Mrs. Fernandez. We’re trying to keep them from cutting you off the phone.

The President. Well, they might become national celebrities if they did that. [Laughter]

Mrs. Fernandez. Can you say “hi”?

Mr. Fernandez. Can you say “hi,” guys?

Children. No.

The President. [Laughter] That’s probably good, too. Thank you very much, and good luck to you.

Our last participant is Mr. James Callor from Utah. James, are you on the line?

Mr. Callor. Yes, sir.

The President. Could you tell the people who are listening to us all over the country about your situation, your story?

Mr. Callor. Okay. On March the 13th, in 1980, my little girl, Jamie Anne, they found cancer on her; it was a neuroblastoma tumor. They found it up at the Primary Children Hospital in Salt Lake. And they done the surgery, and we brought her home. She was doing good. And then—I’m jumping around because I’m nervous.

The President. You’re doing fine. Just relax and tell the people your story.

Mr. Callor. All right, in 1982, July the first is when she died, and a week prior, I asked the company that I was working for and I had sick leave; I had vacation; I had the whole 9 yards, but I still felt that the company could have let me off, which I didn’t care if I didn’t get paid. I just wanted the time off, which I took the time anyway.

But to get back to what we were talking about-anyway, she passed away. And my deal is like when you go to a company and you ask them something and, I mean, these people never had no heart. And that’s all I told the superintendent. I says, I hope one day something happens. And I didn’t mean it, but I just told him, I hope one day if something happens, your boss will say like what you told me. And I didn’t lose my job, but I lost my little girl.

The President. Thank you for telling us that.

Mr. Callor. And if you need any assistance or whatever, I’d be more than glad to come over there, because I could tell you from base one, right up to the time of her death. Maybe we could get-

The President. Bless you, Just telling it today will help very much.

Mr. Callor. Okay.

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, I know I speak for Vice President Gore when I thank all of you for your courage and your support on behalf of your own children and your own families and working families all across this country. We believe that next week, the Congress and the leaders who have worked on this in both parties will help our Nation join the 72 other countries who already have family and medical leave. And if it happens, it will be because of people like you and for people like you.

I think a lot of you said this, but I just want to close with this: It’s easy for people to talk about family values, but it’s also important for us to value families. And your Government is going to be given a chance to value the American family next week. We hope and pray they’ll do it. And if it does happen, you all can claim a lot of the credit.

Thank you so much for being with us today, and have a wonderful time. And keep those kids making that good noise. I like to hear it.

Bless you all. Goodbye.

Note: The teleconference began at 11:41 a.m., and the President spoke from the Oval Office at the White House.
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Gays in the Military

The President. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I’m sorry, we had a last-minute delay occasioned by another issue, not this one.

The debate over whether to lift the ban on homosexuals in the military has, to put it mildly, sparked a great deal of interest over the last few days. Today, as you know, I have reached an agreement, at least with Senator Nunn and Senator Mitchell, about how we will proceed in the next few days. But first I would like to explain what I believe about this issue and why, and what I have decided to do after a long conversation, and a very
The issue is not whether there should be homosexuals in the military. Everyone concedes that there are. The issue is whether men and women, who can and have served with real distinction, should be excluded from military service solely on the basis of their status. And I believe they should not.

The principle on which I base this position is this: I believe that American citizens who want to serve their country should be able to do so unless their conduct disqualifies them from doing so. Military life is fundamentally different from civilian society; it necessarily has a different and stricter code of conduct, even a different code of justice. Nonetheless, individuals who are prepared to accept all necessary restrictions on their behavior, many of which would be intolerable in civilian society, should be able to serve their country honorably and well.

I have asked the Secretary of Defense to submit by July the 15th a draft Executive order after full consultation with military and congressional leaders and concerned individuals outside of the Government, which would end the present policy of the exclusion from military service solely on the basis of sexual orientation and at the same time establish rigorous standards regarding sexual conduct to be applied to all military personnel.

This draft order will be accompanied by a study conducted during the next 6 months on the real, practical problems that would be involved in this revision of policy, so that we will have a practical, realistic approach consistent with the high standards of combat effectiveness and unit cohesion that our armed services must maintain.

I agree with the Joint Chiefs that the highest standards of conduct must be required. The change cannot and should not be accomplished overnight. It does require extensive consultation with the Joint Chiefs, experts in the Congress and in the legal community, joined by my administration and others. We’ve consulted closely to date and will do so in the future. During that process, interim measures will be placed into effect which, I hope, again, sharpen the focus of this debate. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have agreed to remove the question regarding one’s sexual orientation from future versions of the enlistment application, and it will not be asked in the interim.

We also all agree that a very high standard of conduct can and must be applied. So the single area of disagreement is this: Should someone be able to serve their country in uniform if they say they are homosexuals, but do nothing which violates the code of conduct or undermines unit cohesion or morale, apart from that statement? That is what all the furor of the last few days has been about. And the practical and not insignificant issues raised by that issue are what will be studied in the next 6 months.

Through this period ending July 15th the Department of Justice will seek continuances in pending court cases involving reinstatement. And administrative separation under current Department of Defense policies based on status alone will be stayed pending completion of this review. The final discharge in cases based only on status will be suspended until the President has an opportunity to review and act upon the final recommendations of the Secretary of Defense with respect to the current policy. In the meantime, a member whose discharge has been suspended by the Attorney General will be separated from active duty and placed in stand by reserve until the final report of the Secretary of Defense and the final action of the President. This is the agreement that I have reached with Senator Nunn and Senator Mitchell.

During this review process, I will work with the Congress. And I believe the compromise announced today by the Senators and by me shows that we can work together to end the gridlock that has plagued our city for too long.

This compromise is not everything I would have hoped for or everything that I have stood for, but it is plainly a substantial step in the right direction. And it will allow us to move forward on other terribly important issues affecting far more Americans.

My administration came to this city with a mission to bring critical issues of reform and renewal and economic revitalization to the public debate, issues that are central to the lives of all Americans. We are working
on an economic reform agenda that will
begin with an address to the joint session of
Congress on February 17th. In the coming
months the White House Task Force on
Health Care, chaired by the First Lady, will
complete work on a comprehensive health
care reform proposal to be submitted to Con-
gress within 100 days of the commencement
of this administration. We will be designing
a system of national service to begin a season
of service in which our Nation’s unmet needs
are addressed and we provide more young
people the opportunity to go to college. We
will be proposing comprehensive welfare re-
form legislation and other important initia-
tives.

I applaud the work that has been done in
the last 2 or 3 days by Senator Nunn, Senator
Mitchell, and others to enable us to move
forward on a principle that is important to
me without shutting the Government down
and running the risk of not even addressing
the family and medical leave issue, which is
so important to America’s families, before
Congress goes into its recess. I am looking
forward to getting on with this issue over the
next 6 months and with these other issues
which were so central to the campaign and,
far more importantly, are so important to the
lives of all the American people.

Q. Mr. President, yesterday a Federal
court in California said that the military ban
on homosexuals was unconstitutional. Will
you direct the Navy and the Justice Depart-
ment not to appeal that decision? And how
does that ruling strengthen your hand in this
case?

The President. Well, it makes one point.
I think it strengthens my hand, if you will,
in two ways. One, I agree with the principle
embodied in the case. As I understand it-
I have not read the opinion—but as I under-
stand it, the opinion draws the distinction
that I seek to draw between conduct and sta-
tus. And secondly, it makes the practical
point I have been making all along, which
is that there is not insignificant chance that
this matter would ultimately be resolved in
the courts in a way that would open admis-
sion into the military without the opportunity
to deal with this whole ran e of practical is-
issues, which everyone who has ever thought
about it or talked it through concedes are
there. So I think it can—it strengthens my
hand on the principle as well as on the proc-

Q. Mr. President, there’s a glass of water
there, by the way, while I ask the question.
Do you think, since you promised during the
campaign—your literature put out a very
clear statement: lift the ban on homosexuals
in the military immediately—do you think
you didn’t think through these practical prob-
lems? What have you learned from this expe-
rience in dealing with powerful members of
the Senate and the Joint Chiefs? And how
much of a problem is this for you to accept
a compromise which doesn’t meet your real
goals?

The President. Well, I haven’t given up
on m real goals. I think this is a dramatic
step forward. Normally, in the history of civil
rights advancements, Presidents have not
necessarily been in the forefront in the be-
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the courts in a way that would open admis-
sion into the military without the opportunity
to deal with this whole ran e of practical is-
issues, which everyone who has ever thought
about it or talked it through concedes are

Q. Mr. President, there’s a glass of water
there, by the way, while I ask the question.
Do you think, since you promised during the
campaign—your literature put out a very
clear statement: lift the ban on homosexuals
in the military immediately—do you think
you didn’t think through these practical prob-
lems? What have you learned from this expe-
rience in dealing with powerful members of
the Senate and the Joint Chiefs? And how
much of a problem is this for you to accept
a compromise which doesn’t meet your real
goals?

The President. Well, I haven’t given up
on m real goals. I think this is a dramatic
step forward. Normally, in the history of civil
rights advancements, Presidents have not
necessarily been in the forefront in the be-
inning. So I think the fact that we actually
have the Joint Chiefs of Staff agreeing that
it’s time to take this question off the enlist-
ment form, that there ought to be a serious
examination of how this would be done, even
though they haven’t agreed that it should be
done; that the Senate, if they vote for the
motion advocated by Senators Nunn and
Mitchell, will agree; Senators who don’t
agree that the policy should be changed are
agreeing that we ought to have a chance to
work through this for 6 months and persuade
them of that, I think, is very, very significant.

Now, I would remind you that any Presi-
dent’s Executive order can be overturned by
an act of Congress. The President can then
veto the act of Congress and try to have his
veto sustained if the act stands on its own
as a simple issue that could always be vetoed.
But I always knew that there was a chance
that Congress would disagree with my posi-
tion. I can only tell you that I still think I’m
right; I feel comfortable about the way we
have done this; and I’m going to maintain
the commitment that I have.

Q. But do you think that you hadn’t exam-
ined the practical problems—

Q. Sir, I just wonder, do you think in retro-
spect that—obviously, you didn’t intend the
first week—I’m sorry, you want to

The President. No, I had always planned
to allow some period of time during which
policies would be developed to deal with what I think are the significant practical problems. This, in effect, may reverse the process over what I intended to do, but there has to be a time in which these issues, these practical issues are developed and policies are developed to deal with them.

**Q.** Obviously, you didn’t intend the first week of your administration, given your promise to have the laser focus on the economy, to be seen around the country as military gay rights week. I wonder if in retrospect you think you could have done things differently to have avoided that happening?

**The President.** I don’t know how I could have done that. The Joint Chiefs asked for a meeting about a number of issues, in which this was only one. We spent a lot of time talking about other things. This issue was not put forward in this context by me; it was put forward by those in the United States Senate who sought to make it an issue early on. And I don’t know how I could have stopped them from doing that.

**Q.** You don’t think that in making the promise and then in promising to follow through on it early that you might have given rise to this, do you, sir?

**The President.** Well, I think it was pretty clear to me that we were talking about some sort of 6-month process days and days ago. And the people who wanted it debated now were not deterred by that, and probably a lot of them won’t be deterred by the agreement announced today. I think that we must—they have the perfect right to do this. But the timing of this whole issue was clearly forced by the people in the Senate who were opposed to any change of the policy no matter what the facts are. And I think that was their right to do, but they control the timing of this, not me.

**Q.** Two questions. First of all, just to make sure that we’re clear on this: July 15th this happens, period, regardless of what comes out at these hearings, is that correct? The ban will be issued, or will be lifted, rather?

**The President.** That is my position. My position is that I still embrace the principle, and I think it should be done. The position of those who are opposed to me is that they think that the problems will be so overwhelming everybody with good sense will change their position. I don’t expect to do that.

**Q.** So you definitely expect to do it. And secondly—

**The President.** I don’t expect to change my position, no.

**Q.** What do you think is going to happen in the military? There have been all sorts of dire predictions of violence, of mass comings-out, whatever. What do you think the impact of this is going to be, practically?

**The President.** For one thing, I think if you look at the last 10 years of experience here, according to the reports we have, this country spent $500 million in tax dollars to separate something under 16,500 homosexuals from the service and has dealt with complaints, at least, of sexual abuse, heterosexual abuse, largely against women, far greater volumes. But during this period, we have plainly had the best educated, best trained, most cohesive military force in the history of the United States. And everybody, ask anybody, and the Joint Chiefs will tell you that.

They agreed that we should stop asking the question. This single thing that is dividing people on this debate, I want to make it very clear that this is a very narrow issue. It is whether a person, in the absence of any other disqualifying conduct, can simply say that he or she is homosexual and stay in the service. I do not expect that to spark this kind of problem. And I certainly think in the next 6 months, as people start to work it through and talk it through, a lot of legitimate, practical issues will be raised and dealt with in a more rational environment that is less charged. That is certainly what I hope will happen.

Thank you.

**Q.** Want to tell us what the other problem was you were working on, Mr. President, on the Middle East, sir?

**The President.** No, tomorrow or the next day.

**NOTE:** The President’s first news conference began at 1:44 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.
Memorandum on Ending Discrimination in the Armed Forces

January 29, 1993

Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense

Subject: Ending Discrimination on the Basis of Sexual Orientation in the Armed Forces

I hereby direct you to submit to me prior to July 15, 1993, a draft of an Executive order ending discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in determining who may serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. The draft of the Executive order should be accompanied by the results of a study to be conducted over the next six months on how this revision in policy would be carried out in a manner that is practical, realistic, and consistent with the high standards of combat effectiveness and unit cohesion our Armed Forces must maintain.

In preparing the draft, I direct you to consult fully with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the military services, with other Departments affected by the order, with the Congress, and with concerned individuals and organizations outside the executive branch.

William J. Clinton

Nomination of John A. Rollwagen To Be Deputy Secretary of Commerce

January 29, 1993

The President today nominated John A. Rollwagen, the head of the world’s largest manufacturer of supercomputers, to be the Deputy Secretary of Commerce. Rollwagen is the chairman and CEO of Cray Research, Inc.

"The Department of Commerce will play a leading role in the development of a high skill, high wage economy," President Clinton said. "Having presided over a high skill, high wage corporation for 15 years, John Rollwagen can help us bring this about. As a proven CEO of a high technology company, Rollwagen is an innovative thinker and highly respected manager. He combines business savvy, international experience, and high technology knowledge. I’m convinced that he is the best choice to work together with Secretary Ron Brown to make the Commerce Department a powerful part of our administration’s work of restoring the competitiveness of American business," said the President.

"In talking with leaders in the high tech industry," said Secretary Brown, "two things kept coming up. The first was the sense that this Department has the potential to facilitate an explosion of new job opportunities in the areas of high technology and telecommunications. The second thing that kept coming up was John Rollwagen’s name. I’m thrilled that John has agreed to serve in this administration, and I’m thrilled that we have our first choice," said Brown.

Rollwagen, 52, has been president of Cray Research since 1977, and chief executive officer since 1980. He joined the company in 1975 as vice president of finance and led a successful campaign to capitalize the company as it moved into commercial production. His other business affiliations include memberships on the boards of directors for Apple Computer, Inc., Dayton-Hudson Corp., and Minnesota Public Radio. In 1987, Rollwagen was appointed by President Reagan to the Advisory Committee for Trade Negotiations. President Bush reappointed him to the position in 1990.

Rollwagen earned a master’s degree from Harvard Business School in 1964 and an electrical engineering degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1962.
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January 23

In the morning, the President had telephone conversations with President Boris Yeltsin of Russia and Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel.