

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records
Subgroup/Office of Origin: National Service
Series/Staff Member: Shirley Sagawa
Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 24268
FolderID:

Folder Title:
Asian Pacific American Appointees

Stack:
S

Row:
66

Section:
1

Shelf:
9

Position:
2

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. memo	Donald L. Fowler & Christopher J. Dodd to Asian Pacific Elected Officials & Community Leaders; re: Delivering the Democratic Message (3 pages)	08/01/1995	Personal Misfile
002. list	re: Democratic National Committee - Contact List (2 pages)	08/01/1995	Personal Misfile
003. memo	Jon-Christopher Bua to Interested Democrats; re: Talk Radio (7 pages)	05/09/1995	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Service
Shirley Sagawa
OA/Box Number: 24268

FOLDER TITLE:

Asian Pacific American Appointees

2013-0661-F

jp4946

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Office of the Managing Director

08/02/96

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 21, 1995

*Par to
Heidi-Joe
from Judy*

TO: Asian Pacific American Appointees

FROM: Doris O. Matsui *DMS*
Deputy Assistant to the President and
Deputy Director of Public Liaison

RE: Affirmative Action

Affirmative action is a defining issue for the Clinton Administration. In his speech earlier this week, the President stood by his longtime convictions and made it clear that this Administration will not shy away from the issue for political expediency. We have received overwhelmingly enthusiastic responses from people throughout the country.

At the same time he steadfastly supports affirmative action, the President has instructed federal agencies to review their procedures. Affirmative action programs that discriminate against anyone, must be revised accordingly. He has also ordered vigorous prosecution of cases of fraud and misuse of affirmative action programs.

Yesterday, as many Asian Pacific appointees as could attend on short notice, met here for a briefing by Stuart Ishimaru, counsel to Deval Patrick, Asst. Attorney General for Civil Rights. Stuart was intimately involved in the work of President Clinton's task force which reviewed affirmative action. Also participating was Dennis Hayashi, director of civil rights for HHS, a member of the President's task force on affirmative action.

As leaders from your communities and as Clinton appointees, you will likely be asked to speak, explain or defend this administration's position on affirmative action. I want to make sure that those of you who could not attend, do have copies of the handouts. We will send you additional materials as they become available.

When you hear from people in your hometown, please let us know what they are saying. Fax news clips or just a couple of sentences of comments to us. It is very important to have ongoing input from our communities. We have also faxed a copy of the President's speech and a news release to Asian community media across the country. If we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

July 19, 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

SUBJECT: Evaluation of Affirmative Action Programs

This Administration is committed to expanding the economy, to strengthening programs that support children and families, and to vigorous, effective enforcement of laws prohibiting discrimination. These commitments reflect bedrock values -- equality, opportunity, and fair play -- which extend to all Americans, regardless of race, ethnicity, or gender.

While our Nation has made enormous strides toward eliminating inequality and barriers to opportunity, the job is not complete. As the United States Supreme Court recognized only one month ago in *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña*, "[t]he unhappy persistence of both the practice and the lingering effects of racial discrimination against minority groups in this country is an unfortunate reality, and government is not disqualified from acting in response to it." This Administration will continue to support affirmative measures that promote opportunities in employment, education, and government contracting for Americans subject to discrimination or its continuing effects. In every instance, we will seek reasonable ways to achieve the objectives of inclusion and antidiscrimination without specific reliance on group membership. But where our legitimate objectives cannot be achieved through such means, the Federal Government will continue to support lawful consideration of race, ethnicity, and gender under programs that are flexible, realistic, subject to reevaluation, and fair.

Accordingly, in all programs you administer that use race, ethnicity, or gender as a consideration to expand opportunity or provide benefits to members of groups that have suffered discrimination, I ask you to take steps to ensure adherence to the following policy principles. The policy principles are that any program must be eliminated or reformed if it:

- (a) creates a quota;
- (b) creates preferences for unqualified individuals;
- (c) creates reverse discrimination; or
- (d) continues even after its equal opportunity purposes have been achieved.

In addition, the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña* requires strict scrutiny of the justifications for, and provisions of, a broad range of existing race-based affirmative action programs. You recently received a detailed legal analysis of *Adarand* from

the Department of Justice. Consistent with that guidance, I am today instructing each of you to undertake, in consultation with and pursuant to the overall direction of the Attorney General, an evaluation of programs you administer that use race or ethnicity in decision making. With regard to programs that affect more than one agency, the Attorney General shall determine, after consultations, which agency shall take the lead in performing this analysis.

Using all of the tools at your disposal, you should develop any information that is necessary to evaluate whether your programs are narrowly tailored to serve a compelling interest, as required under Adarand's strict scrutiny standard. Any program that does not meet the constitutional standard must be reformed or eliminated.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

CLINTON SUPPORTS AFFIRMATIVE ACTION DONE THE RIGHT WAY

"It (affirmative action) is a moral imperative, a Constitutional mandate, and a legal necessity."

"Affirmative action has been good for America. But that does not mean it has always been perfect. That does not mean that it should go on forever. Affirmative action should be retired when its job is done -- and I am resolved that that day will come. But the job is not done."

President Clinton
Wednesday, July 19, 1995

Our Central Challenge. As we approach the 21st century, the President believes we must restore the American Dream of opportunity; find Common Ground amid our great diversity of opinion and experience; and strengthen the American commitment to Equal Opportunity for all, special treatment for none.

Presidential Directive to Ensure Affirmative Action is Fair. Affirmative Action must be consistent with our ideals of personal responsibility and merit. Today, the President directs all federal agencies to comply quickly with the Supreme Court's decision in Adarand and to apply four standards to make sure that all affirmative action programs are fair:

- o No quotas.
- o No reverse discrimination.
- o No preferences for unqualified individuals.
- o No continuation of programs that have met their goals.

Any program that does not meet any of these four principles must be eliminated or changed.

Done Right, Affirmative Action Works. President Clinton ordered a review of the government's affirmative action programs. That review concluded affirmative action is still an effective tool to expand economic and educational opportunity:

- o The military's approach, ensuring it has a wide pool of qualified candidates for every promotion, has given us the world's most diverse and best qualified military leadership.
- o Education Department programs targeted at minorities do a lot of good with a small investment -- about 40 cents of every \$1,000 in student aid.

- o The goals and timetables first instituted by President Nixon for large federal contractors have prevented discrimination and fostered fairness-- without quotas or mandated outcomes.
- o "Set-asides" have helped build up firms owned by minorities and women who were historically excluded from the "old boy" network. They have helped a new generation of entrepreneurs to flourish, fostering self-reliance and economic growth.

We Have Made Progress Toward the Ideal of Equal Opportunity: We have passed major milestones: Emancipation, women's suffrage, civil rights, voting rights and equal rights. That progress, won by hard work and countless acts of conscience, has allowed millions of Americans, once on the fringe, to contribute to our democracy and prosperity:

- o Asian Pacific Americans have made real gains in employment, education and contracting.
- o Women are now major earners.
- o A true black middle class is emerging.
- o Higher education is now more open to women, racial and ethnic minorities.
- o Police departments across the country reflect diversity of their communities.

We Cannot Retreat While Discrimination Continues. We must not become the first generation of Americans since the end of Reconstruction to narrow the reach of equal opportunity. We must continue the struggle toward equal opportunity for all and special treatment for none. America cannot afford to waste a single person as we confront new challenges. Affirmative action has closed many gaps in economic opportunity, but we still have a long way to go:

Asian Pacific Americans have faced historic discrimination and continue to face discrimination today.

- o Racial discrimination is typically based on appearance and physical characteristics.
- o APAs face additional discrimination based on real or perceived immigrant status, including explicit citizenship discrimination and national origin discrimination such as accent discrimination or English-only discrimination.
- o APAs continue to hit the "glass ceiling" and are channeled away from managerial positions.

Discrimination continues for other groups as well:

- o Unemployment rate for African-Americans remains about twice that of whites.
- o Women still make only 72 percent as much as men.
- o Average income for a Hispanic woman with a college degree is less than that of a white man with a high school degree.
- o The recent Glass Ceiling Report found that women in the nation's largest companies hold less than 5 percent of senior management posts. The number is lower for African-

Americans, Hispanic and Asians, who hold less than 1 percent each of those positions.

- o In 1994, federal government received more than 90,000 complaints of employment discrimination based on race, ethnicity and gender.
- o Hate crimes and violence are still ugly realities in the lives of many Americans.

"Set-Asides" Need Reform. In some cases, "set-asides" have been misapplied, misused or even intentionally abused. Therefore, President Clinton has ordered that we:

- o **Crack Down on "Set-Aside" Fraud and Abuse.** Make sure set-asides go to businesses that need them most. No permanent set-asides for any company.
- o **Comply with the Supreme Court's Adarand decision.** Limit set-asides to areas where serious discrimination remains.
- o **Do More to Help Disadvantaged People and Distressed Communities.** The President has directed the Vice President to develop new ways to use government contracting to help businesses locate in distressed areas and hire workers from those areas.

Those Who Would Divide Us Threaten America's Future. Those who prey on our worst instincts and sow division cannot succeed. APAs have often been singled out as the "model minority." This so called positive stereotype has been used to admonish other minorities to be more like the "quiet, hard working Asians." At the same time, it is being used as a rationale on some campuses to limit APA student admission. It is important that we understand how these divisive tactics are being used to pit us against other people of color.

America will survive and prosper as a society if we are confident and united. Today in America, 150 racial and ethnic groups co-exist in harmony -- an achievement unmatched in human history. President Clinton believes we have a responsibility to renew and strengthen the ideals that fostered that unity.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

July 19, 1995

The Rotunda
National Archives

In recent weeks I have begun a conversation with the American people about our fate and our duty to prepare our nation not only to meet the new century, but to live and lead in a world transformed to a degree seldom seen in all of our history. Much of this change is good, but it is not all good, and all of us are affected by it. Therefore, we must reach beyond our fears and our divisions to a new time of great and common purpose.

Our challenge is twofold: first, to restore the American dream of opportunity and the American value of responsibility; and second, to bring our country together amid all our diversity into a stronger community, so that we can find common ground and move forward as one.

More than ever these two endeavors are inseparable. I am absolutely convinced we cannot restore economic opportunity or solve our social problems unless we find a way to bring the American people together. To bring our people together we must openly and honestly deal with the issues that divide us. Today I want to discuss one of those issues: affirmative action.

It is, in a way, ironic that this issue should be divisive today, because affirmative action was begun 25 years ago under a Republican president with bipartisan support. It began simply as a means to an end of enduring national purpose -- equal opportunity for all Americans.

So let us today trace the roots of affirmative action in our never-ending search for equal opportunity. Let us determine what it is and what it isn't. Let us see where it has worked and where it hasn't, and ask ourselves what we need to do now. Along the way, let us remember always that finding common ground as we move toward the 21st century depends fundamentally on our shared commitment to equal opportunity for all Americans. It is a moral imperative, a constitutional mandate, and a practical necessity.

There could be no better place for this discussion than the National Archives, for within these walls are America's bedrocks of our common ground -- the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights. No paper is as lasting as the

words these documents contain. So we put them in these special cases to protect the parchment from the elements. No building is as solid as the principles these documents embody, but we sure tried to build one with these metal doors 11 inches thick to keep them safe. These documents are America's only crown jewels. But the best place of all to hold these words and these principles is the one place in which they can never fade and never grow old -- in the stronger chambers of our hearts.

Beyond all else, our country is a set of convictions: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Our whole history can be seen first as an effort to preserve these rights, and then as an effort to make them real in the lives of all our citizens. We know that from the beginning, there was a great gap between the plain meaning of our creed and the meaner reality of our daily lives. Back then, only white male property owners could vote. Black slaves were not even counted as whole people, and Native Americans were regarded as little more than an obstacle to our great national progress. No wonder Thomas Jefferson, reflecting on slavery, said he trembled to think God is just.

On the 200th anniversary of our great Constitution, Justice Thurgood Marshall, the grandson of a slave, said, "The government our founders devised was defective from the start, requiring several amendments, a civil war, and momentous social transformation to attain the system of constitutional government and its respect for the individual freedoms and human rights we hold as fundamental today."

Emancipation, women's suffrage, civil rights, voting rights, equal rights, the struggle for the rights of the disabled -- all these and other struggles are milestones on America's often rocky, but fundamentally righteous journey to close the gap between the ideals enshrined in these treasures here in the National Archives and the reality of our daily lives.

I first came to this very spot where I'm standing today 32 years ago this month. I was a 16-year-old delegate to the American Legion Boys Nation. That summer was a high-water mark on our national journey. That was the summer that President Kennedy ordered Alabama National Guardsmen to enforce a court order to allow two young blacks to enter the University of Alabama. As he told our nation, "Every American ought to have the right to be treated as he would wish to be treated; as one would wish his children to be treated."

Later that same summer, on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, Martin Luther King told Americans of his dream that one day the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave-owners would sit down together at the table of brotherhood; that one day his four little children would be judged not by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character. His words captured the hearts and steeled the wills of millions of Americans. Some of them sang with him in the hot sun that day. Millions more, like me, listened and wept in the privacy of their homes.

It's hard to believe where we were just three decades ago. When I came up here to Boys Nation and we had this mock congressional session, I was one of only three or four southerners who would even vote for the civil rights plank. That's largely because of my family. My grandfather had a grade school education and ran a grocery store across the street from the cemetery in Hope, Arkansas, where my parents and my grandparents are buried. Most of his customers were black, were poor, and were working people. As a child in that store I saw that people of different races could treat each other with respect and dignity.

But I also saw that the black neighborhood was the only one in town where the streets weren't paved. And when I returned to that neighborhood in the late '60s to see a woman who had cared for me as a toddler, the streets still weren't paved. A lot of you know that I am an ardent movie-goer. As a child I never went to a movie where I could sit next to a black American. They were always sitting upstairs.

In the 1960s, believe it or not, there were still a few courthouse squares in my state where the rest rooms were marked "white" and "colored." I graduated from a segregated high school seven years after President Eisenhower integrated Little Rock Central High School. And when President Kennedy barely carried my home state in 1960, the poll tax system was still alive and well there.

Even though my grandparents were in a minority, being poor, Southern whites who were pro-civil rights, I think most other people knew better than to think the way they did. And those who were smart enough to act differently, discovered a lesson that we ought to remember today: Discrimination is not just morally wrong, it hurts everybody.

In 1960, Atlanta, Georgia, in reaction to all the things that were going on all across the South, adopted the motto, "The city too busy to hate." And however imperfectly over the

years, they tried to live by it. I am convinced that Atlanta's success -- it now is home to more foreign corporations than any other American city, and one year from today it will host the Olympics -- that success all began when people got too busy to hate.

The lesson we learned was a hard one. When we allow people to pit us against one another or spend energy denying opportunity based on our differences, everyone is held back. But when we give all Americans a chance to develop and use their talents, to be full partners in our common enterprise, then everybody is pushed forward.

My experiences with discrimination are rooted in the South and in the legacy slavery left. But I also lived with a working mother and a working grandmother when women's work was far rarer and far more circumscribed than it is today. We all know there are millions of other stories -- those of Hispanics, Asian Americans, Native Americans, people with disabilities, others against whom fingers have been pointed. Many of you have your own stories, and that's why you're here today -- people who were denied the right to develop and use their full human potential. And their progress, too, is a part of our journey to make the reality of America consistent with the principles just behind me here.

Thirty years ago in this city, you didn't see many people of color or women making their way to work in the morning in business clothes, or serving in substantial numbers in powerful positions in Congress or at the White House, or making executive decisions every day in businesses. In fact, even the employment want ads were divided, men on one side and women on the other.

It was extraordinary then to see women or people of color as television news anchors, or, believe it or not, even in college sports. There were far fewer women and minorities as job supervisors, or firefighters, or police officers, or doctors, or lawyers, or college professors, or in many other jobs that offer stability and honor and integrity to family life.

A lot has changed, and it did not happen as some sort of random evolutionary drift. It took hard work and sacrifices and countless acts of courage and conscience by millions of Americans. It took the political courage and statesmanship of Democrats and Republicans alike, the vigilance and compassion of courts and advocates in and out of government committed to the Constitution, to equal protection, and to equal opportunity. It took the leadership of people in business who knew that in the end we would all be better. It took the leadership of people in labor unions who knew that working people had to be recognized.

Some people, like Congressman Lewis here, put their lives on the line. Other people lost their lives. And millions of Americans changed their own lives and put hate behind them. As a result, today all our lives are better. Women have become a major force in business and political life and far more able to contribute to their families' incomes. A true and growing black middle class has emerged. Higher education has literally been revolutionized, with women and racial and ethnic minorities attending once overwhelmingly white and sometimes all male schools. In communities across our nation, police departments now better reflect the make-up of those whom they protect. A generation of professionals now serve as role models for young women and minority youth. Hispanics and newer immigrant populations are succeeding in making America stronger.

For an example of where the best of our future lies, just think about our space program and the stunning hook-up with the Russian space station this month. Let's remember that that program, the world's finest, began with heroes like Alan Shepard and Senator John Glenn, but it's also had American heroes like Sally Ride, Ellen Ochoa, Leroy Chiao, Guy Bluford and other outstanding, completely qualified women and minorities.

How did this happen? Fundamentally, because we opened our hearts and minds and changed our ways. But not without pressure -- the pressure of court decisions, legislation, executive action, and the power of examples in the public and private sectors. Along the way we learned that laws alone do not change society; that old habits and thinking patterns are deeply ingrained and die hard; and that more is required to really open the doors of opportunity. Our search to find ways to move more quickly to equal opportunity led to the development of what we now call affirmative action.

The purpose of affirmative action is to give our nation a way to address the systemic exclusion of individuals of talent, on the basis of their gender or race, from opportunities to develop, perform, achieve and contribute. Affirmative action is an effort to develop a systematic approach to open the doors of education, employment and business development opportunities to qualified individuals who happen to be members of groups that have experienced longstanding and persistent discrimination.

It is a policy that grew out of many years of trying to navigate between two unacceptable paths. One was to say simply that we declared discrimination illegal and that's enough. But that way still relegated blacks with college degrees to jobs as railroad porters and kept women with degrees under a glass ceiling with a lower paycheck.

The other path was simply to impose change by leveling draconian penalties on employers who didn't meet certain imposed, ultimately arbitrary, and sometimes unachievable quotas. That, too, was rejected out of a sense of fairness.

So a middle ground was developed that would change an inequitable status quo gradually, but firmly, by building the pool of qualified applicants for college, for contracts, for jobs, and giving more people the chance to learn, work and earn. When affirmative action is done right, it is flexible, it is fair, and it works.

I know some people are honestly concerned about the times affirmative action doesn't work, when it's done in the wrong way. There are times when some employers don't use it in the right way. They may cut corners and treat a flexible goal as a quota. They may give opportunities to people who are unqualified instead of those who deserve it. They may, in so doing, allow a different kind of discrimination. When this happens, it is also wrong. But it isn't affirmative action. And it is not legal.

When our Administration finds cases of that sort, we will enforce the law aggressively. The Justice Department files hundreds of cases every year, attacking discrimination in employment, including suits on behalf of white males. Most of these suits, however, affect women and minorities for a simple reason -- because the vast majority of discrimination in America is still discrimination against them. But the law does require fairness for everyone, and we are determined to see that that is exactly what the law delivers.

Let me be clear about what affirmative action must not mean and what I won't allow it to be. It does not mean -- and I don't favor -- the unjustified preference of the unqualified over the qualified of any race or gender. It doesn't mean -- and I don't favor -- numerical quotas. It doesn't mean -- and I don't favor -- rejection or selection of any employee or student solely on the basis of race or gender without regard to merit.

Like many business executives and public servants, my views on this subject are, more than anything else, the product of my personal experience. I have had experience with affirmative action, nearly 20 years of it now, and I know it works.

When I was Attorney General of my home state, I hired a record number of women and African American lawyers -- every one clearly qualified and exceptionally hardworking. As

Governor, I appointed more women to my Cabinet and state boards than any other governor in the state's history and more African Americans than all the governors in the state's history combined. No one ever questioned their qualifications or performance. And our state was better and stronger because of their service.

As President, I am proud to have the most diverse Administration in history in my Cabinet, my agencies and my staff. And I must say, I have been surprised at the criticism I have received from some quarters in my determination to achieve this.

In the last two and a half years, the most outstanding example of affirmative action in the United States, the Pentagon, has opened 260,000 positions for women who serve in our Armed Forces. I have appointed more women and minorities to the federal bench than any other president, more than the last two combined. And yet, far more of our judicial appointments have received the highest rating from the American Bar Association than any other Administration since those ratings have been given.

In our Administration, many government agencies are doing more business with qualified firms run by minorities and women. The Small Business Administration has reduced its budget by close to 40 percent, doubled its loan output, and increased the number of loans to women by more than 80 percent and to minority small business people by nearly sixty percent, without reducing the number of loans to white male business owners and without changing the loan standards for a single, solitary application. Quality and diversity can go hand in hand, and they must.

Affirmative action has also done more than just open the doors of opportunity to individual Americans. Most economists who study it agree that affirmative action has also been an important part of closing gaps in economic opportunity in our society, thereby strengthening the entire economy.

A group of distinguished business leaders told me just a couple of days ago their companies are stronger and their profits are larger because of the diversity and the excellence of their work forces achieved through intelligent and fair affirmative action programs. They said they had gone far beyond anything the government requires they had because managing diversity and individual opportunity and being fair to everybody is the key to their future economic success in the global marketplace.

Now, there are those who say that even good affirmative action programs are no longer needed; that it should be enough to resort to the courts or the Equal Employment Opportunity

Commission in cases of actual, provable, individual discrimination because there is no longer any systematic discrimination in our society. In deciding how to answer that let us consider the facts.

The unemployment rate for African Americans remains about twice that of whites. The Hispanic rate is still much higher. Women have narrowed the earnings gap, but still make only 72 percent as much as men do for comparable jobs. The average income for an Hispanic woman with a college degree is still less than the average income of a white man with a high school diploma.

According to the recently completed Glass Ceiling Report, sponsored by Republican members of Congress, in the nation's largest companies only six-tenths of one percent of senior management positions are held by African Americans, four-tenths of a percent by Hispanic Americans, three-tenths of a percent by Asian Americans; women hold between three and five percent of these positions. White males make up 43 percent of our work force, but hold 95 percent of these jobs.

Just last week, the Chicago Federal Reserve Bank reported that black home loan applicants are more than twice as likely to be denied credit as whites with the same qualifications; and that Hispanic applicants are more than one and a half times as likely to be denied loans as whites with the same qualifications.

Last year alone the federal government received more than 90,000 complaints of employment discrimination based on race, ethnicity or gender. Less than three percent were for reverse discrimination.

Evidence abounds in other ways of the persistence of the kind of bigotry that can affect the way we think, even if we're not conscious of it, in hiring and promotion in business and education.

Crimes and violence based on hate against Asians, Hispanics, African Americans and other minorities are still with us. And, I'm sorry to say, that the worst and most recent evidence of this involves a recent report of federal law enforcement officials in Tennessee attending an event literally overflowing with racism -- a sickening reminder of just how pervasive these kinds of attitudes still are.

By the way, I want to tell you that I am committed to finding the truth about what happened there and to taking appropriate action. If anybody who works in federal law enforcement thinks that that kind of behavior is acceptable, they ought to think about working someplace else.

Now, let's get to the other side of the argument. If affirmative action has worked and if there is evidence that discrimination still exists on a wide scale in ways that are conscious and unconscious, then why should we get rid of it as many people are urging? Some question the effectiveness or the fairness of particular affirmative action programs. I say to all of you, those are fair questions, and they prompted the review of our affirmative action programs, about which I will talk in a few moments.

Some question the fundamental purpose of the effort. There are people who honestly believe that affirmative action always amounts to group preferences over individual merit; that affirmative action always leads to reverse discrimination; that ultimately, therefore, it demeans those who benefit from it and discriminates against those who are not helped by it.

All of you have to decide how you feel about that, and all of our fellow countrymen and women have to decide as well. But I believe if there are no quotas, if we give no opportunities to unqualified people, if we have no reverse discrimination, and if, when the problem ends -- the program ends, that criticism is wrong. That's what I believe.

Now let's deal with what I really think is behind so much of this debate today. There are a lot of people who oppose affirmative action today who supported it for a very long time. I believe they are responding to the sea change in the experiences that most Americans have in the world in which we live.

If you say now you're against affirmative action because the government is using its power or the private sector is using its power to help minorities at the expense of the majority, that gives you a way of explaining away the economic distress that a majority of Americans honestly feel. It gives you a way of turning their resentment against the minorities or against a particular government program, instead of having an honest debate about how we all got into the fix we're in and what we're all going to do together to get out of it.

That explanation, the affirmative action explanation for the fix we're in is just wrong. It is just wrong. Affirmative action did not cause the great economic problems of the American middle class. And because most minorities or women are either members of that middle class or people who are poor who are struggling to get into it, we must also admit that affirmative

action alone won't solve the problems of minorities and women who seek to be a part of the American Dream. To do that, we have to have an economic strategy that reverses the decline in wages and the growth of poverty among working people. Without that, women, minorities and white males will all be in trouble in the future.

But it is wrong to use the anxieties of the middle class to divert the American people from the real causes of their economic distress -- the sweeping historic changes taking all the globe in its path, and the specific policies or lack of them in our own country that have aggravated those challenges. It is simply wrong to play politics with the issue of affirmative action and divide our country at a time when, if we're really going to change things, we have to be united.

I must say, I think it is ironic that some of those -- not all, but some of those who call for an end to affirmative action also advocate policies that will make the real economic problems of the anxious middle class even worse. If the real goal is economic opportunity for all Americans, why in the world would we reduce our investment in education from Head Start to affordable college loans? Why don't we make college loans available to every American instead?

If the real goal is empowering all middle class Americans and empowering poor people to work their way into the middle class without regard to race or gender, why in the world would the people who advocate that turn around and raise taxes on our poorest working families, or reduce the money available for education and training when they lose their jobs or they're living on poverty wages, or increase the cost of housing for lower-income, working people with children?

Why would we do that? If we're going to empower America, we have to do more than talk about it, we have to do it. And we surely have learned that we cannot empower all Americans by taking opportunity away from some Americans.

So to those who use this as a political strategy to divide us, we must say: no.

But to those who raise legitimate questions about the way affirmative action works, or who raise the larger question about the genuine problems and anxieties of all the American people and their sense of being left behind and treated unfairly, we must say, yes, you are entitled to answers to your questions. We must say yes to that.

That's why I ordered this review of all of our affirmative action programs; a review to look at the facts, not the politics of affirmative action. This review concluded that affirmative

action remains a useful tool for widening economic and educational opportunity. The model used by the military, the Army in particular -- and I'm delighted to have the Commanding General of the Army here today because he set such a fine example -- has been especially successful because it emphasizes education and training, ensuring that it has a wide pool of qualified candidates for every level of promotion. That approach has given us the most racially diverse and best-qualified military in our history. There are more opportunities for women and minorities there than ever before. And now there are over 50 generals and admirals who are Hispanic, Asian or African Americans.

We found that the Education Department had programs targeted on under-represented minorities that do a great deal of good with the tiniest of investments. We found that these programs comprised only 40 cents of every \$1,000 in the Education Department's budget.

College presidents say that their schools benefit from diversity. If their colleges look like the world students are going to live and work in, and they learn from all different kinds of people things they can't learn in books, our systems of higher education are stronger.

On the other hand, every child, without regard to race or gender, needs the chance to go to college. Every child. That means every child has to have a chance to get affordable and repayable college loans, Pell Grants for poor kids and a chance to do things like join AmeriCorps and work their way through school. Every child is entitled to that. But that is not an argument against affirmative action, it's an argument for more opportunity for more Americans until everyone is reached.

This review also found that the executive order on employment practices of large federal contractors also has helped to bring more fairness and inclusion into the work force.

Since President Nixon's Administration, America has used goals and timetables to preserve opportunity and to prevent discrimination, to urge businesses to set higher expectations for themselves and to realize those expectations. But we did not and we will not use rigid quotas to mandate outcomes.

We also looked at the way we award procurement contracts under the programs known as set-asides. There's no question that these programs have helped to build up firms owned by minorities and women, who historically have been excluded from the old-boy networks in these areas. They have helped a new generation of

entrepreneurs to flourish, opening new paths to self-reliance and an economic growth in which all of us ultimately share. Because of the set-asides, businesses ready to compete have had a chance to compete, a chance they would not have otherwise had.

But as with any government program, set-asides can be misapplied, misused, even intentionally abused. There are critics who exploit that fact as an excuse to abolish all these programs, regardless of their effects. I believe they are wrong, but I also believe, based on our factual review, we clearly need some reform. So first, we should crack down on those who take advantage of everyone else through fraud and abuse. We must crack down on fronts and pass-throughs, people who pretend to be eligible for these programs and aren't. That is wrong.

We also, in offering new businesses a leg up, must make sure that the set-asides go to businesses that need them most. We must really look and make sure that our standard for eligibility is fair and defensible. We have to tighten the requirement to move businesses out of programs once they've had a fair opportunity to compete. The graduation requirement must mean something -- it must mean graduation. There should be no permanent set-aside for any company.

Second, we must, and we will, comply with the Supreme Court's Adarand decision of last month. In particular, that means focusing set-aside programs on particular regions and business sectors where the problems of discrimination or exclusion are provable and are clearly requiring affirmative action. I have directed the Attorney General and the agencies to move forward with compliance with Adarand expeditiously.

But I also want to emphasize that the Adarand decision did not dismantle affirmative action and did not dismantle set-asides. In fact, while setting stricter standards to mandate reform of affirmative action, it actually reaffirmed the need for affirmative action and reaffirmed the continuing existence of systematic discrimination in the United States.

What the Supreme Court ordered the federal government to do was to meet the same more rigorous standard for affirmative action programs that state and local governments were ordered to meet several years ago. And the best set-aside programs under that standard have been challenged and have survived.

Third, beyond discrimination we need to do more to help disadvantaged people and distressed communities, no matter what their race or gender. There are places in our country where the free enterprise system simply doesn't reach. It simply isn't working to provide jobs and opportunity. These areas in urban

and rural America are populated by racial minorities, but not entirely. To make this initiative work, I believe the government must become a better partner for people in places in urban and rural America that are caught in a cycle of poverty. And I believe we have to find ways to get the private sector to assume their rightful role as a driver of economic growth.

It has always amazed me that we have given incentives to our business people to help to develop poor economies in other parts of the world, our neighbors in the Caribbean, our neighbors in other parts of the world, which I have supported except when they have been abused, but we ignore the biggest source of economic growth available to the American economy, the poor economies isolated within the United States of America.

There are those who say, well, even if we made the jobs available people wouldn't work. They haven't tried. Most of the people in disadvantaged communities work today, and most of them who don't work have a very strong desire to do so. In central Harlem, 14 people apply for every single minimum-wage job opening. Think how many more would apply if there were good jobs with a good future. Our job is to connect disadvantaged people and disadvantaged communities to economic opportunity so that everybody who wants to work can do so.

We've been working at this through our empowerment zones and community development banks, through the initiatives of Secretary Cisneros and the Housing and Urban Development Department, and many other things that we have tried to do to put capital where it is needed. And now I have asked Vice President Gore to develop a proposal to use our contracting to support businesses that locate themselves in these distressed areas or hire a large percentage of their workers from these areas -- not to substitute for affirmative action, but to go beyond it, to do something that will help to deal with the economic crisis of America.

My fellow Americans, affirmative action has to be made consistent with our highest ideals of personal responsibility and merit, and our urgent need to find common ground, and to prepare all Americans to compete in the global economy.

Today, I am directing all our agencies to comply with the Supreme Court's Adarand decision, and also to apply the four standards of fairness to all our affirmative action programs that I have already articulated: No quotas in theory or practice; no illegal discrimination of any kind, including reverse discrimination; no preference for people who are not qualified for any job or other opportunity; and as soon as a program has succeeded, it must be retired. Any program that doesn't meet these four principles must be eliminated or reformed to meet them.

But let me be clear: Affirmative action has been good for America.

Affirmative action has not always been perfect, and affirmative action should not go on forever. It should be changed now to take care of those things that are wrong, and it should be retired when its job is done. I am resolved that that day will come. But the evidence suggests, indeed screams, that that day has not come.

The job of ending discrimination in this country is not over. That should not be surprising. We had slavery for centuries before the passage of the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments. We waited another hundred years for the civil rights legislation. Women have had the vote less than a hundred years. We have always had difficulty with these things, as most societies do. But we are making more progress than many other nations.

Since, based on the evidence, the job is not done, here is what I think we should do. We should reaffirm the principle of affirmative action and fix the practices. We should have a simple slogan: Mend it, but don't end it.

Let me ask all Americans, whether they agree or disagree with what I have said today, to see this issue in the larger context of our times. President Lincoln said we cannot escape our history. We cannot escape our future either. And that future must be one in which every American has the chance to live up to his or her God-given capacities.

The new technology, the instant communications, the explosion of global commerce have created enormous opportunities and enormous anxieties for Americans. In the last two and a half years, we have seen seven million new jobs, more millionaires and new businesses than ever before, high corporate profits, and a booming stock market. Yet, most Americans are working harder for the same or lower pay. And they feel more insecurity about their jobs, their retirement, their health care, and their children's education. Too many of our children are exposed to poverty and welfare, violence and drugs.

These are the great challenges for our whole country on the homefront at the dawn of the 21st century. We've got to find the wisdom and the will to create family-wage jobs for all the people who want to work; to open the door of college to all Americans; to strengthen families and reduce the awful problems to which our children are exposed; to move poor Americans from welfare to work.

This is the work of our Administration -- to give the people the tools they need to make the most of their own lives, to give families and communities the tools they need to solve their own problems. But let us not forget affirmative action didn't cause these problems. And it won't solve them. And getting rid of affirmative action certainly won't solve them.

If properly done, affirmative action can help us come together, go forward and grow together. It is in our moral, legal and practical interest to see that every person can make the most of his or her life. In the fight for the future, we need all hands on deck. And some of those hands still need a helping hand.

In our national community we're all different, but we're all the same. We want liberty and freedom. We want the embrace of family and community. We want to make the most of our own lives and we're determined to give our children a better one. Today there are voices of division who would say forget all that. Don't you dare. Remember we're still closing the gap between our founders' ideals and our reality. But every step along the way has made us richer, stronger and better. And the best is yet to come.

Thank you very much. And God bless you.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001, memo	Donald L. Fowler & Christopher J. Dodd to Asian Pacific Elected Officials & Community Leaders; re: Delivering the Democratic Message (3 pages)	08/01/1995	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Service
Shirley Sagawa
OA/Box Number: 24268

FOLDER TITLE:

Asian Pacific American Appointees

2013-0661-F
jp4946

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. list	re: Democratic National Committee - Contact List (2 pages)	08/01/1995	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Service
Shirley Sagawa
OA/Box Number: 24268

FOLDER TITLE:

Asian Pacific American Appointees

2013-0661-F
jp4946

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. memo	Jon-Christopher Bua to Interested Democrats; re: Talk Radio (7 pages)	05/09/1995	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Service
Shirley Sagawa
OA/Box Number: 24268

FOLDER TITLE:

Asian Pacific American Appointees

2013-0661-F

j p4946

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN DEMOCRAT

Democratic National Committee

July 1995

Volume 1, Issue 1

S.F. BAY AREA APAs SUPPORT DEMOCRATS

A non-partisan exit poll of the November 1994 elections found that 61.9% of Asian Pacific Americans (APAs) in the San Francisco Bay Area identify with the Democratic Party as opposed to only 21.6% who identify with the Republicans. Of the 4,009 citizens polled in three cities, San Francisco, Oakland, and Daly City, 893 of the respondents were APAs. The results dispel the prevailing notion that APA voters are politically conservative and tend to be apathetic.

The study was sponsored by San Francisco based Asian Law Caucus and funded by the Ford Foundation. Two further exit poll studies of APA voters in the Los Angeles and New York City are expected to be released soon.

The following are some of the highlights of the findings:

- ◆ When viable APA candidates run, APAs strongly vote in favor of APA candidates.
- ◆ When informed of issues affecting their communities, APAs have greater turnout and vote decisively.
- ◆ 73 percent of the surveyed APA voters voted against Proposition 187, a 1994 California state initiative which sought to deny all educational, medical, and social services to undocumented immigrants.
- ◆ Generationally, the second generation and beyond APA voters tend to identify and affiliate more with the Democratic Party than first generation APA voters.
- ◆ APAs use bilingual materials, when available.
- ◆ APAs have significant problems of underparticipation.
- ◆ There continues to be racial polarization in voter behavior.

DR. FOSTER DENIED SENATE VOTE ON NOMINATION

The nomination of Dr. Henry Foster as U.S. Surgeon General was defeated by Republican partisan politics and intra-party posturing. Dr. Foster became a pawn in the pre-election struggle between Majority Leader Robert Dole and Senator Phil Gramm to win votes among the far right in their pre-election bid for the White House. After two days of contentious debate, Foster's supporters fell three votes short of the sixty required to end the debate on the nomination and send it to the floor for an up or down vote.

President Clinton issued this statement, "The Senators who voted to deny Dr. Foster an up or down vote did a disservice to a good man. They also did a disservice to our whole system of democracy. And make no mistake about it, this was not a vote about

continued on next page

FOSTER CONTINUED...

the right of the President to choose a surgeon general. This was really a vote about every woman's right to choose."

Dr. Foster is a prominent Nashville obstetrician/gynecologist who has devoted much of his 38 year career in medicine working to improve the health of women and children in poor and rural areas. His efforts to curb teen pregnancy have earned him high praise among both Democrats and Republicans, among which include former President George Bush who declared Dr. Foster as one of America's Thousand Points of Light for his work in this area.

CLINTON SUPPORTS SMALL BUSINESSES

Recognizing the importance of small business, President Clinton welcomed 1,790 small business representatives to the 1995 White House Conference on Small Business (WHCSB) at the nation's capitol June 11-15, 1995. The conference produced 60 recommendations on small business which will be submitted to President Clinton and Congress by September 30 of this year.

There were a total of 75 Asian delegates attending the conference, the largest group coming from California with a total of 28 delegates. APAs from across the country had an opportunity to meet with each other as well as with APA Presidential appointees and APA Congressional Caucus members at a special reception organized by the California Asian Delegation. WHCSB Commissioner Josie Natori hosted the reception. Natori was one member of the 11 member commission responsible for planning the massive policy-making conference.

The Asian Small Business agenda focused on procurement, affirmative action, equal opportunity, community development, and international trade. Clifford Tong, business consultant from Northern California, was the lead negotiator on affirmative action and procurement issues. Tong said, "We were unified. The Asian Delegation and all the negotiators played a key role in shaping the majority support for issues that affected all small business owners."

President Clinton's keynote address was the highlight of the conference. Clinton earned applause and laughs when he promised delegates to cut 16,000 pages of federal regulations as his aides toted out 39 pounds of regulations bound in red tape.

Clinton has an impressive record in improving the regulatory and economic environment for small business among which include:

- ◆ Amendments to bank regulatory policies which have expanded small businesses access to bank loans.
- ◆ Small businesses are now allowed the opportunity to escape penalties for first time violations.
- ◆ Reducing the SBA loan application from a 1 1/2 inches of paper to a single, two sided form.
- ◆ Providing tax credits for which currently 90 percent of small businesses are eligible.
- ◆ Increasing the amount a small business can expense for equipment purchases from \$10,000 to \$17,500 or 75% more.
- ◆ Establishing the Extended Research and Experimentation Tax Credit which gives a 20% credit for qualified research expenditures.
- ◆ Expanding business opportunities for small businesses through the passage of NAFTA and the successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round of GATT.

REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA IS A CONTRACT AGAINST EDUCATION

Education has always been a top priority for the APA community, but access to higher education and job training is being threatened by the Republican agenda of slashing education to provide tax cuts for the wealthy. Here are some of the highlights of the Republican "solution" for a balanced budget:

- **Make Student Loans More Expensive.** Republicans want to help pay for their tax cuts for the wealthy by eliminating the grace period that allows 4.5 million students to defer interest charges while in school. For a four year student who borrowed the maximum amount (\$17,125) at the maximum interest rate (8.25%), this proposal would increase costs by \$3,150 or 18%.
- **Cut Back the New Direct Lending Program.** The New Direct Lending Program was developed by Clinton Administration to lower costs and provide better coverage of students by eliminating banks as intermediaries and forwarding loans directly to the schools. The President opposes Republican efforts to help banks by capping participation in Direct Lending and preventing thousands of schools and millions of students from receiving its benefits.
- **Cut Education, Training, and Employment Services.** Republican cuts would eliminate over three million training opportunities and Skill Grants.

The Republicans want to take away all this while providing over \$630 billion in tax cuts over 10 years with 51.5% of the benefits going to families making over \$100,000 (the Treasury estimates more).

- **Tax Breaks Weighted Toward the Wealthy -** The wealthiest 1% (families making over \$350,000) get more tax breaks than the bottom 60% (over 65 million families).
- **Tax Cuts for the Wealthy are 75 Times Bigger than Breaks for Working Families -** The average tax cut for the wealthiest 1% is over \$20,000 —over 75 times larger than the average break for the 65 million families in the bottom 60%.

President Clinton wants to target tax cuts to *middle income Americans* and help our people get the education and skills required to compete in today's global economy. He is increasing educational opportunities for all Americans.

Here is what Clinton and the Democrats are fighting for:

- ♦ **Student Loan Reform Act.** This act greatly increases access to higher education—20 million students can take advantage of low-interest rate loans and better repayment terms.
- ♦ **Direct Lending.** The President wants to expand his Direct Lending program which simplifies the application process for student loans, reduces fees for students, and offers borrowers convenient repayment options, including pay-as-you-can. Direct Lending is saving taxpayers billions of dollars in administrative expenses because it cuts out the middlemen.
- ♦ **Bridging the Classroom and the Work Place.** The School-to-Work Opportunities Act bridges the classroom and the work place so that our young people can compete in the global marketplace. School-to-work gives students the tools they need to succeed—strong academic and occupational skills and education after high school to prepare young people for first jobs and continuing education.

Statement by President Bill Clinton

The Supreme Court's Miller versus Johnson Redistricting Ruling

I am disappointed by the Supreme Court decision in the Georgia congressional redistricting case. The decision is a setback in the struggle to ensure that all Americans participate fully in the electoral process and it threatens to undermine the promise of the Voting Rights Act.

My Administration remains fully committed to full enforcement of the Voting Rights Act. We will continue working to ensure that minority citizens in racially polarized areas have an effective remedy against the unlawful dilution of their votes and against impairment of their ability to participate in the electoral process. Congress, on a bipartisan basis, passed the Voting Rights Act to fulfill the Constitutional guarantees of full political rights for all citizens, regardless of race. The Justice Department will continue its vigorous enforcement of the law.

We have traveled a long road to fulfill the promise of political rights for all citizens. Today is a difficult day on that journey, but the road does not end here. While the ruling in the Georgia case is unfortunate, I am gratified that the Court's statements and actions make clear that race properly may be considered in the drawing of legislative districts.

Despite today's setback, we will not let this decision turn back the clock. We will not abandon those citizens who look to the Voting Rights Act to protect their constitutional rights.

REACTION FROM THE DNC ON THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION RULING

Statement from DNC National Chairman Donald L. Fowler

Under the leadership of six Democratic presidents - Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy, Johnson, Carter, and now Clinton - The Democratic Party has been in the forefront of the fight for equal rights and opportunities for all of the citizens of this country. Even in the Supreme Court's 5 to 4 decision to establish new standards for affirmative action, it is encouraging that four justices concur that there is a clear and present role for the government to continue to work toward eliminating racial discrimination against minority groups in America. And two of the five justices rendering the majority decision, especially justice Sandra Day O'Connor, offer some hope for the preservation of affirmative action as a fair and just principle to provide equal opportunity for all our citizens.

Statement from DNC General Chairman Christopher Dodd

The Supreme Court's decision signals a new era for affirmative action, but our goal continues to be equal opportunity and working towards a level playing field.

Affirmative Action is about opportunity, not entitlement, and must not become a divisive issue in the months to come, but rather one that will unify Democrats. The Democratic Platform states, "We don't have an American to waste. Democrats will continue to lead the fight to ensure that no Americans suffer discrimination or deprivation of rights on the basis of race [or] gender..."

A color-and gender-blind society is the hope of all Americans. Unfortunately, discrimination still exists.

NEW APA STAFF AT DNC

Director

Mona Pasquil was appointed by Chairman Don Fowler to serve as Director of Asian Pacific Affairs and Communications for the Campaign Division. Pasquil will manage political outreach to the Asian Pacific American community and constituency relations that will complement the Democratic National Committee's (DNC) coordinated campaign program. Pasquil comes to the DNC from the California Department of Education, where she served as a Deputy to Boards and Commission for Superintendent Delaine Eastin. Prior to her appointment, she served as Legislative Affairs Director for former State Treasurer Kathleen Brown. Additionally, she served as Administrative Assistant to former Senator John Garamendi.

Deputy

Yoko Nakagawa is the new Deputy Director of Communications. Nakagawa recently received a Masters degree from the University of California at San Diego's International Relations in Pacific Studies program. She was a California State Senate Fellow during 1993-94 where she worked as a legislative aide for State Senator Lucy Killea of San Diego. Nakagawa also has experience in the private sector having worked as an analyst for Morgan Stanley in New York. She also has international experience working for the public sector through positions in the Japan Development Bank and the Japan Exchange and Teaching Program.

Summer Interns

Robie Evangelista, an undergraduate at the University of Southern California, is majoring in Environmental Studies with an emphasis in Public Policy and Management. As an intern for the Office of Asian Pacific Affairs at the DNC, she hopes to achieve a better understanding of policies affecting Asian Americans nationwide. Upon completion of her Bachelor of Arts degree, Evangelista plans to attend graduate school to pursue a Masters Degree in Public Policy.

Dean Grafilo is a recent graduate from San Francisco State University who majored in Political Science and minored in Asian American Studies. In addition to being a summer intern with the DNC, he is an organizer for Filipino Civil Rights Advocates. In the future, Grafilo hopes to attend law school in order to prepare for a career in the public interest arena.

Meg Mateo is currently an undergraduate at the University of California, Los Angeles. She is majoring in Psychology and Asian American Studies. Through interning in the Asian Pacific Affairs Office of the DNC she plans to acquire more knowledge about the issues affecting Asian Pacific communities. Mateo aspires to pursue a career in the area of Asian American Mental Health.

Lea Sugimura is currently attending Lakeside High School in Seattle, where she will be a junior next year. She has participated in many local political campaigns and has been a summer intern at the Smithsonian. She intends to go to college and is currently looking at various schools.

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

July 27, 1995

President of South Korea, Official State Visit
Korean War Memorial Dedication
Washington, DC

July 27- July 30, 1995

APA Leadership Conference
Organization of Chinese Americans
Miami, FL

August 3- August 6, 1995

Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance
New York, NY

August 23- August 26, 1995

Asian American Journalists Association
Hawaii

November 10, 1995

National Asian Pacific American Bar Association
Boston, MA

November 17- November 19, 1995

Organization of National Asian Women's Health
Organizations
San Francisco, CA

For more comments, questions, and suggestions
PLEASE CONTACT:

**THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN POLITICAL DESK
430 SOUTH CAPITOL ST., S.E.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20003
Fax: (202) 479-5135**

Director:
Mona Pasquil
(202) 588-5080

Deputy Director of Communications:
Yoko Nakagawa
(202) 588-5067