to give people in my income group a tax cut. And that's not my idea of the kind of 21st century I want to live in.

Now, I want you to listen to this. The Wall Street Journal, hardly an arm of the Democratic Party—[laughter]—reported the other day that if this budget passes with all of the taxes in it and all the tax cuts in it, with all the tax cuts in it the group of Americans as a group who make less than \$30,000 a year, which is 51 percent of the American people, will have greater tax hikes than tax cuts. I get a tax cut, and we're going to soak people like that?

You know, in 1993, one of the best things about our economic program was that we doubled the family tax credit, the earned-income tax credit, which had bipartisan support, signed into law by Gerald Ford, supported by Ronald Reagan, increased by George Bush, and we doubled it. Why? Because I wanted to be able to say to the American people, "Look, you got to choose work and family over welfare and dependence. And anybody who'll work 40 hours a week with children in the house—I don't care how low their pay is—we will not tax them into poverty. We will use the tax system to lift them out of poverty." That is the principle. That is the principle. And it's the right thing to do.

I mean, I thought the game plan was we were supposed to be growing the middle class and shrinking the under class. They want to cut this by more than I increased it. They want to kick people out of the middle class and then pull the ladder up so poor people can't work their way into it. You want to get more people on welfare? Raise taxes on people with two kids making \$11,000–\$12,000 a year, and they will say, no thank you. This does not make sense. It violates our values. It violates our interest. It is bad for the economy. It is wrong for America. And if I can stop it with a veto pen or with

my voice or whatever it takes, I am going to do everything I can to stop it. And I want you to help me, too.

Audience members. Veto! Veto! Veto!

The President. This is the last issue I want you to focus on. These are great hits. I want you to remember this. I want you to go home, I want you to talk to friends in the workplace, and I want you to talk to friends who aren't in your union. I want you to talk to people at church, at the bowling alley, at the ball-park, wherever two or more are gathered. I want you to talk to people. I want people to know about this. This is their country, just like it's your country. This is not about me or the Republicans in Congress. It's about the future of the American family, the future of the American workplace, the future of the United States. And so I want you to listen to this. This is the greatest last hit.

During the 1980's, when—you know, that "everything goes" decade where everything was going to trickle down to ordinary people—thousands and thousands of corporations transferred some \$20 billion out of their employees' pension funds for buyouts and other purposes. An awful lot of workers lost their life savings. Last December, one of the proudest things I was able to do in the last Congress, even after the November election, the Congress passed a bill that saved 8½ million American pensions and stabilized 40 million others that were in danger of being in trouble. I don't know what the retirement income of 48½ million Americans is worth to the strength, the stability of America; to our pro-family, pro-work values; to our economic future, but I think it's worth an awful lot.

Now, as if we haven't learned anything from the eighties and didn't have to do that, this Republican budget would allow companies to withdraw money from their workers' pension funds to use it for whatever reason they want.

Audience members. No-o-o!

The President. For whatever reason they want. Corporate buyouts, bonuses, any reason.

Now, folks, we just had to fix this last year. You know, I don't remember as well as I used to; my circuits are kind of jammed. But I can at least remember what I did last year.

[Laughter] That is not my idea of what I want America to look like in the 21st century, taking good middle class people that worked hard all their lives, paid into their pension, showed up at work, did everything they were supposed to, and, "Oh, I'm sorry, your pension is gone." One of two things is going to happen: Either the Government will have to bail it out again, in which case the deficit reduction won't take place. Or we'll throw them into the street, and we'll one more time shrink the middle class and grow the under class. Say no to that. Say no to looting the pension funds. Say no. It's wrong. It's wrong.

And look, the thing that bothers me about this is that this budget would snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. This country is in better shape than it was 2½ years ago. We're moving in the right direction. What we need to do is build on what we've done, not tear it down. We need to build on middle class economics. We need to build on an economy that has the largest number of new small businesses in history. We need to build on the best time for education in the last 30 years, in the last Congress. We need to build on medical reforms that are slowing the rate of medical inflation without stripping elderly people of the security and dignity of knowing that their health care is there. We do not need to tear it down. We need to prove we can make the environment and the economy go together, not walk away from our common responsibilities.

Folks, this is about more, even more, than all the things that we are concerned about that directly affect any of us individually. This is about what kind of country we're going to be. This is about what kind of people we're going to be. It's about whether we're going to live by the values we all say we believe in. It's about whether the American dream is going to be alive in the 21st century. And what we really have to do is to do what that sign says. If we'll just stand up for America's working families, if we'll just do what we know is right, if we'll use every tool at our command—I will use the tools at my command, but I want you to go home, and I want you to talk to people in the streets and say we're moving this country. This country is going into the 21st century. Don't let these people take us back. If it takes a veto, you'll

have it. But I need you in the streets standing up for America's future.

God bless you, and thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:35 p.m. in the Imperial Ballroom at the Sheraton New York Hotel and Towers. In his remarks, he referred to Tom Donahue, president, AFL-CIO, and Owen Bieber, former president, United Auto Workers.

Proclamation 6843—National Consumers Week, 1995

October 23, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Business and trade have always been central to the American experience. In the period since the Industrial Revolution, the extraordinary growth of our economy has created a marketplace that is the foundation of global commerce. Unparalleled natural and human resources have energized every part of our society—from the agricultural heartland that feeds an international community; to the textile and steel mills that began the machine age in America; to the scientific, computer, and information companies that are leading the way into the fast-paced world of the 21st century.

Consumer protections such as fair pricing and product safety rules are more necessary than ever to ensure that all of us are able to fully and fairly participate in a free enterprise system that encourages competition, productivity, and innovation. These protections have evolved alongside the remarkable expansion of the world economy. In 1962, President John F. Kennedy clarified the importance of consumer protection in a Special Message to Congress that has become known as the Consumer Bill of Rights. This statement articulated each person's rights to safety, information, and choice, and the right to be heard in the process of resolving consumer problems. In 1975 President Gerald R. Ford added the right to consumer education.

As the driving force behind the richest, most prosperous country in the world, the

United States' free market is a model for others to emulate. We must ensure that our system continues to emphasize the centrality of the consumer even as it becomes increasingly technology-oriented. Accordingly, last year, I was proud to add the latest element to the Consumer Bill of Rights—the right to service—which urges that convenience, courtesy, performance, and responsiveness remain hallmarks of the American marketplace. So that Federal workers and agencies can take the lead in providing high-quality service, my Administration has also initiated the National Performance Review to improve efficiency and promote excellence in every sector of our Government.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim October 22 through October 28 as National Consumers Week. I call upon Government officials, industry leaders, and the people of the United States to recognize the vital relationship between our economy and our citizenry and to support the right of all Americans to service excellence.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-third day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twentieth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:36 p.m., October 24, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 26.

Proclamation 6844—United Nations Day, 1995

October 23, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Fifty years ago, at the end of the most destructive war the world has ever known, delegates from fifty-one countries met in San

16TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1994 Federal Information Systems Corporation
Federal News Service

MARCH 22, 1994, 7:20 P.M. (EST) TUESDAY

SECTION: WHITE HOUSE BRIEFING

LENGTH: 5109 words

HEADLINE: REMARKS BY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
TO THE UNITED AUTO WORKERS
SHERATON WASHINGTON HOTEL

BODY:

MRS. CLINTON: Thank you. (Applause.) Thank you. Thank you so much. (Continued applause.) Thank you.

(Chants of "Health care now! Health care now!")

Thank you! Boy. Can you all come back every week? (Cheers.) If that's what it takes, I like that. I am so pleased to be here and so pleased to be with all of you. (Applause.)

I want to start by thanking President Bieber for his strong support of what we are trying to do. If we could --

PRESIDENT BIEBER (?): If we could please, everybody take their seats. Everybody take their seat, please. We want to hear what the first lady has to say.

(Applause.)

MRS. CLINTON: I actually like being mobbed by friendly faces. (Laughter.) And I really like being with people who know that you can have some fun while you're trying to fight for doing what's right. It really makes me happy to be here. (Applause.) And that's what the UAW has done for so many years in the fight for social justice and change in this country. You have been there for workers who struggled for fair wages and pensions and holidays and other benefits.

And in the middle of this century, you were there to ensure equal rights for all Americans, and that was a tough battle as well. (Applause.) And now, at the end of this century, you are here again. You are here in so many ways. I want to talk to you about your support for health care, but I also want to compliment every one of you and to compliment your leadership in this union, because you have been fighting over the last years to preserve and strengthen the biggest and most indispensable industries in our country, and you have shown it can be done. (Applause.)

You know, just last week the president was in Michigan for the G-7 jobs summit and he visited Detroit Diesel with Owen Bieber and I think some of you who are here tonight. It was a great occasion for him. I talked to him on the phone that night and he just couldn't stop talking about what he had seen and how excited he was because he saw first-hand the kind of innovative thinking and partnership that was going on in that plant and many others like it around the country.

At Detroit Diesel, the UAW and management are working together to improve quality control and to create a state-of-the-art, high-performance workplace. And the end result is that you've increased market share, fewer jobs have been lost, and America leads the world in what is done. That is the kind of history that we are making every day with your help. (Applause.)

Federal News Service, MARCH 22, 1994

You know, it is that spirit of cooperation that has resulted in domestic auto sales up 23 percent this year, auto production up 27 percent, the domestic market share the highest in any year since 1979, the last time a Democrat was in the White House. (Applause.)

And the UAW deserves a lot of credit for that. And this president and this administration knows that, and I want to salute all of you. I also want to thank you for what you have done on behalf of health care throughout the years. You know, 50 years ago, Walter Ruther and Harry Truman shared a vision of national health insurance, and today Owen Bieber and Bill Clinton share that vision. And this year we're going to get it done. (Applause.)

You know, I've gone back and read some of President Truman's speeches when he introduced national health care. He did it twice. He did it in '46. He did it again in '48. The UAW was there. Not many other people were because not many understood the issues then. And in those days, the special interests spent millions and millions of dollars to scare people. But, you know, they made the same arguments then that they're making today. And President Truman gave barn-burning speeches and he got criticized as he did day in and day out for standing up and telling it like it is. Well, I think we owe Harry Truman and Walter Ruther our best efforts, because they deserve to see their dreams come true. (Applause.)

And, you know, health care reform is not an isolated legislative goal. It's not something that stands out there all by itself. It has a history. It goes back to Franklin Roosevelt when he thought that health security would be the other part of social security. It goes to Harry Truman. It goes to John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, who tried and finally got Medicare and Medicaid so that at least our older Americans and our poorest, most defenseless Americans would have some health security.

So there is a long history of presidents trying to get real health care reform. But in this -- (an audience member shouts off- mike) -- that's true, that's true. But I will say this, and I take a big risk saying it to this crowd, but I'll say it, that even Richard Nixon proposed national health care reform in 1972. And, you know, even he couldn't get it done. So this is not just a Democrat- Republican problem. When the special interests line up against you, it is a problem for government. It is a problem for leadership, trying to be sure that we can have our voices heard.

But health care reform is part of a larger agenda that this president and the UAW are fighting for. You helped us on family and medical leave. We finally had a president who would sign it in order that parents could be good workers as well as family members. (Applause.) You helped us by reaching your hands out to other working people in the budget last year.

Remember that budget that all the Republicans said was going to drive us into a deep recession, going to stall any kind of sales of homes or automobiles? You remember that, don't you? And instead, what did we do? We passed the first responsible budget in 12 years that told the truth to the American people, and it is working. (Applause.)

And one of the things that you did in that supportive effort was to help other working Americans who do not have the income from the job they get up and go to every single day to stay out of poverty. So we are now, for 17 million working families in America, going to reform the tax code so that this April 15th they will pay less than they did last year and they'll be able to take care of their kids and maybe buy a new car for a change. (Applause.) And with your help, with your help, this president will pass what is being called the re-employment act. We are tired of the unemployment act. We want people back in jobs, and we want

Federal News Service, MARCH 22, 1994

to change the system. (Applause.)

And we're moving on a lot of other fronts. We've got a crime bill up there that if we finally get it through the gridlock of this Congress, with the Republicans making one set of arguments on the other side, if we finally get it through, we will have 100,000 more police on the streets doing what police should do, making you safer in your homes and your neighborhoods. (Applause.)

And we will also be doing something that the Republicans have talked about for a long time but never got around to doing, and that is reforming the welfare system so that it is a second chance and not a way of life for people.

(Applause.)

So all of this is going on, and a lot more, but what is really at the centerpiece of this is our effort to make Americans more secure again, to give every one of us the feeling that the American dream is back within our reach. And there is no more important issue to be able to do that than health care reform. There are still some in our country who claim there is no health care crisis. You hear them. You see them. They're always people who have their own health insurance, aren't they? They're always people who have enough money so that they can say, "Oh, there's no crisis" because they know they'll be taken care of.

Well, those people haven't spent the last year the way I have, going into workplaces, going into hospitals, visiting with men and women and children who have found themselves on the outskirts of our health care system. This is not just about the people who don't have health insurance, because there is not one person in this country today with insurance who knows he will have the same insurance for the same price to cover the same benefits this time next year. Employers go out of business. They figure out how to abrogate their contracts with unions. They shut down in giving benefits to their people. You get sick and all of a sudden you've got a pre-existing condition and you're no longer eligible. You have a lifetime limit that is in your insurance policy, and somebody gets really, really ill and you hit that limit.

There are millions and millions and millions of reasons why not one of us, no matter how well-insured we are -- and you have been so fortunate because your leadership has fought for some of the greatest health benefits of any group in this country. (Applause.) But even you, even you cannot be secure in the system we currently have. No one is. And what we have to do is to face up to the fact that yes, we do have the finest doctors and nurses and hospitals in the world, but we have the stupidest financing system for health care in the entire world. (Applause.)

And what the president wants to do is to preserve what works and fix what's broken. And he has five major points that I want to stress with you tonight, because this is what you're fighting for when you endorse this health plan, as President Bieber has already referred to.

The first is guaranteed private insurance that can never be taken away. It will be yours forever. (Applause.) And that means that it doesn't matter where you live or who you work for, how old you are, whether you're sick or you have someone in your family who is sick. You will always be guaranteed insurance. And you will be guaranteed benefits as good as what members of Congress get. And we want to make sure -- (applause) -- we want to make sure that the benefits that the UAW has bargained for are protected. And in the president's plan, they are. You get to keep your benefits. (Applause.)

There are other alternatives out there that would not enable you to keep your benefits. They would start taxing those benefits. They would only give tax preference if you went into certain plans but not others.

You know, it's been a long time since the wages of working people in this

Federal News Service, MARCH 22, 1994

country rose at the steady rate they should have, because of the economic policies of the previous administrations. How unfair it is to even consider taxing benefits when benefits were the only part of wages and compensation that continued to increase during the 1980s. (Applause.) And we want to be sure that the benefits guaranteed to every American include things that you take for granted in your plans, but most Americans don't have.

We want to include mental health benefits. There are many people with serious problems that need the same health for a mental illness that they get for a physical illness. We want to be sure -- (applause) -- we want to be sure that we take care of primary and preventive health care. How did we ever get into the situation in our country where if you took your child for a check-up, trying to be a good mother or father, that wasn't reimbursed by insurance, but if your child got sick in the middle of the night and you went to the emergency room, that was paid for by insurance? Let's start paying for preventive health care in order to take care of our people better than we do today. (Applause.)

The second point we're fighting for is to preserve your choice of doctor and health plan, because what is happening in today's marketplace is that many insurers and many employers are beginning to tell workers what doctors they can use and what hospitals they can go to. We don't agree with that. We don't think it should be an insurance company's choice as to what doctor you see. We think it ought to be your choice. And under the president's plan, that choice is preserved. (Applause.)

And there will always be at least three choices, and in most metropolitan areas many, many more choices, but at least three. You can go to any doctor in the phone book. You can join a network of doctors that have pooled together, often called a prepaid medical organization, or you can join a health maintenance organization. But it will be your choice, not anybody else's. That is a cornerstone of the president's plan that we are fighting for. (Applause.)

The third point is we want to outlaw unfair insurance practices once and for all. We intend to be able to say to the American people that health insurance will mean what it should mean and what it used to mean. Everybody pays something. They pay the same amount. And everybody is insured. You don't have to pay more if you all of a sudden find out you've got diabetes or if you have a child who's born with a serious illness. You have the right to be able to have your illnesses and your accidents and your diseases insured against without being discriminated against because you once were sick.

Every one of us will someday get sick and every one of us sure enough is going to get old. So we have this old-fashioned idea that young people and older people and well people and sick people, we ought to be in this together. So let's outlaw pre-existing conditions that make you pay more or keep you out of insurance altogether. (Applause.)

Under the president's reform plan, it will be illegal for insurance companies to charge you more if you get sick, to raise your rates if you've ever been sick, to drop coverage or cut benefits, to impose lifetime limits to cut off your benefits, or to charge older people more than younger people.

If we do nothing, you, even though you bargain hard and you've got able leadership in that bargaining, you will be at the mercy of insurance companies who want to make their money by only insuring people who have never been sick and they think never will be sick but will just drop dead one day, and that's a life insurance problem, not a health insurance problem. (Applause.)

Now, fourth, we want to protect and improve Medicare, because Medicare has worked for older Americans. And what we want to do is add two benefits to Medicare that need to be there. Number one, we want to extend prescription drug coverage to Medicare recipients. (Applause.) And number two, we want to begin to

Federal News Service, MARCH 22, 1994

offer alternatives to older Americans and disabled Americans other than nursing homes. If you want to keep your mother or your father or your child at home and that person has serious health problems, you ought to be able to get a little bit of help to do that instead of having only the nursing home as your alternative. (Applause.)

And the fifth point is we want to guarantee health coverage at the workplace. It is the easiest, simplest way to make sure everyone has coverage. Most Americans, most of us in this room, all of us in this room, we get our insurance at our workplace. Eight out of 10 of the Americans, the nearly 40 million Americans -- that's 32 million plus -- eight out of 10 are working Americans. They work in jobs, though, without health benefits.

Does it make any sense to you that 32 million-plus Americans get up every day and they go to work, they serve you in restaurants, they wash your cars, they pump your gas, they work in our retail stores, they pay taxes which goes to provide health benefits to people on welfare when they don't even have those benefits for themselves? That is not right. (Applause.)

There are two additional points that I want to stress particularly for you and for your union. The president's reform will protect early retirees, a major problem in many industries. (Applause.) Many companies, as you well know, are thinking about or already have eliminated early retirement benefits. And for Americans between the ages of 55 and 64, this can mean extremely expensive premiums that offer mediocre protection or no insurance at all.

The president's reform will solve that by having the government cover the employer's share for most early retirees. We don't think it is right that people between those ages before they're eligible for Medicare often find themselves with increasing health problems and decreasing health insurance protection. That needs to be remedied, and the president's plan prescribes how to do that. (Applause.)

And finally, you know better than many in the country that rising health costs have robbed American workers of the wage increases that they deserve. Higher health care costs have weakened American competitiveness overseas. You know, for example, that General Motors spends more on health care than on steel today. That's not good for business. That's not good for workers. That's not good for America.

And if we do not fix our health care system now, by the end of the decade it will cost the average working American family over \$600 in lost wages each year. We are spending more than any of the major industrialized countries we compete with. Think of what you have done with that burden right around your necks in the last years as you have continued to increase productivity. And think what you could do if our health care costs were controlled and brought down and your employers could spend more money on wages and on other expansions of business. We could have the (boomingest?) economy that we've had since the end of World War II. (Applause.)

But let me just add that this is not just about money. It's not just about the five points -- guaranteed private insurance and guaranteed choice and preserving Medicare and outlawing insurance practices and guaranteeing benefits at the workplace. This is an issue that goes far beyond that. And Walter Ruther and Owen Bieber and many of your leaders have not supported health care only because it was the right thing to do for your membership. They've supported it because it was the right thing to do for our country.

And I wish that -- (applause) -- I wish that every one of you could have come with me over the past year and met the people that I have met and heard their stories. I wish you could have been with me in New Orleans as I talked with a woman who had worked with the same company for over 15 years as a bookkeeper;

Federal News Service, MARCH 22, 1994

didn't have any insurance, couldn't afford to buy it on her own. But every year she tried to do the responsible thing and go to the doctor and get a check-up. And when I talked to her last spring, she'd been to her doctor and he'd found a lump in her breast and he had referred her to a surgeon. And the surgeon had told her, "If you had insurance, we'd biopsy that lump. But since you don't, we are just going to watch it."

Or I wish you had been with me in Las Vegas in a hospital -- some people go to Las Vegas for other reasons; I go to visit hospitals -- talking with families who are working families where the insurance was so costly because they didn't get any employer health. One couple I talked to, the father had to make a very difficult decision. They had enough money in their budget to insure him, as the primary wage-earner, and their four children, but not enough to add his wife, who stayed at home and took care of the children. He left his wife off the insurance policy.

A few months later she got pregnant. When I met her, she was about to have her fifth child. And she said to me, "You know, we have looked at all these expenses that we've got. I've got no insurance. I'm just not going to be able to have any anesthesia when I have my baby." Now, there aren't many women in this crowd, because of your benefits, who'd ever even have to think like that. And I can guarantee you there's no woman married to a member of Congress who has to make the choice about a mortgage payment or anesthesia. (Applause.)

Or I wish you could have been with me yesterday in Florida, where I met two of the nearly 1 million Americans who have written to me about what is happening in their lives. And I met a man whose wife had a stroke nine years ago. He's still working into his 70s because he wants to keep his wife at home. He has depleted most of his savings, nearly all of his retirement nest egg. The one way he was able to keep his wife at home with him was for his daughter to quit her job as a school teacher to come home to take care of her mother.

Once his daughter quit her job, she no longer had insurance and they didn't have enough money for her to be insured. And here is this man doing what every one of us would want to support and encourage, taking care of his own family, and a daughter who's coming home to take care of a mother. They didn't want to warehouse her in a nursing home. They wanted to keep her in the loving atmosphere of that family. They did not get any financial help because under our current rule there is nothing between being healthy and ending up in a nursing home when you're a certain age unless you spend yourself into poverty and then you can qualify for some limited assistance.

This man wasn't asking for a handout. He was asking for a little bit of help that will save us money, because we will pay if she's in a nursing home. We should pay a little bit to support him and his daughter as they're trying to keep their mother and wife at home.

And I wish, finally -- (applause) -- I wish you had been with me at the Cleveland Rainbow Children's Hospital one day when I met a lot of the wonderful doctors and nurses who perform miracles for children there, just like they do across our country in our children's hospitals. And I talked to a couple who had three children; the first, a healthy young boy about 10, and then two daughters, both of whom were born with congenital diseases. And every time I meet somebody like that, I think there but for the grace of God go any of us. And these two little girls racked up enormous medical bills in their young lives. They busted their parents' lifetime limits. They then became uninsurable. And this mother told me about how proud she and her husband were. They didn't want to take welfare. They didn't want to take assistance. They wanted to pay their own way, and they went from insurance company to insurance company. And they never got anywhere. And finally, one insurance agent, after

Federal News Service, MARCH 22, 1994

hearing their story and how sick their daughters were, looked at them and said, "What you don't understand is we don't insure burning houses."

I want you think about how you would feel if that were said to you about one of your children. I know how I would feel. And I want my daughter to grow up and live in a country where that can never be said again to anybody at all.

(Applause.)

We have a really tough fight ahead of us. And I love this button. Thank you for making it. Thank you for wearing it. But if we get health care reform like we're going to get this year in Congress, it's not going to be because of me. It's going to be because of you. And it's going to be because you will spend your time between now and the day the president signs that bill telling your friends and neighbors, telling your members of Congress, telling your leadership that this has to be done, because that is what is going to be necessary for this country finally to make good on what the promise of its destiny is to every one of us, that if you work hard and you play by the rules, you are going to deserve and receive social and health security just like Franklin Roosevelt tried to do, just like Harry Truman tried to do. And now Owen Bieber and Bill Clinton are going to get it done. (Applause.)

END

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 23, 1994

UAW LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

I. PROTECTING WORKER RIGHTS

The GOP controlled Congress has mounted an unprecedented assault on fundamental worker rights. In particular, right wing Republicans have pushed legislative initiatives that would:

- * overturn President Clinton's anti-scab executive order;
- * allow employers to establish phony, company-dominated labor unions;
- * undermine workplace health and safety protections and slash funding for OSHA enforcement;
- * dismantle the 40 hour work week and overtime pay requirements; and
- * establish a national "Right-to-Work" law that would prohibit workers from negotiating union security provisions anywhere in the United States.

In addition, the Republicans have advanced proposals that would eliminate collective bargaining rights for 200,000 transit workers, repeal laws requiring the payment of prevailing wages under federal construction and service contracts, cut funding for the National Labor Relations Board and curb its ability to seek injunctions against lawbreaking employers, allow employers to discriminate against pro-union solicitations and literature distributions, and place restrictions on so-called "corporate campaigns" which are used by workers to pressure employers that break the law and refuse to bargain in good faith.

At the same time they have been pursuing all of these anti-worker proposals, the Republicans have steadfastly refused to consider legislation to raise the minimum wage, which is desperately needed in order to provide economic assistance to millions of working families.

Thanks to an aggressive grass roots campaign, so far the UAW and the rest of the labor movement have been able to stop all of these GOP assaults on worker rights. But we need to remain vigilant against these reactionary proposals. We need to continue to send a loud, clear message to Congress that American workers will not stand for any weakening of their fundamental rights and labor standards! And we

need to send an equally loud message that American workers need a raise, including a long overdue increase in the minimum wage!

II. PRESERVE MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

Congressional Republicans have pushed proposals which would have a devastating impact on our two federal health care programs, Medicare and Medicaid. Specifically, the Republicans have passed legislation that would:

- * make huge cuts of \$270 billion in Medicare and \$165 billion in Medicaid;
- * double the premiums which must be paid under Medicare Part B, causing serious financial hardship for many seniors;
- * undermine the quality of care provided under Medicare by drastically reducing payments to hospitals and other providers; this could force some urban and rural hospitals to close; and many doctors might refuse to treat Medicare patients;
- * threaten the social insurance nature of Medicare by allowing private insurance carriers to "cherry pick" lower risk seniors;
- * repeal the existing Medicaid program, which currently guarantees health care for the poor and long term care for low and middle income families; this would be replaced with a block grant program that only provides limited funds to the states; as a result, there no longer would be any guarantee of coverage or benefits; this means that millions of individuals could lose their access to basic health care services; in particular, many working families could suddenly find themselves without access to long term care services which they desperately need in order to care for elderly or disabled parents.
- * impose further burdens on collectively bargained health care plans; if Medicare and Medicaid are cut back, this means labor unions would have more gaps to fill in at the collective bargaining table in order to maintain adequate health care coverage for retired members; in addition, if payments to health care providers are drastically reduced, they will simply shift these costs to other payers - mainly private sector health care plans - which amounts to a back door "tax" on working families.

Fortunately, President Clinton vetoed these reactionary GOP proposals. But the Republicans are continuing to press their proposals to dismantle Medicare and Medicaid.

The UAW and a broad coalition of progressive organizations have been vigorously fighting these attacks on our health security. But we need to keep up the pressure in this key area. We need to let Congress know that we are unalterably opposed to the right wing attempts to undermine Medicare and Medicaid. We must continue to insist that Medicare and Medicaid must be preserved!

III. DEFEND TAX FAIRNESS

House and Senate Republicans have been pushing a series of proposals that would give huge new tax breaks to corporations and wealthy individuals. This includes big reduction in taxes on capital gains, as well as provisions that would repeal the corporate alternative minimum tax and increase business depreciation deductions. At the same time, the Republicans have attempted to scale back the earned income tax credit, thereby increasing taxes on low income working families.

This "Robin Hood In Reverse" agenda would be bad enough by itself. Even worse, however, is how the Republicans have proposed to pay for their tax goodies for corporations and the rich: namely, by making huge cuts in Medicare and Medicaid.

President Clinton vetoed the GOP's skewed tax and budget proposals. Instead, he proposed a plan to balance the federal budget which preserved Medicare and Medicaid and did not provide huge tax giveaways to corporations and the rich. The Republicans flatly rejected Clinton's budget plan. In doing so, the Republicans showed that their real objective in slashing Medicare and Medicaid was not to achieve a balanced budget, but rather to pay for the big new tax breaks for their "fat cat" allies.

The Republicans have made no secret about their future tax agenda. If they prevail in the 1996 elections, the GOP leadership is determined to push proposals for a so-called "flat tax". This is simply another right wing scheme to provide huge tax windfalls to the rich, without providing any genuine tax relief to middle and low income working families.

The UAW and other progressive groups have been strenuously opposing the GOP tax proposals. We need to continue stand up for fundamental tax fairness, and against proposals that would provide tax giveaways to corporations and the rich, while increasing taxes on ordinary working families.

* * * * *

The 1996 elections will mark a crucial turning point for our country. If the Republicans maintain their control of Congress and win the Presidency, then they will be able to enact their reactionary agenda. Fundamental worker rights will be repealed; Medicare and Medicaid will be slashed; and the tax code will be further skewed towards special interests and the rich. On the other hand, if we are able to elect pro-worker candidates to Congress and re-elect President Clinton, then this right wing agenda will be killed. We can once again begin to work for progressive policies that will benefit working families.

Thus, our current task is clear. We must continue to educate UAW members, their families, friends, neighbors, and the general public about the crucial issues facing our country. We must emphasize the critical priorities facing us:

PROTECT WORKER RIGHTS

PRESERVE MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

DEFEND TAX FAIRNESS

AR:car
opeiu494
C977

Fax 456-5709

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA—UAW

STEPHEN P. YOKICH, President

ROY O. WYSE, Secretary-Treasurer

VICE PRESIDENTS

CAROLYN FORREST • JACK LASKOWSKI • ERNEST LOFTON • RICHARD SHOEMAKER

FAX to:*Sabrina Carlette
First Lady's Ofc.***FROM:***Alan Reuther***TIME/DATE:***4/15/98***SUBJECT:****COMMENT:****PAGES to FOLLOW:** *4*IN REPLY REFER TO
1757 N STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036
TELEPHONE: (202) 838-8500
FAX (202) 293-3487
TELEX 710-822-1841

I am tempted to say that we actually arranged this weather today so that Captain O'Grady would know for sure that he was not going to be left high and dry. [Laughter]

We are all here to thank our men and women in uniform for the rescue of Captain Scott O'Grady. Their mission made all Americans proud, just as Captain O'Grady's courage has made all Americans proud. We know that the skill and professionalism of our Armed Forces and the intelligence that backs them up are unmatched. We know that the months, the weeks, the years in training someday, somewhere will always have to be put into effect. And, last week, those of you who brought life to that training and saved one brave man's life said more about what we stand for as a country, what our values are, and what our commitments are than any words the rest of us could ever utter, and we thank you for it.

Consider this: that an F-16 pilot in Captain O'Grady's "Triple Nickel" squadron picks up a faint radio signal and relays it to an AWACS plane. Within minutes, the AWACS operators positively identify Captain O'Grady and pinpoint his location. Then just hours later, no less than 40 airplanes and helicopters are airborne, led by a combat search and rescue team from the 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit, commanded by Colonel Martin Berndt. The AWACS aircraft, a marvel of our technology, guide two Super Stallion helicopters to within 50 yards of Captain O'Grady. In 2 minutes, the marines secure the landing site, and whisked the captain to safety under hostile conditions.

When I spoke to Captain O'Grady once he was on board the U.S.S. *Kearsarge*, he told me his rescuers were the real heroes. Well, it can't be done any better than they did it. They showed our Nation and the world the best of our teamwork. When we finished our conversation, Captain O'Grady remarked, "Mr. President, I just want to say one thing: The United States is the greatest country in the world. God bless America."

The men and women of our Armed Forces also bless our America with your service and your skills. Because you do your job so well, our Nation will always be "The Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave." Now, let me say it was a very great personal honor

for me to host Captain O'Grady and all the fine members of his family, beginning with his grandparents and going down to his brother and sister and some of his friends, at the White House for lunch today.

I can tell you that he certifies he got a better meal today than he did in those 6 days in Bosnia. But he gave us something more precious than we can ever give him, a reminder of what is very best about our country. And I'd like to now ask Captain O'Grady to come up here and say what's on his mind and heart to the people who gave him back his freedom.

Captain Scott O'Grady.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:42 p.m. at the Pentagon.

Remarks to the United Auto Workers Convention

June 12, 1995

Thank you very much. Thank you, Owen, for that fine introduction, and thank you for your leadership over the years. I want to congratulate you and the other officers who are retiring. I want to say a special word of hello to all the brothers and sisters of the United Auto Workers throughout the country, especially those from my home State of Arkansas, with whom I've worked over the years.

I'd like to say a word, also, to Dennis Fitting, the president of Local 455 out of Saginaw, who was with me last Friday at the White House for a reunion of a group of exceptional Americans whom I met along the campaign trail in 1992. We call this group the Faces of Hope. And I want to thank Dennis for being a member of the group and for his commitment to our efforts to move America forward.

All of you know better than anybody that Owen Bieber has dedicated his entire life to improving the lives of working families. He took over the UAW 12 years ago, during one of the toughest periods in your entire history. In all of the years, he has never wavered, even in the face of administrations here in Washington that were sure less than friendly. He's always stood strong not only for UAW workers and their families and their incomes and their future but for the kind of broad

social progress that has been the hallmark of the UAW since its beginning in the 1930's. Whether it was in the fight for civil rights or the fight to end apartheid in South Africa, your solidarity with the American farm workers, the UAW has always been there for others as well as for your own interests.

Owen Bieber has truly carried on the legacy of Walter Reuther. And moreover, in a very difficult period in our country's history, he has set the stage for even greater strength for you in the 21st century. We all owe him our deepest gratitude and our best wishes. And I feel especially indebted to him for his advice, his counsel, and his ferocious support. Thank you very much, Owen. We all wish you well and Godspeed.

Now, I know you haven't elected your new officers yet, but I wanted to say that I personally would feel a whole lot better about my campaign if we could go into 1996 with poll numbers looking like Steve Yokich's do right now for you.

One of the most memorable moments in my 1992 campaign, and I had a lot of memorable moments with the UAW, but one of the most memorable was the opportunity I had to walk the picket line with Owen and the striking workers of Caterpillar in Peoria. I looked into the tired but determined faces of men and women on that picket line, and I realized how much was at stake, for them and for all the rest of us as well.

I ran for President because I believed we had to do more to help those workers and millions of Americans just like them who had seen their stake in the American dream uprooted during the 1980's; people who were being abandoned by Washington; people who were working harder and harder for less and less. Their struggle showed me better than any report or any poll that the fight to save the American dream and the fight to save American families must begin with the fight to save America's workers and their incomes and their jobs. Of course, the struggle at Caterpillar is still not over, but my administration continues to walk the line with you, and we'll stay there.

I came to Washington to work with you and with all other Americans to turn these disturbing economic trends around. I wanted to shrink the under class and to grow the

middle class. I wanted to rebuild a sense of hope and community. I wanted to help people to make the most of their own lives. I wanted to reward the values that have kept this country strong, the values of work and family and community. And so I've worked hard to develop an economic strategy that focuses on both creating jobs and raising incomes. And I've focused on a social strategy that would, instead of just talking about family values or work, would actually reward work and family and responsible parenting and good citizenship. And it's beginning to work.

In the past 2½ years, our economic strategy has added almost 7 million new jobs to our economy, and nearly all of them have been in the private sector. We're cutting the deficit by a trillion over 7 years, reducing it for 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President. But we have been able to invest more in the education and training of our people and in the promotion of our children and strengthening our families.

We've been able to give a tax cut to 15 million working families through the earned-income tax credit. What that means in simple terms is that this year working families with two children with an income of under \$28,000 will have a tax break of about \$1,000.

We want to make it so that every family who works for a living will not live in poverty. We want parents who are willing to work full-time to be good parents and good workers at the same time. That's also why I worked so hard and you worked so hard for the passage of the Family and Medical Leave Act. It will make a real difference to working families in this country.

As you know, we're having a big debate now in Washington over balancing the budget. As I have said many times, I want to balance the budget. It will help you if we do. It will lower interest rates. It will free up money to invest in the private sector and new jobs. It will mean that we can spend more of your tax money on things like the education of our children and less paying interest on the debt.

But we cannot balance the budget by giving a huge and untargeted tax cut that benefits mostly very wealthy people and paying

for it by excessive cuts in the Medicare program. We can't do it by walking away from the fact that we have not only a budget deficit but an education investment. You know as well as anyone, from the increases in productivity the UAW has achieved in the last several years, that we have to have constant education and training if we're going to guarantee our young people the incomes and the security they need.

So I say, we all know that the countries that do the best job of educating all their people will be the real winners in the global economy. No one understands this more than you. You have led the way with your apprenticeship programs and your training programs. You have worked and worked and worked to support the kind of lifelong learning agenda that is central to my efforts to revitalize the American middle class.

And that's why, even though I agree we should balance the budget, we don't have to be targeted into an arbitrary timetable, funding excessive tax cuts to people who are doing well and don't need it, and having excessive cuts either in Medicare for our elderly or in the investments that make our country strong.

I'm fighting to preserve our investments, like the direct student loan initiative, which lowers the cost of college loans to your children, eases their repayment terms and makes it possible for more of our young people to go and to stay in college; our innovative school-to-work apprenticeship efforts, which involves partnerships with unions and community colleges and employers all over the country; our successful national service initiative, AmeriCorps, which gives 20,000 young people college scholarship funds in return for community service work in their local community, helping people to help themselves.

We can't afford not to support something as important to our future as the education and training of all of our people. That's why I am also supporting a new GI bill for America's workers, to collapse about 70 smaller Government training programs into one big block and to give people a check or a voucher when they're unemployed or when they're underemployed so that they can take the money for up to 2 years to a local community college or to any other approved training pro-

gram to get the kind of training they need. When people lose their jobs in this country today, too often people walk away from them. And it's wrong.

Let me take just a moment to talk about one other aspect of our strategy that is crucial to our future. As we enter the 21st century, trade is becoming more and more important to the long-term health of the American economy. We only have 4 percent of the world's population. Our success in the future rests heavily on being able to sell our goods and our services to the other 96 percent of the world.

When we open new markets, we find new consumers for our products. When we sell more products, we create more jobs. Every billion dollars in new exports creates 17,000 new American jobs. That's why I've done my dead-level best as President to open new markets around the world. The Congress has helped me, because it means so much to our economy and to our way of life. The fight for open trade should not be a partisan issue. Democrats and Republicans work together to put in place more than 80 trade agreements in just over 2 years.

I know you haven't always agreed with us, and I understand. I think I did the right thing, because we get the burdens of low wage countries shipping goods into this country and into our markets no matter what we do. The trade agreements we've reached aren't just pieces of paper, they're meaningful, concrete pacts that open up markets to us and create jobs that, on balance, pay above the national average.

Open trade is now expanding all around the world, everywhere, that is, but Japan. Of all the industrialized countries, Japan imports fewer manufacturing goods for their size than any other by a long shot. At times, some people said it was our fault that we didn't sell more there. They said our deficit was too high. They said our products were not competitive.

Well, we cut the deficit, and on an annual basis now, our deficit is as small a percentage of our income as that of any other advanced country in the world. And all of you and millions of American workers like you worked hard to make sure that our products could

compete and win in terms of price and quality.

Now in some areas we have made progress with Japan over the last 2½ years. We've concluded 14 results-oriented agreements. Believe it or not, they're now eating American rice in Tokyo. Japanese consumers are buying everything from our apples to our telecommunications equipment. But in many areas, Japan's market remains stubbornly closed. There's no question this is about artificial trade barriers, not the quality of American products.

By some estimates, if Japan had open markets, the increase in U.S. exports would create hundreds of thousands of American jobs. By the way, it would have been good for the Japanese, too, because their consumers pay almost 40 percent more than they should for the basic necessities and products of life.

Japan's trade barriers are most unfair, as you well know, when it comes to cars and car parts. In the last 25 years, we shipped 400,000 cars to Japan, and they shipped 40 million cars to us. That's a 100:1 ratio. Be sure and quote that number the next time somebody tells you there's not really a trade problem here.

Twenty-two years ago, in 1973, the Big Three had less than one percent of Japan's auto market. Every President since then has tried to fix this problem and open the Japanese market to American cars. You know what kind of success we've all had, what kind of market share the Big Three has today, after 22 years? A whopping 1.5 percent.

Now, you know how bad this problem is. Our auto industry accounts for about 5 percent of our gross domestic product directly. It employs 2½ million Americans. But when the auto industry does well, so do a lot of other people, the people who make iron and steel and aluminum and rubber and glass and semi-conductors, the things the auto industry needs. American auto parts are so good that we have an auto parts trade surplus of \$5.1 billion around the world, because demanding companies, like BMW and Mercedes, use our auto parts all the time. But with Japan, we have \$12.8 billion trade deficit.

My fellow Americans, this is a simple question of fairness. The American auto market is open to Japanese products, more open

than the European market, more open than most markets in the world. The Japanese auto market, by contrast, is still closed to American products. We have tried and tried other means as long as we could. And we have tried long enough. Now we must act decisively to level the playing field and to protect American jobs.

I have ordered the U.S. Trade Representative to impose 100 percent tariffs on 13 Japanese-made luxury cars by June 28 unless Japan agrees to open its markets to cars and car parts before then. Now the ball is in their court. I hope Japan is ready to reach a serious agreement. But make no mistake, if we have not resolved this by June 28, these sanctions will go into effect.

I'm gratified that there's so much overwhelming bipartisan support for this policy in the Congress. It's time for the Japanese to play by the same rules the rest of us play by. If working Americans see us continue to put up with unfair deals, they'll lose their faith in open trade. And we can't afford that. We've made too much progress opening markets to risk letting this problem with Japan spin out of control. We can't hesitate to fight for our rights.

Japan is a valued friend and partner. We cooperate on a host of other issues. Our trade relationship must also reflect that kind of cooperation. It has to be a two-way street. That's all I'm working to do. Just as we must be good partners with the other nations of the world, we know that Japan must be a good partner with us.

Let me say again, this is not just in our interest; this is in their interest. Even though their incomes are high, they are paying almost 40 percent more for consumer products than they should. We'll all win if we have fair and open trade.

I also want to ask all of you to be partners in strengthening the economy. I believe good, strong unions and good faith collective bargaining are essential to helping us meet the challenges of the future. That's why one of the first things I did upon taking office was to rescind the anti-union Executive orders of the previous 12 years. And 3 months ago I signed an Executive order that states loud and clear we will not allow companies

that do business with the Government to permanently replace striking workers.

The right to strike is a fundamental American right. Anyone who tries to deny that right can expect a fight from this administration. Labor unions have worked too hard in the 1980's and the early nineties. They have made too many concessions. They have changed too many work rules. They have shown over and over and over again the willingness to make changes to become more productive and more competitive. When they make those kind of changes and show that kind of flexibility and when they have the kind of results that have been achieved, they deserve to be respected, and the spirit as well as the letter of the law should be honored.

We will also fight any attempts by companies to dominate labor unions. I will veto any effort to weaken Section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act. And I am fighting to preserve your hard-earned wage protections. The Davis-Bacon Act and the Service Contract Act are the foundations for decent living standards for many, many Americans. Some want to take that away, but I want to stand at your side to protect that standard of living that you have fought long and hard to maintain. I don't agree with those who criticize these acts as inefficient or excessive. I believe that the Davis-Bacon and Service Contract Act simply put the American Government on the side of favoring a high-wage, high-growth economy. I don't believe we should support policies that increase the inequality that has grown so much over previous years.

I believe we should go up or down together. We should have shared sacrifice; we should have shared benefits. And I will veto any effort to repeal those laws.

I also believe, as you do, that collective bargaining is not a privilege but a right. Our appointments to the NLRB, Bill Gould, Peggy Browning, and the General Counsel, Fred Feinstein, are committed to preserving that right.

And so, together, we are all working here, fighting hard to help you hold on to what you've struggled to win over six decades. But after standing in your way for 12 years, there are those in Congress who now want you to believe they're on your side. Kind of reminds

me of the words to a country and western song, "How can anything that sounds so good make me feel so bad?"

There are those who talk about the health and safety of working Americans that try to weaken, even to gut health and safety standards; those who say they support work over welfare, but support a welfare reform bill that's weak on work and tough on children, one the Congressional Budget Office says is unworkable in 44 of our 50 States. They say that work should pay, but they oppose raising the minimum wage to make it a living wage. All of you know how important the minimum wage has been to making sure people have a decent standard of living in this country.

You know, I saw something recently that brings home the need for an increase in the minimum wage more than anything else that I've seen in recent months. I was watching a news special on television, and they went down South to a town that had a lot of minimum-wage workers. There they interviewed a remarkable woman in a local plant who was working for the minimum wage. They said to her, "You know, your employer says if we raise the minimum wage, then they'll either have to lay off people or put more money into machinery and reduce their employment long term, and you could be affected. What do you say to that?" And the woman just threw back her shoulders and smiled and said, "Honey, I'll take my chances."

There are a lot of women and no small number of men out there who are in that situation. Some of them are raising their kids on the minimum wage. The truth is we have looked at all the arguments, pro and con. There is really no evidence that a raise in the minimum wage will cost jobs, but we do know it will make more people want to move from welfare to work. We do know it will reward work. And we know if we don't raise the minimum wage, next year it will be at a 40-year low, once you adjust for inflation.

That's not my idea of the 21st century economy. My idea of the 21st century economy is Americans working hard, working smart, well-trained, well-supported, competing and winning in the global economy, doing the kinds of things the UAW is doing today, not driving down the minimum wage so that more and more people work harder and

harder just to fall into poverty. That's wrong, and we need to turn it around. We need to give everybody a fair shot at the American dream.

In closing, let me say that our work here requires a partnership with you, so that we'll be ready to compete and win in the 21st century; so that we don't raise the first generation of Americans to do worse than their parents; so that, instead, we begin to grow the middle class and shrink the under class again. The future of our Nation depends upon rewarding the efforts of workers like you. You and your families are the heart and soul of America, so we have to work together to preserve not only what has been won but to fight for the jobs, the incomes, the justice, the American dream of the future. We can do it. We can do it.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke by satellite at approximately 5:45 p.m. from Room 459 of the Old Executive Office Building to the UAW meeting in Anaheim, CA. In his remarks, he referred to Owen Bieber, outgoing president, and Steve Yokich, incoming president, United Auto Workers.

Statement on the Retirement of Lane Kirkland

June 12, 1995

American workers, and workers around the world, owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to Lane Kirkland. For nearly five decades, he has been a catalyst for international democracy and a guiding force for workplace fairness, dignity, and innovation.

His record of achievement rivals the great labor leaders that came before him, and his ideas and accomplishments will benefit working families for generations to come. He served with distinction during some of the toughest times for American workers and brought creativity, a laser-like determination, true grit, and an unparalleled intellect to his job as president of the AFL-CIO.

Hillary and I wish him the very best for the future and will always be grateful for his strong support, keen advice, and valued friendship.

Proclamation 6809—Father's Day, 1995

June 12, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

As children finish the school year and families begin to enjoy the long days of summer, Americans across the country reach out to their fathers in thanks. Every year, Father's Day gives us a chance to spend time with our families and to honor the bond between parent and child. It is a moment for dads to find joy in the blessings that fatherhood brings. And it is a day for remembering that children can grow up immeasurably stronger with the gift of a father's love.

The most fortunate among us can claim warm memories of our fathers' lessons—times when dads can be models of energy and patience. Whether encouraging their children in taking their first steps, riding a bike or meeting other challenges in life, fathers teach us the importance of balance and stand behind us until we're steady. Through the scrapes and self-doubts that every young person confronts, fathers can be our role models and heroes, soothing childhood fears and instilling the steady values of hard work and fair play. They are our guidance counselors and our best friends. Their faith inspires us to try again when we fail and fills us with pride when we succeed. As coaches and caregivers, teachers and workers, fathers who make parenthood a priority earn their families' lasting respect.

We Americans rely on our fathers for courage and compassion, and the security of having them with us gives us confidence in all of our endeavors. On this special day, let America's sons and daughters show their fathers that they care. Let us continue to strive for a world in which every child grows up safe—a world in which every child knows that though they may feel sometimes unsteady, their fathers are behind them always.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, in accordance with a joint resolution of the Congress approved April 24, 1972 (36 U.S.C. 142a), do hereby proclaim Sunday, June 18,

Scheduling Proposal

2/5/96

SM

PS

File April

___Accept

___Regret

___Pending

TO: Patti Solis
Director of Scheduling

FROM: Harold Ickes
Jennifer O'Connor

REQUEST: For the First Lady to attend a dinner
for the International Union, United
Automobile, Aerospace and Agriculture
Implement Workers of America's
Legislative-Political conference.

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND: Over 2,000 delegates will attend the
1996 Legislative-Political Conference
for UAW. This conference will be
attended by UAW local union leaders and
political activists from across the
country, as well as the Officers and
Board Members of the UAW. This speech
will serve to both energize and educate
the participants for this crucial
election year. This is the first
legislative conference for the new UAW
President Steve Yokich, so it is crucial
that we send a principal.

DATE and TIME: April 21, 1996, 8:00 p.m.

DURATION: 30 minutes

PARTICIPATION: Stephen Yokich, President, UAW
2,000 UAW local union leaders

OUTLINE OF EVENTS: TBD

REMARKS REQUIRED: Remarks needed

ORIGIN OF PROPOSAL: UAW invitation

CONTACT: JENNIFER O'CONNOR
6-6350



INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA—UAW

STEPHEN P. YOKICH, PRESIDENT

ROY O. WYSE, SECRETARY-TREASURER

VICE-PRESIDENTS: CAROLYN FORREST • JACK LASKOWSKI • ERNEST LOFTON • RICHARD SHOEMAKER

February 1, 1996

Mr. William J. Clinton, President
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20050

*Fletcher asked if
for this*

Dear Mr. President:

The UAW would like to invite you to speak at two important UAW events that are scheduled for April, 1996.

First, we would like you to be the keynote speaker at a sit-down dinner for over 2000 delegates at our annual Legislative-Political Conference on Sunday, April 21, 1996 at the Sheraton Washington Hotel in Washington, D.C. This conference will be attended by UAW local union leaders and political activists from across the country, as well as the Officers and Board Members of the UAW. We are confident that your remarks can energize these delegates to carry back to their factories and communities enthusiasm and dedication for the many important battles that lie ahead during the coming year.

The sit-down dinner will be held in the Sheraton Ballroom of the Sheraton Washington Hotel, 2660 Woodley Road, N.W. The dinner will start at 7:00 p.m. If possible we would like you to speak at around 8:00 p.m. for about 30 minutes. Of course, we would be happy to make adjustments to accommodate your schedule.

Second, we would like to invite you to make a presentation, either in person or by satellite link up, to the delegates who will be attending our Collective Bargaining Convention at Cobo Hall in Detroit on April 1, 1996. This convention will be attended by over 2000 local union leaders from all parts of the country, who will be establishing the UAW's collective bargaining agenda for the upcoming auto negotiations. Again, we believe your remarks would be well received by these delegates, and would help to spark excitement for the difficult tasks that confront us in this critically important year.

We would be happy to work with you and your staff on arrangements for these two events. If you have any questions, you can reach my office at (313) 926-5201. You can also have your staff contact either Tim Foley, Administrative Assistant and National CAP Director, at (313) 926-5687, or Alan Reuther, Legislative Director, at (202) 828-8500.

Thank you for considering these invitations. I hope you will be able to address these two important gatherings of UAW leaders and political activists.

Sincerely,

Yokich

Stephen P. Yokich

Stephen P. Yokich
President, UAW

SPY:car

C893

34TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1993 PR Newswire Association, Inc.
PR Newswire

September 22, 1993, Wednesday

SECTION: Domestic News

DISTRIBUTION: TO NATIONAL AND MEDICAL EDITORS

LENGTH: 289 words

HEADLINE: UAW SUPPORTS CLINTON HEALTH CARE PLAN

DATELINE: DETROIT, Sept. 22

BODY:

UAW President Owen Bieber strongly endorsed the health care plan to be announced tonight by President Bill Clinton, stating, "We believe that this well-thought-out and carefully studied plan will make health care more affordable, more accessible and more secure."

"That's good for workers, good for employers and good for the country," Bieber added.

"As long-time leaders in the fight for national health care reform," Bieber continued, "we will work with pride and energy to enact this landmark program."

Commenting on specific elements of the Clinton proposal, the UAW leader said, "According to our information, this plan incorporates a number of basic principles which the UAW has long supported. We are pleased that the plan:

- guarantees universal access to a comprehensive range of health care benefits;

- imposes tough cost containment through enforceable budgets;

- solves the retiree health care problem;

- establishes a level playing field between all employers by requiring all employers to contribute to the cost of health care, and by requiring community rating for health insurance premiums;

- places a cap on overall out-of-pocket costs (both premiums and cost sharing) which any individual may be required to pay; and

- retains the tax-free status of health care benefits."

Bieber also commended the Clinton plan for its compatibility with the union's long-term goal of achieving a single-payer health care system.

"We salute the efforts of President Clinton, Hillary Rodham Clinton and the entire White House health care team for their dedicated and successful effort.

PR Newswire, September 22, 1993

We are committed to its passage," Bieber concluded. CONTACT: Reg McGhee of the
UAW, 313-926-5291
LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: September 23, 1993

Dole Pulls Bill On Immigration Over Side Issues

By ADAM CLYMER

WASHINGTON, April 16 — Senator Bob Dole suddenly pulled the immigration bill from the Senate floor today, angered by Democratic attempts to force votes on amendments dealing with the minimum wage and Social Security, two issues that would put the presumptive Republican Presidential nominee and his party on the spot politically.

Democrats offered to limit debate on their amendments to an hour each, or less. Nevertheless, Mr. Dole, the majority leader, accused Democrats of holding the immigration bill "hostage" and of trying to frustrate Republican efforts to pass any legislation. "We have the majority," he insisted.

Mr. Dole appeared flummoxed by how to deal with the issue of raising the minimum wage from \$4.25 to \$5.15, a central Democratic campaign issue. The idea is supported by 84 percent of the American public, according to the latest New York Times/CBS News Poll. But it draws intense opposition from business and House Republican leaders.

But while he juggled competing political considerations, the Democrats were enjoying his difficulties and the opportunity to stick Mr. Dole with the disadvantages of running the Senate while running for President.

So far the minimum wage proposal is supported by only a few Senate Republicans, but they and the Democrats can combine to pass it if it ever comes up for a vote.

Thirteen House Republicans are expected to announce Wednesday that they have broken ranks on the issue, too. House leaders, who spurned a Democratic demand for a vote today, are understood to be uncertain about whether they would win if they had to allow one.

Over the weekend, Mr. Dole said he had not thought about what

Continued from Page A1

should be done on the minimum wage, and today he avoided questions on the subject by walking briskly past reporters whom he usually chats with on Tuesdays after the regular Republican caucus lunch.

Then his anger bubbled over after Democrats rejected his request that any amendments to the immigration bill be relevant to immigration. Unlike the House, the Senate permits amendments that are not germane to the bill on the floor, and members of the majority and the minority often use such amendments as a way to extract proposals that are trapped in committee.

Mr. Dole complained that the immigration bill, which would strengthen enforcement efforts against illegal immigrants and deny some benefits to lawful immigrants, "is going to be held hostage to Social Security amendments, minimum wage amendments," adding: "They can think of five or six others. Then they have the gall to stand up and say, we want to move ahead on illegal immigration. We know what's happening."

He told the Senate, "I know some would like to frustrate any efforts on this side of the aisle, but we do have a majority."

"We will try to do our best to move legislation the American people have an interest in," he continued. "Illegal immigration, wherever you go, illegal immigration is a big, big issue. If we are going to be frustrated by an effort on the other side to hold the bill hostage, that's up to them. They can make it happen, and they can explain it to the voters in November."

Senator Tom Daschle, the minority leader, shot back: "We didn't pull the bill. We could be taking up amendments right now. We have already agreed to short time agreements."

Senator Edward M. Kennedy, the Massachusetts Democrat who is leading the minimum wage effort, said, "We have been unable to get consideration of that measure now for over a year." He warned, "This issue is not going to go away."

Senator Alan K. Simpson of Wyoming, the floor manager of the immigration bill, said he did not think the bill was dead. "They will get back to immigration when it gets to the end of the week," he said. "It's called how you really legislate."

But he indicated that he was not

sure how this would come to pass.

The immigration bill, on which Mr. Simpson and Mr. Kennedy have worked closely, would also make it easier to deport aliens and curtail the process of seeking political asylum.

The Social Security issue is an effort by Democrats to pass a non-binding statement that the Senate does not believe that changing receipts and outlays for Social Security should be considered to be a legitimate part of any constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. Mr. Dole intends to bring up that constitutional amendment, which the Senate defeated last year, again in May, but under a parliamentary situation in which the Democrats could not offer the Social Security proposal.

But plainly the minimum wage is the most difficult issue, and it became even tougher this afternoon when 13 House Republicans announced that they supported increasing the minimum wage to \$5.25, raising the Democrats a dime.

The 13 Republicans are Representatives Nancy L. Johnson and Christopher Shays of Connecticut, Bill Martini of New Jersey, Sherwood Boehlert, Benjamin A. Gilman, Amo Houghton, Rick A. Lazio, Jack Quinn and James T. Walsh of New York, Phil English of Pennsylvania, Jim Leach of Iowa, Peter G. Torkildsen of Massachusetts and Steve Horn of California.

Mr. Martini, who announced the proposed legislation, said: "It is time to give hard-working men and women a raise. They deserve a fair return on a hard day's labor. That is why I have called upon the House leadership to bring this important bill up for a vote."

By themselves, the 13 Republicans would not be enough to get a bill passed, even if the 196 Democrats and one independent voted for it. But they would make it close. There are 236 Republicans in the House and two vacancies.

And Representative Richard A. Gephardt of Missouri, the minority leader, said today that the important thing was to get the issue before the House for a vote. "I think when we have that chance," he said, "we will pass it" because other Republicans would be reluctant to vote against an increase.

Continued on Page A18, Column 1

BEIRUT STAGGERS AS ISRAEL'S RAIDS ENTER SIXTH DAY

ECONOMIC STRAIN GROWS

Seaports Shut, Power Plants Badly Damaged and Sales of Gasoline Rationed

By DOUGLAS JEHL

BEIRUT, Lebanon, April 16 — As Israel pounded targets in Lebanon for the sixth straight day, this capital staggered today under the social and economic strain of an assault that has all but closed the country's sea ports, damaged three power stations and sent hundreds of thousands of refugees fleeing their homes.

With the country's schools transformed into temporary shelters, the authorities announced that all classes would be curtailed until at least early next week. And as Israeli warships maintained an offshore blockade, the Government advised service stations to ration gasoline sales.

The mounting toll of attacks that Israel says are aimed at the pro-Iranian forces of Hezbollah, or the Party of God, represents a heavy blow for people who had begun to believe that their country had finally overcome 15 years of civil war and might reclaim its lost glory.

"We've been climbing the ladder for five years now, trying to accomplish something," said Fouad Fares, a Christian businessman. "And now in the last six days, it's as if everything has broken down."

As Israeli attacks continued to rain down on Hezbollah strongholds across south Lebanon and in Beirut's southern suburbs, Lebanese officials accused Israel of trying to exploit sectarian divisions by unleashing the huge exodus from the south's heavily Shiite Muslim areas northward toward Beirut.

In Beirut today, where refugees were encamped in homes and mosques as well as in most schools, there were signs that relief workers were near the point of being overwhelmed. George Harrouk, the director of the Lebanese Red Cross, warned of "a crisis situation."

But neither the Lebanese Government nor the public showed any sign of turning against Hezbollah, whose cross-border rocket attacks are said by Israel to have provoked its heavy counterstrike. At least 31 people have been killed and more than 150 wounded since the Israeli attacks began on April 11.

"The battle is not against Hezbollah; it is against Lebanon," said Elie Firzli, the deputy speaker of Lebanon's Parliament. "And I am not Hezbollah. I am a Christian."

The Lebanese Government has said it has no intention of reining in

Continued from Page A1

Hezbollah. In any case, there is a serious question about its ability to do so singlehandedly; the Syrian Army, not the Lebanese Army, is the most powerful military force in this country and many diplomats believe that only Syria is in a position to seriously constrain Hezbollah's military operations.

Syria has 35,000 troops in Lebanon, and its endorsement of what it calls Hezbollah's justifiable war against Israeli occupiers makes it all but impossible for any Lebanese officials to criticize the organization publicly.

In Beirut today, scores of Hezbollah volunteers found ready contributors as they made collections among passing motorists in the city's mostly Muslim west and predominantly Christian east. The volunteers wore vests adorned with Hezbollah's symbol, a hand clutching a dagger.

At the headquarters for the Lebanese Red Cross, dozens of other youngsters — Christians and Muslims alike — packed boxes with food and other supplies for distribution at refugee sites that virtually line the coastal road from Beirut south to Sidon.

In attacks today, Israeli strikes claimed seven more Lebanese lives, including two soldiers in south Lebanon and a 2-year-old girl who was killed in southern Beirut when helicopter rocket fire demolished a three-story apartment building.

Lebanese officials say that none of those killed so far were Hezbollah members. And after two days in which Israeli warplanes have bombed power stations on the outskirts of Beirut, causing damage estimated at tens of millions of dollars, the officials vented fury at what they called an indication that Israel's campaign had strayed far beyond its declared targets.

Israel has defended the three power-plant raids, two on Monday and one on Sunday, as a tit-for-tat response to Hezbollah's Katyusha rocket attacks against similar targets in northern Israel. But in a capital that managed to restore round-the-clock electric power only last year, the Lebanese officials denounced the attacks as part of a campaign to undermine the country's economy and scare away foreign investors.

"When they hear that 350,000 or 400,000 refugees are coming to Beirut, do you think they will be encour-

**'The battle is not
against Hezbollah; it
is against Lebanon.'**

aged anymore to come to Lebanon?" said Farid Makari, Lebanon's Minister of Information. "'Capital is coward,' they say. They will think three times before they come again."

It may be several months, Lebanese officials say, before the most heavily damaged of the power plants can be fully repaired, leaving tens of thousands of people with only sporadic electric supplies. While it has not yet made an estimate of the total cost of the war damage, the Lebanese Government has said the cost of repairing the worst-hit plant might surpass \$80 million.

The Lebanese Red Cross, which has just 32 ambulances and 700 volunteers, acknowledged today that it had been able to provide food for no more than a fraction of the refugee population, although private foundations, including one headed by the sister of Lebanon's Prime Minister, Rafik al-Hariri, have made substantial contributions.

Young volunteers at the Red Cross headquarters were trying desperately to procure donations of medicine, and officials said the organization, which relies entirely on private donations, is totally out of cash.

"Children are getting the flu and infections from sleeping on the ground and from going without hot food or milk," one worker said. "Old people don't have their diabetes medicine. We need everything thing from aspirin to antibiotics."

As the United States and other powers tried to broker a cease-fire, the attention of Lebanon's leaders, turned tonight toward diplomacy, with President Elias Harawi, Prime Minister al-Hariri and the parliamentary Speaker Nabih Berri, meeting jointly with the French Foreign Minister, Hervé de Charette.

Earlier, Richard Jones, the United States Ambassador to Lebanon, presented Faris Bouez, the Lebanese Foreign Minister, with a copy of a new American proposal to end the fighting. But as refugees like Jumanah Aoub, a mother of two toddlers, made their way north, the power of emotions they expressed made it difficult to imagine what such a settlement might look like.

Outside a dark, drafty mosque in

Beirut where 400 refugees shared a few hundred loaves of bread, 150 mattresses and one toilet, Mrs. Aoub said she had been among the last to leave her village Monday night and had spent Tuesday vainly seeking refuge along the coastline.

"Everywhere we went, they said: 'We have no more room. We have no more food. Move on, go north,'" said Mrs. Aoub, who added that her husband had remained in the south to fight with Hezbollah. "We risked our lives to escape and I spent all our money paying for cars to bring us here. I should have stayed with my husband. I will go where God sends me. Where can God send me?"

At a school in Beirut's southern suburbs, the refugee center was run by Hezbollah, which in addition to its military role functions as the country's best-organized charity, and there were extra blankets and mattresses for all.

"Hezbollah brings us everything we need," said one woman, Zana Mousalmani. "They care for us and fight for us. We are ready to stay here until they get rid of the Israelis."

Another woman, Samir Said, had given birth to a baby girl only a few days before, helped by a Hezbollah doctor. In tribute to the rocket that is the militants' favorite weapon, she named the child Katvisha.

THE NEW YORK TIMES
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 1996

Continued on Page A6, Column 1

1ST STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 Information Access Company, a Thomson Corporation
Company
ASAP

Copyright 1995 Ward's Communications Inc.
Ward's Auto World

June, 1995

SECTION: Vol. 31 ; No. 6 ; Pg. 21; ISSN: 0043-0315

LENGTH: 3553 words

HEADLINE: State of the union; the UAW's Yokich: a tough guy for tough times; United Auto Workers President Stephen P. Yokich; includes related articles on Yokich's tough guy image, his union roots, and the influence of former UAW leader Walter Reuther

BYLINE: Lowell, Jon

BODY:

Comedian Dick Gregory once told a story that during the 1960s civil rights movement in the South he "sat in" for weeks at a lunch counter demanding to be served. When they finally relented, he discovered that the food was terrible.

Incoming United Auto Workers union President Stephen P. Yokich, 59, should be forgiven if similar thoughts pass through his mind when, as expected, he succeeds Owen Bieber this month at the UAW Convention in Anaheim, CA, after years of waiting in the wings.

It has been a long road for both men. Industry observers say that 12 years ago, in a hotly contested election for president, Mr. Yokich dropped his pursuit of the top spot and threw his support behind Mr. Bieber allowing the outgoing president to win by a "landslide" of two votes. Mr. Yokich, by all accounts, became heir apparent.

During May the two men were all smiles as they hosted a breakfast for reporters at what could only be called a farewell for Mr. Bieber and a mini coronation for Mr. Yokich. Naturally, they spared no adjectives in praising each other.

Rarely since World War II has organized labor in general and the UAW in particular found itself in a less-hospitable climate.

Some examples:

* Active membership (see chart p. 22) has fallen from a 1970 high of 1.61 million members to 826,236 last year. The percentage of retirees among total membership has more than tripled from 11.7% in 1970 to 37.27% in 1994.

* With aerospace and defense cutbacks, that part of the UAW's membership has been badly crunched. UAW membership at the McDonnell-Douglas Corp. in California, for example, has been slashed from 21,000 a few years ago to just

8,000.

* Foreign-owned automotive plants want nothing to do with the UAW and so far have successfully kept the union out. Germany's BMW AG and Mercedes-Benz AG are the latest to set up non-union assembly plants. U.S.-based operations of Japan's Toyota Motor Corp., Honda Motor Co. Ltd. and Nissan Motor Co. Ltd. collectively are building millions of cars and trucks in North America, none carrying the union's label. * Scores of auto suppliers have closed union facilities and replaced them with non-union operations. One estimate is 400,000 union supplier jobs have switched to non-union status in the last decade.

* The U.S. political climate has shifted sharply to the right, leaving organized labor with waning influence even in the Democratic party it calls home.

* Traditional union employers such as Caterpillar Inc. are showing increasing willingness to take bitter strikes and hire replacement workers. Cat's workers have been on strike for nearly a year, with no signs of an imminent settlement. Regarding Cat, Mr. Bieber says he feels like former President Jimmy Carter, who failed to win release of U.S. hostages in Iran only to see them set free just as Ronald Reagan moved into the White House. He'd like a settlement before he retires at noon on June 15. * Falling foreign trade barriers make it easier to source both parts and entire vehicles outside the U.S.

These are tough times requiring a tough leader, and by most measures Mr. Yokich fits the bill. Experts say the incoming UAW president is left with three basic choices, the least glamorous of which is a long, expensive, tedious effort to reunite the supplier industry. It is there, they say, where the change has been most dramatic and the union case for representation perhaps strongest.

Unlike the transplant assembly plants, where wages are near UAW rates, there's a huge gap between Big Three supplier wage rates and those paid at the non-union shops. But it will take, according to most experts, decentralization of the UAW's sometimes cumbersome organizing apparatus, and a union-wide commitment not apparent in recent years. That's not likely to happen. Mr. Yokich promises to stay the course. And while vowing to continue the UAW's effort to organize the Japanese transplants, Mr. Yokich hasn't publicly indicated that he plans to restructure the UAW's organizing department.

Both Mr. Bieber and Mr. Yokich say organizing foreign-owned, non-union automotive operations in the U.S. is a top priority. But it isn't easy. They liken the effort to the UAW's early forays to organize the Big Three. The numbers bear them out. They've yet to organize a wholly owned and operated Japanese transplant. And according to Mr. Yokich, though he says it proudly, the UAW has organized a mere handful of U.S.-based, Japanese suppliers. Unless the UAW can organize non-union suppliers, foreign-owned and domestic alike, thousands more UAW jobs could be lost.

"It's absolutely critical," says Sean McAlinden, an auto economist and labor expert at the University of Michigan's Office for the Study of Automotive Transportation, of a supplier-organizing effort. "Currently 80,000 jobs at (GM's) Delphi (components group) are at risk. Entire divisions like Inland Fisher depend on some kind of aggressive organizing of the (non-union)

competition. That's just union economics, and they know it."

Mr. McAlinden says automakers themselves might agree to somewhat higher costs from newly unionized plants if they could be located more closely to existing assembly operations and contribute more efficiently to modern manufacturing methods.

But that would put the two-tier wage system for parts workers on the table during contract negotiations with the Big Three in 1996. "It's an open secret in Detroit that Mr. John Battenberg (president of Delphi) would like a separate contract from the UAW in 1996," says Mr. McAlinden. "It's another open secret the UAW would love to avoid that."

The more obvious and higher-profile policy, if Mr. Yokich decided to launch his presidency by swinging for the fences, would be another no-holds-barred attempt to organize one of the transplants. The likely target, if Mr. Yokich chooses this option, is not the Japanese but the Germans.

Mr. Bieber has had extensive meetings with German union officials, and ties reportedly are strengthening between the UAW and its European colleagues. By law, unions are heavily represented on the management boards of German companies. And that's the route the UAW is apparently exploring: an authorization vote at BMW's and/or Mercedes' U.S.-based assembly plants, not at the urging of American workers on the plant floor but by pressure applied in German board rooms.

The remaining course of action left to Mr. Yokich, say insiders, is to essentially do nothing. With an average age approaching 50 and annual incomes and benefits the envy of many of their college-educated juniors, an extended trip to the strike barricades may not generate much enthusiasm. "All the current membership really wants is a steady income and no forced relocations until they retire," notes one expert.

But the betting is Mr. Yokich will be more outspoken and aggressive. Of his predecessor and political ally, Mr. Yokich says Mr. Bieber is a quiet, mental giant and admits that his style is different. Mr. Yokich says there have been times when Mr. Bieber gently admonished him to tone it down. "If it had of been me, I would have reached out and grabbed me by the throat," he quips.

Without that calming hand, intemperate outbursts are likely. Union insiders whisper about Mr. Yokich's short temper and long memory for perceived slights. Although occasionally profane and less traditionally articulate than predecessors like former presidents Leonard Woodcock and Douglas Fraser, no one questions Mr. Yokich's intelligence nor his passion.

And his political skills may be unmatched in recent UAW history. At a time when huge gains were impossible at companies like Ford and GM, he successfully convinced the membership that he got what was possible at the bargaining table. It was Mr. Yokich, as the lead negotiator at GM talks in 1990, who persuaded the giant automaker to guarantee workers' pay.

Contrary to his hardball image, Mr. Yokich and Peter J. Pestillo, Ford's savvy executive vice president-corporate relations, managed to forge innovative agreements in the '80s that kept Ford workers happy while allowing the No.2

Ward's Auto World, June, 1995

automaker to make dramatic changes in plant operations. "A union that can't change as society changes can't survive," he told reporters.

"Can he lead the UAW? Absolutely," Mr. Pestillo tells WAW. "But he needs to be a bit more forthcoming; he needs to develop a national persona." Translation: He now must switch from the rough and tumble of day-to-day union business to

the role of labor statesman and spokesman.

The quickest way to do that is to develop warmer relationships with the press, historically the object of his contempt and sometimes hostility. During the breakfast last month at the UAW's Solidarity House headquarters, only three reporters sat at Mr. Yokich's table early on while Mr. Bieber's table quickly filled up. The five empty chairs at Mr. Yokich's table eventually filled, but they should have been the hottest seats in the room. They weren't.

During the press conference, however, Mr. Yokich repeatedly showed a lighter side -- a softer edge than portrayed by his image and reputation.

Mr. Yokich seems to work best in the background. At GM, where there has been a series of expensive local strikes (see WAW -- May '95, p.40), company sources describe the working relationship as "healthy" and Mr. Yokich as realistic about the problems facing the company. The relationship improved significantly when President John F. (Jack) Smith Jr. began talking personally to Mr. Yokich, who would rather deal with decision-makers. But one GM insider is still scratching his head over 1993 bargaining when almost within hours Mr. Yokich congratulated the giant automaker for adopting a more progressive attitude during the talks and then, within earshot of reporters, angrily denounced company bargainers for the way they were handling local-contract disputes.

That incident may be an excellent example of Mr. Yokich's formidable political skills. Early in his career he reached out from the virtually all-white skilled trades wing of the union to make alliances with black union leaders. He authorized strikes at GM locals headed by dissidents, allowing them to settle disputes that might have boiled up at the convention.

G. Richard Wagoner Jr., president of GM North American Operations, describes restructuring the company's relationship with the UAW as "the most socially complex task we face." The man almost certain to be given day-to-day responsibility for that relationship has been both aide and ally to Mr. Bieber and Mr. Yokich: Richard Shoemaker, executive administrative assistant to the president, who's expected to be elected a UAW vice president and head of the GM Dept., replacing Mr. Yokich.

It's no secret that Mr. Yokich has no love for the unique contract the UAW and GM's Saturn Corp. subsidiary agreed to in the mid-80s. "It's not where I'd like to see it be," he says. "It's an experiment; there are a lot of good things at Saturn." There'll soon be more: Mr. Yokich reportedly engineered a deal with GM recently to assemble a larger, Opel-based Saturn model starting in 1999 at its Wilmington, DE, plant where Chevrolet Corsica/Beretta are now built.

Unless things change, GM will continue to be allowed some technical violations of the current contract that requires the company to hire one worker for every two that retire or quit. It appears to be a case of mutual interest.

With more UAW workers than Ford and Chrysler combined (225,000 active At GM, 175,000 at the other two), a healthy GM is in the UAW's interest.

Mr. Yokich dismisses gossip that his lifestyle tastes may not be in tune with the squeaky-clean image built up by a long line of UAW presidents. His official biography lists golf and boating as hobbies, and he's known to spend time on the lush golf courses in and around Palm Springs, CA, and in Scotland with Mr. Pestillo.

Friends note he hasn't been accused of anything officials at other top unions don't do without criticism. However, the Department of Labor is investigating allegations that he steered GM eye-care contracts to his friends and received kickbacks in return.

Mr. Yokich pooh-poohs the probe. "I don't get (health care) contracts, the corporation does that," he says. "This has been going on for 2 1/2 years. They wanted to look at some records. We turned them over, and we've heard nothing from them since."

One of the first clues students of the UAW are watching for is who gets promoted. Will Mr. Yokich begin developing younger, less-traditional leadership or will the sometimes criticized UAW bureaucracy simply shuffle up the ladder?

With Mr. Shoemaker in line to succeed him at GM, Mr. Yokich seems intent on tradition for now. Roy Wyse is expected to succeed Bill Casstevens as secretary-treasurer. Mr. Wyse, a 33-year veteran, is director of Region 5 and seems a perfect fit. He's more a finance guy than a politician, so it's unlikely he'll cause any ripples in the politically calm seas.

Eligible for six years as head of the union, Mr. Yokich likely will be the last of the "old line" of UAW leaders that began with Walter Reuther. "Management has gotten more sophisticated, but the UAW has not caught up," says one Big Three student of the union.

His time at the top will cover a period of profound change in his organization's membership. And through appointments, patronage and political support, Mr. Yokich will have a direct hand in the next generation of leadership. Thus, he'll have a major impact on the UAW's long-term future.

That may include a merger with another union, some UAW watchers suggest, and possibly reunification with the Canadian Auto Workers. After a rancorous fight with Mr. Bieber, the Canadians -- led by feisty Bob White -- seceded from the UAW in 1985. Mr. White later left the CAW and is now retired. With Mr. Bieber departing, there may be reasons to eye rapprochement.

Mr. Yokich says that's possible, but it could involve more than just the two unions. He alludes to forming a "North American metal workers federation" patterned after Europe's International Metal Workers Federation (IMF), which represents workers in many industries and many countries.

The UAW also "will continue to seek partners" where that may make sense, he says. The list includes the Teamsters, which recently rejoined the AFL/CIO, but Mr. Yokich is vague about specifics.

Ward's Auto World, June, 1995

Among his most pressing challenges is the giant change that's coming in his membership demographics. The Big Three will hire an estimated 200,000 new workers in the next nine years to replace retirees, all of them the products of careful screening. They are expected to be better-educated, more technically skilled, more diverse, and largely devoid of memories of the early struggles of the union movement.

Some think they may not, however, be as anti-union as corporate executives might like. A source familiar with research done on the more than 10,000 hourly workers hired by the Big Three in the past year says that although most may 'not be budding union activists, they rank unions above corporations as worthwhile institutions. That may give Steve Yokich the kind of clout he needs to insure a viable future for the UAW in the 21st Century.

RELATED ARTICLE: Yokich downplays tough guy image

Beyond a brief lecture to the press to be more positive, incoming United Auto Workers President Stephen P. Yokich downplays his tough guy image at a mid-May breakfast press conference with his predecessor, Owen Bieber.

Careful to avoid any comments that might be perceived as critical of Mr. Bieber, Mr. Yokich uses the gathering to stress continuity rather than change. Organizing efforts will continue at the transplant complexes, the union will stand by its social and political agenda, and Big Three bargaining next year will focus on traditional issues such as health care, job security and outsourcing of work now done internally at the Big Three, he says.

Both union leaders hint that more progress toward unionizing German and Japanese transplants is being made than the press is aware of, but they decline to set timetables for organizing efforts.

"There is a time when you bring some of these things out in the open and there's a time when you continue to work quietly," observes Mr. Bieber. "We continue to work quietly."

Mr. Bieber says he intends to slip quietly into the background after his 12-year run as the union's leader, devoting the first year of his retirement to his western Michigan lakeside cottage. But he also promises to "help, any way I can" in the 1996 general election, which he predicts will bring a second term for Bill Clinton.

But Mr. Yokich will have more than the normal amount of experienced advice to call on if need be. The UAW will have an unprecedented three living ex-presidents: Mr. Bieber, Douglas Fraser and Leonard Woodcock.

RELATED ARTICLE: Yokich's union roots run deep

You don't have to look hard for the union label on Steve Yokich. Both his parents were union activists and his grandparents were union members as well. At 59, Mr. Yokich is a blue-blood of organized labor.

Though he lacks the urbane polish of former UAW presidents Leonard Woodcock and Douglas Fraser and the rhetorical fire of the late Walter Reuther, Mr. Yokich makes up for it with nuts and bolts seasoning. "He has a more varied

Ward's Auto World, June, 1995

background and experience than anybody who ever assumed the presidency including Walter, Leonard, Owen (Bieber) or myself," says former UAW President Fraser.

Born in Detroit, Mr. Yokich started as a tool and the apprentice but quickly became active in UAW Local 155 in Detroit, which represented a rough and tumble group of tool and the shops. He rose to vice president of the local.

Mr. Reuther appointed Mr. Yokich to the Detroit-based Region 1 staff in 1969. That put him squarely in the middle of a number of bitter strikes, notably the 26-city struggle between the UAW and the Square D. Co., an electric components supplier, in the early 1970s.

In 1977, he was elected director of the region. Three years later Mr. Yokich was elected a vice president of the international union and given responsibility for difficult negotiations with "ag imp" companies such as John Deere and Caterpillar.

Mr. Yokich became an odds-on favorite to head the UAW when he dropped his bid to become national president and supported Mr. Bieber who, after winning the presidency, appointed Mr. Yokich director of the Ford Dept. in 1983. After leading national contract negotiations at Ford and setting the pattern in 1987, Mr. Yokich was given the plum assignment of heading the GM Dept. in 1989, considered by many to be the second most powerful post in the UAW.

He got the job despite serving from 1983 to 1989 as head of national organizing. The hard reality was there was no realistic way, amid massive plant closings, to stanch declining membership. He did succeed in expanding non-traditional UAW membership, including signing up 22,000 employees of the State of Michigan. And now he stands ready to assume the post he brazenly told his mother he would get almost 30 years ago: president of the United Auto Workers union.

RELATED ARTICLE: Reuther's influence still felt at UAW

Fewer than 40 people gathered on the Wayne State University campus in midtown Detroit on May 9 to memorialize a legend in the U.S. labor movement: The late United Auto Workers union leader, Walter Reuther. It was an odd collection that included a federal appellate judge, former Michigan Gov. George Romney, and aging political and union officials.

Mr. Reuther and his wife, May, were killed May, 9, 1970, in a Northern Michigan plane crash while en route to the union's education and training retreat at Black Lake. But to this day Walter Reuther remains, if not a presence, a titanic reminder of the stature and influence organized labor once had both in the U.S. and around the world.

His influence on the union and those who have followed him to the top job is barely diminished even now, and it's a legacy Steve Yokich should have no trouble assimilating.

"Walter more than any other individual forged the ideals, principles and philosophy of the UAW," says former UAW President Douglas Fraser, long one of

Mr. Reuther's top aides. Mr. Reuther was a true visionary. He plunged the

Ward's Auto World, June, 1995

UAW to a dizzying variety of issues well before they had become mainstream causes. Civil rights, world peace, the environment, the treatment of Mexican immigrants, health care reform, government support of the arts had become the union's social tenets. At the bargaining table, Mr. Reuther turned his concepts of a guaranteed annual wage, profit sharing, cost-of-living increases, job security and fully paid hospitalization into reality.

In corporate eyes, he became capitalism's "Public Enemy No. 1 " and in the establishment's view he was deemed a dangerous social tinkerer. Mr. Reuther survived a never-solved assassination attempt in 1948. He could be longwinded and maddeningly self-righteous but he was also widely respected. Wayne State named a school for him, and Interstate 696 coursing through the northern Detroit suburbs bears his name.

'GRAPHIC: Photograph; Cartoon; Graph

SIC: 8631 Labor organizations ; 3710 Motor Vehicles and Equipment

IAC-NUMBER: IAC 17070550

IAC-CLASS: Trade & Industry

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 03, 1995