Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, November 17, 1997
Volume 33—Number 46
Pages 1755–1815

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Bill Signings
Democratic Governors' Association reception—1790
Democratic National Committee dinner—1792
Fast-track trade legislation—1773
Human Rights Campaign dinner—1758
Iraq—1801, 1808
Ken Burns' "Lewis and Clark," screening—1781
Memorial service for Representative Walter H. Capps—1784
Organization of American States Hemispheric Arms Trafficking Convention, signing ceremony—1804
Radio address—1756
Virginia, Veterans Day ceremony in Arlington—1782
White House Conference on Hate Crimes—1776, 1778

Bill Signings

Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998
Remarks—1797
Statement—1800

Bill Signings—Continued

Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, statement—1809

Bill Vetoes

Line item veto override, message—1801

Communications to Congress

See also Bill Vetoes
Agreement Establishing the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme and documentation, message transmitting—1755
Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization, letter transmitting report—1801
Major narcotics producing and transit countries, letter—1772
Weapons of mass destruction, message—1786

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Oval Office—1801
South Lawn—1773
Interview with Tim Russert of "Meet the Press"—1761

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

Editor's Note: The President was en route to Las Vegas, NV, on November 14, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for $80.00 per year ($137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for $93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is $3.00 ($3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents.*

Contents—Continued

Joint Statements

Declaration of President Clinton and President Zedillo—1806

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Mexico, President Zedillo—1801, 1804, 1806

Notices

Continuation of Emergency Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction—1785

Statements by the President

See also Bill Signings
"Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997," congressional action—1800
Immigration legislation, congressional action—1809
Iraq, United Nations Security Council Resolution—1785
Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses, special report—1757
Voluntary national testing for basic education skills, House of Representatives action—1755

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1814
Checklist of White House press releases—1813
Digest of other White House announcements—1812
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1812

Statement on House of Representatives Action on Voluntary National Testing for Basic Education Skills

November 7, 1997

Legislation passed by the House of Representatives this evening provides an impressive victory for American education. It moves us down the road to high national standards and voluntary national tests in the basic skills, and it invests in providing our country with better schools and increased educational opportunities.

I am very pleased that we have reached an agreement on one of my top priorities for this year and for my Presidency: making sure that America's schoolchildren can master the basics and achieve higher academic standards. America's parents, teachers, and principals can now be sure that we are going to hold children's educational skills up to the same high standard whether they live in Michigan, Maine, or Montana.

The educational agenda I have established for the Nation—from high standards and testing to making a college education possible for every young American—is designed to give our children the tools they need to succeed in a changing global economy. Today's agreement fulfills a critical part of that agenda, and I appreciate that politics indeed stopped at the schoolhouse door.

The Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill, which includes the agreement on national standards and tests, also helps meet our national commitment to expand educational opportunities for all students. It provides a $1.5 billion increase in Pell grants to help an additional 210,000 young people attend college, and increases the maximum Pell grant to $3,000, the highest level in history. Special education funding is increased by $800 million, funding for technology for our schools is almost doubled, and there is $7.4 billion to help our most disadvantaged students master the basic skills. Goals 2000 is funded at $491 million, to continue to support school reform in every State, and funding for after-school programs is increased from $1 million to $40 million.

I am also pleased to see the House pass bipartisan charter school legislation to promote choice and accountability in the public schools and help achieve my goal of 3,000 charter schools.

NOTE: This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Message to the Senate on Transmitting Agreement Establishing the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme and Documentation

November 7, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the Agreement Establishing the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme, done at Apia on June 16, 1993 ("the Agreement"). The report of the Department of State with respect to the Agreement is attached for the information of the Senate.

The South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) has existed for almost 15 years to promote cooperation in the South Pacific region, to protect and improve the South Pacific environment and to ensure sustainable development in that region. Prior to the Agreement, SPREP had the status of an informal institution housed within the South Pacific Commission. When this institutional arrangement began to prove inefficient, the United States and the nations of the region negotiated the Agreement to allow SPREP to become an intergovernmental organization in its own right and enhance its ability to promote cooperation among its members.

The Agreement was concluded in June 1993 and entered into force in August 1995. Nearly every nation—except the United States—that has participated in SPREP and in the negotiation of the Agreement is now party to the Agreement. As a result, SPREP now enjoys a formal institutional status that allows it to deal more effectively with the pressing environmental concerns of the region. The United States and its territories can only participate in its activities as official observers.

The Agreement improves the ability of SPREP to serve the interests of American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and Guam. Its ratification is supported by our territories and will demonstrate continued United States commitment to, and concern for, the South Pacific region.

Under its terms, the Agreement entered into force on August 31, 1995. To date, Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, France, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tonga, and Western Samoa have become parties to the Agreement.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Agreement and give its advice and consent to ratification.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 7, 1997.

NOTE: This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

November 8, 1997

Good morning. This weekend the United States House of Representatives will decide whether America will continue to move forward with confidence on the road to continued prosperity or give in to fear and fail to seize all the opportunities of the 21st century. There's a lot at stake.

Over the past 5 years, our economic strategy has worked to make the new economy work for all Americans. We're balancing the budget, investing in our people through education and health care, and expanding exports through tough trade deals.

Yesterday, we learned again that this strategy is succeeding: Unemployment is at 4.7 percent—that's the lowest in 24 years—a quarter million new jobs in October alone, and 13½ million since I took office; inflation in check; exports booming. And after dragging for decades, incomes for American workers are rising strongly, up $2,200 after inflation since 1993.

Now, wages are rising in part because more American jobs are high-paying, export-related jobs. And if exports keep expanding, that will help to keep wages rising. We must press forward with this economic strategy. That's why I'm asking Congress to renew the so-called fast-track authority that enables America to negotiate new trade agreements. A strong bipartisan majority in the Senate backs this bill, which simply gives me the same authority to lower barriers to American products that Presidents of both parties have had for more than 20 years. That's why Presidents Bush, Carter, and Ford support this measure. Now it's up to the Members of the House of Representatives to decide.

A yes vote means America stays in the lead in fighting for new markets. That's now at risk. Just this week, Canada gained an advantage on us by signing a comprehensive agreement with Argentina, Brazil, and others. That means their products will sell in those countries at lower prices than ours because we'll still have to pay tariffs they don't. Now, that's a strategy of America last, not America first.

A yes vote means that America helps to write the rules for the new global economy. That's the only way to make sure that it works for the American people. We already have lower barriers in our country on foreign products than most countries. Other countries have higher barriers on the sale of our products and services.

A yes vote means that we can also address labor protections and environmental concerns around the world as part of our trade negotiations. This is the very first time this has been a part of the President's negotiating authority. Walking away from this will not create a single job or clean up a single toxic

waste site, here or in any other country around the world.

Finally, and perhaps most important, a yes vote means that American leadership in this hemisphere and elsewhere, not only on trade but in fighting drugs and terrorism and dealing with our other security problems will be strengthened.

In the post-cold-war world, national security requires economic strength and economic leadership. If America, with the world's strongest economy, withdraws from nations who want to be our economic partners, they're much less likely to be our partners in fighting crime and drugs and terrorism and the proliferation of dangerous weapons.

A yes vote is a vote for confidence in the world's strongest economy. But a no vote says, "We don't want our country to negotiate lower trade barriers. We're pulling back. We're afraid we can't compete, and we're willing to walk away from our unique world leadership at this moment."

Other countries look at us and ask, "With 4.7 percent unemployment and 13½ million new jobs, what could America be afraid of?" No other country has an economy so strong with so much promise.

Now, will some people be hurt if we lower our already low trade barriers more? Yes. Though most of our job losses have come because of technological changes and changes in consumer buying habits, trade does cause some. But overall, we're way ahead in the last 5 years.

The answer is to help the people who lose their jobs, for whatever reason, get good new ones and to do it more quickly. We've got a plan to do that. And we're already spending more than twice as much as we were when I took office helping dislocated workers.

By expanding trade, we expand opportunity for working families and give more and more of them a shot at the American dream. It's working. Why in the world would we turn back now?

I ask every Member of Congress, Republican and Democrat alike, to look to the future. Cast the vote you know is right. If we move to seize the opportunities of this new time and to help the people in the communities who need an extra push to get ahead, then our country will enter the 21st century stronger than ever before.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 6:48 p.m. on November 7 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on November 8.

Statement on the Special Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses

November 8, 1997

Our administration has made it a priority to care for and compensate Gulf war veterans who have fallen ill. The First Lady and I were both troubled by the pain and frustration these veterans felt. We have been determined to find out why they are sick, to make public the facts as we learned them, and to apply the lessons of the Gulf war for the future. In May 1995, I asked some of America's best doctors and scientists, as well as Gulf war veterans, to undertake an independent and open review of the Government's response to our veterans' health care concerns. Now, the Presidential Advisory Committee I established has delivered its Special Report. I thank its Chairman, Dr. Joyce Lashof, and the other members for their outstanding work and for extending their efforts 10 months beyond their original mandate. Based on their recommendations, I am taking the following actions:

First, to better care for and compensate our veterans: We will work to establish a new benefits system that will ensure that Gulf war veterans receive treatment and compensation for all illnesses linked to service in the Gulf even if we cannot identify the direct cause. We will ask the National Academy of Sciences to review the ongoing scientific research regarding the connections between all reported illnesses and Gulf war service so we have the fullest understanding of the health consequences of that service. In addition, we will work with Congress on legislation to guarantee that this system of benefits is maintained in all administrations to come.

Second, to deepen our understanding of why Gulf war veterans might have gotten sick: We will dedicate $13.2 million for new

research on low-level exposure to chemical agents and other possible causes of illness.

Third, to make sure our veterans and the public know all the facts and have full confidence in DOD's fact finders: Former Senator Warren Rudman has agreed to lead an oversight board to ensure that the Defense Department's ongoing investigations into events in the Gulf meet the highest standards.

Fourth, to apply the lessons we have learned for the future: I am directing the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs to create a new Force Health Protection Program. Every soldier, sailor, airman, and marine will have a comprehensive, lifelong medical record of all illnesses and injuries they suffer, the care and inoculations they receive, and their exposure to different hazards. These records will help us prevent illness and identify and cure those that occur.

From the beginning, I vowed that we would not rest until we uncovered all the facts about Gulf war illnesses and used that knowledge to improve the health of our veterans, their families, and all who serve our Nation, now and in the future. As Veterans Day approaches, we are continuing work to fulfill that pledge. The men and women of our Armed Forces put everything on the line for us. I am determined that we show the same resolve for them.

Remarks at the Human Rights Campaign Dinner

November 8, 1997

The President. Thank you. Well, you have just made me feel the way I did——

Audience member. We love you, Bill.

The President. Thank you. I sort of feel the way I did when I made my very first speech as a public official more than 20 years ago now. You know, Elizabeth just stood up here and gave that magnificent speech. Wasn't she great? [*Applause*] She actually said about everything that could be said. [*Laughter*] And then you gave me this wonderful welcome, which makes me reluctant to say anything. [*Laughter*]

And I was sitting up here—I was thinking, somehow flashing back to my mind, this reminded me of a Rotary Club banquet I spoke at once. [*Laughter*] And I'll tell you why. Here's what happened. Only the punch line is the same, but you'll have to listen to this.

I had just taken office as attorney general almost 21 years ago, and they asked me to speak to this Rotary Club banquet. And there were 500 people there. The dinner started at 6:30. I didn't get up to speak till a quarter to 10. [*Laughter*] Everybody that was at this banquet got introduced but three people, and they went home mad. [*Laughter*] The guy who got up to introduce me was so nervous he didn't know what to do. And we had been there forever, and he finally said—and he didn't mean it this way, but here's what he said, he said, in my introduction, he said, ''You know, we could have stopped here and have had a very nice evening.'' [*Laughter*] And we could have stopped with the applause and Elizabeth's speech and had a great evening.

I'm delighted to be here. I thank the Members of Congress who are here. I congratulate your honorees. I know that a number of my recent appointees are here, including Virginia Apuzzo, our new Assistant for Management and Administration, Fred Hochberg, John Berry, Jim Hormel—where's Jim Hormel? He's here—Jesse White, Hal Creel.

Now, Hal Creel is now the most popular person I have appointed, in the Congress, because the Maritime Commission broke the impasse on the Japanese ports, which destroys another stereotype here. I am so grateful for what they did, and a lot of Americans are going to have a decent income because of it, and I want to thank him for that.

We have a lot of people here from the White House, as well. I want to thank Richard Socarides, Marsha Scott, Karen Tramantano, Sean Maloney, Tom Shea, and our AIDS czar, Sandy Thurman, for all their work. And because it's dark here, I would like to ask everyone who works for this administration in any department of the Federal Government or who has an appointment in any way to please stand, including the White House. [*Applause*] Thank you.

A little more than 6 years ago, I had this crazy idea that I ought to run for President. [*Laughter*] Only my mother thought I could

win. [*Laughter*] And at the time, I was so obsessed with what I thought had to be done I thought winning would take care of itself. What bothered me was that our country seemed to be drifting and divided as we moved into a new and exciting and challenging area where we were living differently, working differently, relating to each other and the rest of the world in very different ways on the edge of a new century.

And I sat down alone before I decided to do this and asked myself, what is it that you want America to look like when you're done if you win? My vision for the 21st century—now, I have said hundreds and hundreds of times, but I still think about it every day—I want this to be a country where every child and every person who is responsible enough to work for it can live the American dream; I want this country to embrace the wider world and continue to be the strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity; and I want us to come together across all our lines of difference into one America. That is my vision. It drives me every day.

I think if we really could create a society where there is opportunity for all and responsibility from all and we believed in a community of all Americans, we could truly meet every problem we have and seize every opportunity we have.

For more than two centuries now, our country has had to meet challenge after challenge after challenge. We have had to continue to lift ourselves beyond what we thought America meant. Our ideals were never meant to be frozen in stone or time. Keep in mind, when we started out with Thomas Jefferson's credo that all of us are created equal by God, what that really meant in civic political terms was that you had to be white, you had to be male, and—that wasn't enough—you had to own property, which would have left my crowd out when I was a boy. [*Laughter*]

Over time, we have had to redefine the words that we started with, not because there was anything wrong with them and their universal power and strength of liberty and justice but because we were limited in our imaginations about how we could live and what we were capable of and how we should live. Indeed, the story of how we kept going higher and higher and higher to new and higher definitions and more meaningful definitions of equality and dignity and freedom is in its essence the fundamental story of our country.

Fifty years ago, President Truman stood at a new frontier in our defining struggle on civil rights. Slavery had ended a long time before but segregation remained. Harry Truman stood before the Lincoln Memorial and said, "It is more important today than ever to ensure that all Americans enjoy the rights of freedom and equality. When I say all Americans, I mean all Americans."

Well, my friends, all Americans still means all Americans. We all know that it is an ideal and not perfectly real now. We all know that some of the old kinds of discrimination we seek to rid ourselves of by law and purge our spirits of still exist in America today. We all know that there is continuing discrimination against gays and lesbians. But we also know that if we're ever going to build one America, then all Americans, including you and those whom you represent, have got to be a part of it.

To be sure, no President can grant rights. Our ideals and our history hold that they are inalienable, embedded in our Constitution, amplified over time by our courts and legislature. I cannot grant them, but I am bound by my oath of office and the burden of history to reaffirm them.

All America loses if we let prejudice and discrimination stifle the hopes or deny the potential of a single American. All America loses when any person is denied or forced out of a job because of sexual orientation. Being gay, the last time I thought about it, seemed to have nothing to do with the ability to read a balance book, fix a broken bone, or change a spark plug.

For generations, the American dream has represented a fundamental compact among our people. If you take responsibility and work hard, you have the right to achieve a better life for yourself and a better future for your family. Equal opportunity for all, special privileges for none, a fate shared by Americans regardless of political views. We believe, or we all say we believe, that all citizens should have the chance to rise as far as their God-given talents will take them.

What counts is energy and honesty and talent. No arbitrary distinctions should bar the way. So when we deny opportunity because of ancestry or religion, race or gender, disability, or sexual orientation, we break the compact. It is wrong, and it should be illegal.

Once again, I call upon Congress to honor our most cherished principles and make the ''Employment Non-Discrimination Act'' the law of the land.

I also come here tonight to ask you for another favor. Protecting the civil rights of all Americans——

Audience member. People with AIDS are dying!

Audience members. Sit down!

The President. Wait, wait, wait. I would have been disappointed if you hadn't been here tonight. I'm kind of used to this. People with AIDS are dying. But since I've become President we're spending 10 times as much per fatality on people with AIDS as people with breast cancer or prostate cancer. And the drugs are being approved more quickly. And a lot of people are living normal lives. We just have to keep working on it.

I thank you, but this, too, is part of what makes America great. We all have our say, and nobody has to be afraid when he or she screams at the President. [*Laughter*] That's a good thing. That's a good thing. And at a time when so many people feel their voices will never be heard, that's a good thing.

Audience member. [*Inaudible*]

Audience members. Boo-o-o!

The President. What is not a good thing, however, is when people believe their free speech rights trump yours. That's not good. That's not.

Now, I want to ask you for a favor. You want us to pass the ''Employment Non-Discrimination Act.'' You know when we do—and I believe it will pass—you know when we do it will have to be enforced. A law on the books only works if it is also a law in the life of America.

Let me say, I thank you very much for your support of my nominee for the office of civil rights, Bill Lee. I thank you for that. But he, too, comes from a family that has known discrimination, and now he is being discriminated against, not because there is anything wrong with his qualifications, not because anybody believes he is not even-tempered but because some Members of the Senate disagree with his views on affirmative action.

Now, if I have to appoint a head of the office of civil rights who is against affirmative action—[*laughter*]—it's going to be vacant a long time. [*Laughter*] That office is not there to advocate or promote—primarily to advocate or promote the policies of the Government when it comes to affirmative action; it's there to enforce the existing laws against discrimination. You hope someday you will have one of those existing laws. We need somebody to enforce the laws, and Bill Lee should be confirmed, and I ask you to help me to get him confirmed.

I'd like to say just one more word. There are some people who aren't in this room tonight who aren't comfortable yet with you and won't be comfortable with me for being here.

Audience members. We love you, Bill!

The President. Wait a minute. This is serious. On issue after issue involving gays and lesbians, survey after survey shows that the most important determinant of people's attitudes is whether they are aware—whether they knowingly have had a family or a friendship or a work relation with a gay person.

Now, I hope that we will embrace good people who are trying to overcome their fears. After all, all of us can look back in history and see what the right thing to do was. It is quite another thing to look ahead and light the way. Most people are preoccupied with the burdens of daily living. Most of us, as we grow older, become—whether we like it or not—somewhat more limited in our imaginations. So I think one of the greatest things we have to do still is just to increase the ability of Americans who do not yet know that gays and lesbians are their fellow Americans in every sense of the word to feel that way. I think it's very important.

When I say I believe all Americans means all Americans, I see the faces of the friends of 35 years. When I say all Americans means all Americans, I see the faces of the people who stood up when I asked the people who are part of our administration to stand tonight. When I say all Americans means all

Americans, I see kind, unbelievably generous, giving people back in my home State who helped my family and my friends when they were in need. It is a different story when you know what you are seeing.

So I say to you tonight, should we change the law? You bet. Should we keep fighting discrimination? Absolutely. Is this Hate Crimes Conference important? It is terribly important. But we have to broaden the imagination of America. We are redefining, in practical terms, the immutable ideals that have guided us from the beginning. Again I say, we have to make sure that for every single person in our country, all Americans means all Americans.

After experiencing the horrors of the Civil War and witnessing the transformation of the previous century, Walt Whitman said that our greatest strength was that we are an embracing nation. In his words, a ''Union, holding all, fusing, absorbing, tolerating all.'' Let us move forward in the spirit of that one America. Let us realize that this is a good obligation that has been imposed upon our generation and a grand opportunity once again to lift America to a higher level of unity, once again to redefine and to strengthen and to ensure one America for a new century and a new generation of our precious children.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:52 p.m. in the Independence Ballroom at the Grand Hyatt Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Elizabeth Birch, executive director, Human Rights Campaign; Jesse L. White, Jr., Federal Cochair, Appalachian Regional Commission; and recent nominees, Fred P. Hochberg to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration, John Berry to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and James C. Hormel to be Ambassador to Luxembourg.

Interview With Tim Russert of "Meet the Press"

November 9, 1997

Mr. Russert. Mr. President, welcome to ''Meet the Press,'' and thank you for helping us celebrate the 50th anniversary.

The President. Glad to be here, Tim.

Situation in Iraq

Mr. Russert. The situation in Iraq seems to grow more and more tense. As we sit here tonight and talk, the Deputy Prime Minister has said that if the United States resumes spy flights over Iraq, they will be shot down. If Saddam Hussein was sitting right here in this seat, you would look him in the eye and say what?

The President. Those flights are United Nations flights, even though they're American pilots in those planes, and you cannot dictate to the United Nations what we do. They will resume, and if you shoot at them, you'll be making a big mistake.

Mr. Russert. If a plane is shot down by the Iraqis, will that be considered an act of war by the United States?

The President. I believe that's how the Pentagon characterized it. I think the important thing is that Saddam Hussein needs to know it would be a big mistake. We will not tolerate his efforts to murder our pilots acting on behalf of the United Nations under United Nations Security Council resolutions.

Listen, all that man has to do is to let the monitors go back to doing their job. I think it's important that the American people understand what these monitors are doing. People read this word ''UNSCOM'' in the paper, and they don't know—you know, it sounds like a bad cold or something. These monitors have been there working since the end of the Gulf war to look for weapons of mass destruction or materials used to make weapons of mass destruction.

They have found and destroyed more weapons capacity, the monitors have, than were destroyed in the entire Gulf war, which shows you that Saddam Hussein has not stopped trying to develop this capacity. After all, keep in mind, this is a man who used chemical weapons on the Iranians; he used chemical weapons on his own people. And what they're doing there is terribly important. We do not want him to have chemical or biological weapons capacity. We believe he has the latent capacity to produce more Scud missiles. And we all remember how he aimed the Scuds at Israel during the Gulf war.

So what they're doing is terribly important. And he needs to let them go back and do

their job. None of us are going to be bullied by him.

Mr. Russert. Have you ever met him?

The President. Never.

Mr. Russert. Do you have any intentions of meeting him?

The President. No.

Mr. Russert. If, in fact, the Iraqis are able to keep the American inspectors away from their biological warfare, aren't they succeeding?

The President. Well, that's a different question. The group that we sent over there, the U.N. sent over there to talk to Saddam Hussein, is coming back. They're going to make their report. Then I expect the United Nations to take very strong and unambiguous action to make it perfectly clear that he has to comply.

Now, in the past, we've been able to work these things out. We've been up to this point before and been able to work them out. If he doesn't, then the world community will have to take some action.

Mr. Russert. Will the Russians and the French and the Arab nations support the United States?

The President. Well, what I would hope they would do is support the United Nations. The Russians and the French and the Arab States have a huge stake in not allowing him to develop and deploy weapons of mass destruction. What if he has a missile with the capacity to reach to Europe?

Mr. Russert. Many people are suggesting what he's really up to is to try to provoke an attack by the United States, a Tomahawk missile attack; then he would kick all the inspectors out and go right back to accelerating his campaign of building weapons of mass destruction.

The President. That may be. He may be trying to divide the coalition as well, with the promise that he'll sell oil at good prices and make money for other countries. But so far, I have to tell you, I've been impressed with the unity of the world community. I think that he picked a peculiar way to try to divide the coalition. He seems to be frustrated that the sanctions haven't been lifted. But all he has to do is to allow the inspectors to do their job and quit trying to stockpile the ability to make these weapons of mass destruction. That's all he's got to do.

Mr. Russert. We will never have normal relations with Iraq as long as Saddam Hussein is there?

The President. We will never have normal relations with Iraq as long as Iraq is out of compliance with these basic resolutions of the United Nations. Now, it appears that Saddam Hussein has had several years since the Gulf war to put his country in compliance, and he has declined to do so.

Mr. Russert. Do you think there will be the need for military strike?

The President. I don't want to rule anything in or out. I think it's—at a moment like this it's very important that the President maintain all options and signal none. And that's where I want to be. But I think that Saddam Hussein needs to understand that this is a serious business. And this is not just the President of the United States; the American people feel this way. And it's not just the American people; it's the world community.

There is a United Nations resolution that says that he has to permit inspectors to look into what he's doing to make sure he doesn't again develop the capacity to make and deploy weapons of mass destruction. He's one of the few people who's done it and used it. And we all have an interest in stopping him.

Mr. Russert. And he will comply eventually?

The President. He will comply eventually or we'll have to see what happens then. It will not be without consequence if he does not comply.

China and Cuba

Mr. Russert. You met last week with the President of China, a country of 1.5 billion people, 7,000 miles away. Why is it that we meet with the President of China and trade with China but don't meet with the President of Cuba, 90 miles away, a country of 10 million people? Other than the size of the economic market, are there any differences between the two systems?

The President. Oh, yes, I think there are plainly some. For one thing, the Chinese have shown a willingness to not only engage

us but to open up and to work with us. Of course, we have differences with both China and Cuba on human rights and on their political system.

But if you just look at the—what happened in the last meeting with President Jiang and myself. We said, first of all, we're going to try to work together and establish cooperation, not conflict, as the model for U.S.-China relations in the 21st century. China agreed to cooperate with us in nuclear matters and to stop transfer of nuclear technologies to dangerous states. China agreed to work with us aggressively to try to solve the problem on the Korean Peninsula. China has agreed to an energy and environmental endeavor with us, which is very important in our effort to limit greenhouse gases globally. And for people who are concerned about human rights, China agreed to continue to work with us in developing rule of law systems, which eventually will clearly lead to the protection of individual rights, not just economic rights but other rights as well. So we've got this ongoing relationship.

That's what I wanted to do with Cuba. And when I became President, we had the Cuba Democracy Act, which passed before I took office, but I supported it. And it enabled the President not only to have a tougher economic embargo but also to open up with Cuba, to have a gradually evolving relationship. And I was working on that until they illegally shot those two planes down and basically murdered those people that were in those two planes, which led the Congress to pass the present law.

So we're at an impasse now. I still want that kind of relationship with Cuba. But we have to have some kind of indication that there will be an opening up, a movement toward democracy and openness and freedom if we're going to do that. And I don't have that indication today.

Mr. Russert. Do you expect to get anything like that from Fidel Castro as long as he's there?

The President. I'm not sure. We get mixed signals from time to time. And he's a highly intelligent man. And I know he spends a lot of time thinking about the future. So I wish it could be different than it is. But we have to have some basis for opening. It can't be a one-way street; there has to be some sense that there's an evolution going on in Cuba, and it can turn into a modern state.

Keep in mind, it is now the only country in our entire hemisphere that is not a democracy. And that is a very significant thing.

Fast-Track Trade Legislation

Mr. Russert. Let me turn to another issue confronting our hemisphere, fast-track trade authority. A critical vote tomorrow, Sunday, in the House of Representatives, whether or not the President of the United States should have the unilateral ability to negotiate trade deals throughout our hemisphere. Right now you have less than one out of three Democratic votes in the House. Are you going to win that vote?

The President. I'm not sure yet. It's close, and we're working very hard. I worked very late the last several nights. I've been working on this for weeks. I worked on it today. And I'll be working on it when we finish our interview, and I imagine right up to voting time. On the other side, the Speaker is working hard to try to get the requisite votes from the Republicans.

It's a difficult issue in the House. In the Senate, we had a bipartisan majority in both caucuses; both the Democrats and the Republicans voted for it. Among the Governors, virtually every Democratic Governor, virtually every Democratic mayor is for it. But the House Members, to be fair to them, they feel the pressure of a lot of the changes that are happening in this economy. And I think when plants close down, there's an automatic assumption sometimes that it's because of trade, whether it is or not. And I think that they feel the pressure, particularly, on both sides more than most. And it's tough for them.

But I think the right thing for America is to continue to tear down the trade barriers and sell more American products, to try to lift up labor and environmental standards abroad. And then, when people are dislocated here, if they lose their job from technology or people don't buy the products anymore or trade, whatever the reason is, we need to do more, more quickly for them. And I tried to put in place those kinds of systems.

So I think we've had a balanced approach, and I hope we can persuade a majority of the House tomorrow that that's the right approach.

Mr. Russert. Many Democrats took umbrage when you said the vote was a no-brainer and that if it was a secret ballot, it would pass easily; that perhaps special interests like big labor were forcing them to vote publicly other than the way they felt privately.

The President. No, I didn't say the last. What I said was that I thought, in terms of pure economics, if you look at the last 5 years, where we've had 13½ million jobs, we've got the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years, we've negotiated over 200 trade agreements, and a third of our growth has come from tearing down barriers, I do think economically, for the country as a whole, it's a no-brainer. On the secret ballot issue, I'm simply repeating what several House Members said to me.

But to be fair, they feel—on every critical vote, Members of Congress feel political pressures that may or may not reflect the larger economic realities of the country. And I'm sure that that's no different than it was on a lot of the other tough votes we've had in the past. This is not a question of character; it's a question of judgment. And I think that the right judgment is to give the President the authority to continue to tear down those trade barriers.

Mr. Russert. Now, the leader of the Democrats in the House, Dick Gephardt, opposes you on this. He said yesterday, ''Please, Mr. President, don't trade Democratic values for Republican votes,'' specifically saying, ''Will you reduce or cut funding for family planning across the world in order to win votes.'' Will you?

The President. No.

Mr. Russert. Not at all?

The President. No. We're not going to trade a matter of principle on the Mexico City issue to carry fast track. If we can't get the votes without that, then we'll have to regroup and try to figure out some other way to go forward with fast track, either next week or when Congress resumes.

I have tried my best in working at this to build a bipartisan coalition on every major issue that did not ask either the Republicans or the Democrats to give up their principles. So we have kept separate our negotiations on the census, for example, and our negotiation on the so-called Mexico City language from the trade negotiations.

We have offered a number of compromises that we thought were principled, where the Democrats who disagree with the Republicans could save our principles, and they could save theirs, where we could both be moving forward. So far we haven't succeeded. We're still working at it.

Taxes

Mr. Russert. Let me turn to the issue of taxes. The Republicans say the solution is either a flat tax or a national sales tax. Are you prepared to embrace either of those ideas?

The President. Not tonight. And let me say why. On the flat tax, it has enormous appeal to average people, because they wouldn't have to—the idea is, even if they lost all—especially if they lost all their deductions but paid a lower rate, that they'd never have to have anybody help them fill out their taxes again, nor would they ever have to worry about whether they were in compliance with the Internal Revenue Service laws and regulations again.

The difficulty there is I have never seen a flat tax proposal that was revenue neutral, that is, that kept the balanced budget we've worked so hard for now, that didn't impose higher taxes on people with incomes below $100,000, and that's most Americans, and that's not fair.

With the national sales tax, my concern is that, if you shifted to a national sales tax, it would raise the price of all products dramatically. And we don't know what that would do to inflation in America. We don't know whether it could be done without any kind of destructive economic consequences. Also, we don't know whether that wouldn't be much more regressive for people in the middle and lower income working groups.

Gay Rights

Mr. Russert. Let me turn to a cultural issue. Tonight you will be attending a gay rights dinner, the first sitting President in the

history of the country to do so. What statement are you trying to make?

The President. Well, Tim, you know, I grew up in the segregated South in the forties and fifties. And all my life, from the time I was a child, I was taught and I have believed that every person in this country, no matter what their differences are, in their lifestyle or their race or their religion, if they obey the law, show up for work every day or show up for school, if they're good citizens, they ought to be treated with respect and dignity and equality. And they should be subject to no discrimination in the things that we all have to have access to, like education and a job and health care. What I'm trying to do is to continue to move that forward.

I know this is a difficult issue for a lot of Americans. I know that particularly for Americans who've never known anyone who was gay or lesbian personally, it's an issue that often arouses discomfort. But I think it's the right thing to do. I think we have to keep working until we say for everybody, the only test should be: Are you a law-abiding, hard-working citizen, do you do the things we require of all citizens. If you do, you should be subject to no discrimination, and you ought to be part of the family of America. That's what I believe. And if my presence there tonight advances that goal, then that's a good thing.

Mr. Russert. Do you believe that homosexuality should be taught in schools as an acceptable alternative lifestyle?

The President. No, I don't think it should be advocated. I don't think it should be part of the public school curriculum.

But on the other hand, I don't believe that anyone should teach schoolchildren that they should hate or discriminate against or be afraid of people who are homosexuals. That is the real issue. The real issue is the one that we're going to take up next week at the White House with the Hate Crimes Conference. We're going to have the first Hate Crimes Conference ever at the White House next week. And we're going to deal with that, not only against homosexuals but against other groups of Americans.

I don't believe that we should be in the business of ratifying or validating or politicizing the issue. I think the real problem in America is still continuing discrimination and fear and downright misunderstanding.

Mr. Russert. Now, Vice President Gore caused a stir when he said that Ellen, the TV star who will be honored tonight at the dinner—he said, quote, ''millions of Americans were forced to look at sexual orientation in an open light.'' Was Vice President Gore correct?

The President. Well, I think when she did that on television, and you got to see the interplay with her family and her friends who were not homosexual, you got to see all that—I think for many Americans who themselves had never had a personal experience, never had a friend or a family member who's a homosexual, it did give them a chance to see it in a new light. So I think he was accurate about that.

My experience in life—all I can tell you is what my experience is—and I'm not talking about as President, I'm talking about as a citizen now, as a person—is that most people's attitudes about how homosexuals should be treated really are determined more than anything else based on whether they have ever known someone who is homosexual. Now, whether most people's attitudes about whether the lifestyle should be condoned or condemned is a function, perhaps, of their religious training. But we're not talking about people's religious convictions here. We're talking about how people in the public arena, as citizens, should be treated in terms of their right to education, to jobs, to housing, and to be treated free of discrimination. And that is the agenda that I want to further for all Americans. And that is what I think we ought to be focusing on.

Administration Accomplishments

Mr. Russert. In preparing for this interview, we went out and talked to thousands of American viewers, voters, with a poll, and we asked some interesting questions. The first was, what do you think the best accomplishments were of the Clinton administration.

And let me show it to you on the screen and—going to read from there: protecting Medicare and education, 30 percent; improving economy and creating jobs, 23; keeping

the U.S. at peace, 13; balancing the budget, 13.

Would you agree with that list?

The President. That's a pretty good list. I think the—what I've tried to do is to give the American people the confidence that if we follow the right policies and we all do the right things, we can make America work again, and we can actually prepare our country for the 21st century.

So I think the economy is an important accomplishment. I think the role we played in contributing to the declining crime rate, the role we played in moving people off welfare into work, and the role we played passionately in not only protecting Medicare and education but trying to reform Medicare and trying to improve the quality of education and the access of all Americans to college, I think those will be some enduring legacies of the administration.

Stock Market

Mr. Russert. Are you worried about the roller-coaster stock market?

The President. No. The market, by definition, goes up and down. And we've been very blessed in America to have strong financial markets and to have good, strong underlying institutions. And the market was, I think, 3,200 the day I took office. So I think most Americans are well pleased with where it is now compared to where it was 5 years ago.

Administration Failures

Mr. Russert. Let's look at the bad news, the failures of the Clinton administration, and put them up on the screen here for you: diminishing the Presidency because of ethical problems, 29 percent; not addressing Social Security and Medicare long term, 27 percent.

On the first one, Mr. President, as you know, many people concerned about campaign finance and how your campaign was funded and so forth, we have a situation now where 31 people have pleaded the fifth amendment, 11 people have fled the country. Are you at this point willing to acknowledge that there was at least too much excessiveness in the fundraising on behalf of your election?

The President. Well, what appears to have happened is that there were people who gave money to the Democratic Party who were not legally entitled to give money to the party. Now, as far as I know, when the leaders of the party found out about it, when I found out about, we spent several million dollars doing a review and gave back all the money that we knew of that was not properly accepted.

Mr. Russert. About $3 million.

The President. It was a mistake to accept it. And what we've been trying to determine is whether we could have known—whether the party people could have known, if they'd done the right reviews in the first place. And I think some of them, they could have been known. And I think that was a mistake. But I said that back in 1996, before the election, we have to take responsibility, all of us, including me, for not having in place the kind of reviews that would have protected against that kind of problem.

Now, however, I generally disagree with that. I think that this administration, when the history books are written and people look back at it, the public will have a very different opinion when they read the history about the ethical performance of this administration. In the moment, once you're accused and hearings are held, a certain percentage will think that you must have done something wrong personally or tolerated people doing something wrong, and I don't believe that's the case.

On the other issue, I agree with that. I think that one of our agenda is that we still have to address the long-term problems of Social Security and Medicare for when the baby boomers retire, so that the Social Security and Medicare will be there for them without overburdening their children who are attempting to raise their grandchildren. I think that's very important.

Campaign Financing

Mr. Russert. Let me get to Social Security in one second, but ask a followup on the campaign finance. People like Johnny Chung, Charlie Trie, John Huang have become household names in many ways. Do you think that they should come back to the United States and not take the fifth amendment and voluntarily tell you and the country everthing

they know so we can be certain, and particularly you as Commander in Chief, that our national security was not compromised?

The President. When I asked President Jiang about that, you know, the question about was the Chinese Government involved, which was a question that was raised, he emphatically denied to me personally that their government had tried to do anything to influence the outcome of this election. And he said that he would cooperate with that. Of course, I have encouraged everybody to cooperate with the investigators. I think everyone should. So that's my position for those gentlemen and for everybody else. I think we ought to get to the bottom of it.

But let met say, one thing that Senator Fred Thompson said that I really agree with, is that he said he hoped that his hearings, before he shut them down, would lead to reforming the system. And you know, before you had this job, you used to work for people who were elected officials, and I think that you will at least acknowledge there's something to the point that people don't go out and raise money because they want to, and then they find things to throw the money at. People raise money because they think they have to raise the money to buy access to communications with the public, and the cost of campaigns has been going up.

Now, what I favor is the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform bill, trying to control the amount of contributions and limit expenditures. And then I think we have to have access in the media to either free or reduced air time to people who observe these limits. I think we've got to have both if we're going to have real campaign finance reform.

Mr. Russert. The other complaint, raised by Common Cause, particularly, and others, is that you received $75 million in public funding for the Presidential race but then went out and raised $50 million in so-called soft money, largely corporate money, and bought TV ads all across the country, which brought your popularity ratings up considerably. And people said, that's inappropriate, you really did push through a huge loophole and use big corporate money to pay for TV ads designed and controlled by you, in effect, and that's what helped get you elected.

The President. But keep in mind what the money did at first. Those ads were designed to put forward the Democratic Party's position against the Republican majority, the new Republican majority in Congress and their attempt to implement the contract on America. They benefited me, and they benefited all Democrats because people agreed with what we wanted to do as compared with what was being done there. And they lifted the party as a whole.

The law basically says that you can't do anything that solely benefits you or any other particular candidate. I refused to let any ad run until it had advance clearance from the lawyer for the Democratic Party. And presumably Senator Dole did the same thing when the Republican Party did that. And presumably they got clearance even before they ran ads that affected only one congressional seat up in Staten Island, $800,000 of them.

Should we limit the soft money expenditures? Yes, we should. How can we do it? Only if we're prepared to change the law. Otherwise, there's too much experience where one candidate, who's a good candidate with no money, is blown away because the other candidate that has a lot of money has the only access to the voters. That's what this is about. If we get another kind of access to the voters—let me just ask you to do this some day. One of the things I'd like to see you do here one Sunday is analyze the last British election, for example, and look at the television time that was given to Tony Blair in Labour and John Major in the Conservatives. See how they used it. See whether or not it wasn't more enlightening for the voters. See, if we had the right kind of campaign finance reform, how we could cut the cost and elevate the level of the debate in a way that I think would increase voter turnout and confidence in the system.

I acknowledge that we all have played a role in bringing down voter confidence. But it's the only system that's out there, and if you don't try to get your communication out and the other side does, they will prevail nearly every time.

1996 Campaign

Mr. Russert. Would you acknowledge the ads were pro-Clinton and anti-Dole?

The President. Yes, because—but it was only because—first of all, they should have been pro-Clinton because the Democratic leaders in Congress and I were trying to put our position out against the Republican contract on America. And Senator Dole and Speaker Gingrich were the leaders of the contract side. But at least they furthered the debate on the great national issues before Congress at the time. The Republican ads were even more specific. I never ran an ad, for example, on my upbringing or anything like that.

But as I said, to the best of my knowledge, every ad the Republicans ran was approved by their lawyers. I know every ad we did was approved in advance. The answer is to change the system. We wouldn't have this sort of thing if there was ample access for honest, open debate and communication. Once you've talked to the voters, and they've heard your side, and they've heard the other side in a free and open way, then you don't have the incentive for all this.

Democratic Party

Mr. Russert. The state of the Democratic Party—as you mentioned, the open House seat in Staten Island, the Republicans won. The Republicans won the mayoralties in New York and Los Angeles, the two largest cities; the Governorships in New Jersey and Virginia. In the last 4 years, since you've been head of the Democratic Party, titular head of the Democratic Party, 20 percent of the Democratic Congressmen are gone, 20 percent of the Senators, 38 percent of the Democratic Governors have lost. What is wrong with the Democratic Party?

The President. Well, I think it's going through a period of transition, and I think it will come out stronger.

Now, you should say, to make full disclosure, that every one of those Republican election victories you just mentioned was in a seat already held by a Republican and, in every case but one, by the incumbent who won.

Mr. Russert. Fair enough.

The President. And that we nearly won a race in New Jersey which no one in the world thought we had a chance to win.

Mr. Russert. But the House and Senate and Governorships were all incumbent Democrats.

The President. No, some of them were—some of them quit and the open seats went to Republicans. I think the biggest problem we've had in the Senate is people leaving. If in the last 4 years four Senators had stayed, we'd have 49 Senators, and we'd be virtually even. Same thing in the House. A number of our House seats were people leaving.

But the House seats we lost in '94, I think, were because we were successfully attacked for the economic plan. The Republicans were able to convince people it was a big tax plan on them when it wasn't, and they haven't felt the benefits, and because we failed to reform health care, something I really regret. And that's partly my responsibility.

Entitlement Programs

Mr. Russert. Before we take a break—you mentioned Social Security and Medicare; Medicare goes broke in the year 2001, Social Security has a deficit 2012. Will President Bill Clinton, in the final 3 years of his Presidency, move to restructure Medicare and Social Security in a way that may in fact raise retirement age, increase premiums, perhaps even reduce benefits in order to make it safe for people in my generation?

The President. First, let's say—Medicare does not now go broke in 2001; it's got 12 years on the life of it now. We have more prevention, more choices, and more cost controls in the Medicare reform program that's part of the balanced budget. So it doesn't go broke now in 2001. Social Security is in better shape because of the declining inflation.

But do we have to have a longer term reform for Social Security and Medicare, and should it occur before I leave office? The answer to both those questions is yes.

Mr. Russert. Many believe that Richard Nixon went to China—he was the fervent anti-Communist who could make that deal. It's going to take Democrat Bill Clinton to really make tough decisions and say, "We have to raise retirement age. We have to raise

premiums. We have to reduce benefits for the next generation.'' Are you willing to do that?

The President. I'm willing to do what it takes to preserve and protect Social Security for the next generation and for the people who have to have it in this generation and also for Medicare. We've got a Medicare commission that's about to be appointed by the Congress and by the President, and I think together we're going to come up with a good bipartisan solution on that. And then we'll have to take on Social Security.

I think it is a mistake for me right now to advocate various specific reforms because if it prejudges the work of the commission, it will make it more difficult for them to do it and then for us to pass it in a bipartisan way. But I'm willing to take the hard decisions necessary to preserve both of these programs so they'll be available to people, and they'll work for people, and they'll keep America coming together. I think it's terribly important, a big part of the agenda for the next century.

Mr. Russert. We have to take a quick break. We'll be right back with more of our conversation from President Bill Clinton on the 50th anniversary of ''Meet the Press'' right after this.

[*At this point, the network took a commercial break.*]

Investigations

Mr. Russert. We're back, talking to President Clinton. All the allegations against you, the Whitewater, the lawsuit, Travelgate, coffees, sleepovers, on and on—your favorable rating is still near 60 percent. Are you, not Ronald Reagan, the true Teflon President?

The President. I think down deep inside people are fair-minded, first of all, and they know there is a difference in somebody making a charge against you and having it be true. Secondly, and more importantly, what I've tried to do as President is to cooperate with any investigation, answer any question, but save most of my time and energy, not for defending myself but for working for the American people.

My whole theory is, if the American people are doing better, then everything else is going to come out all right. And that's what we work on. That's sort of our credo at the White House. Don't think about ourselves; think about the American people. Try to move the ball forward every day. Try to make sure when we're done the American people are better off than they were when we started.

The President and the Press

Mr. Russert. Your attitudes towards the press. Your Press Secretary, Mike McCurry, said something interesting——

The President. I couldn't believe he said that.

Mr. Russert. I want to show it to you on the screen and get your reaction.

The President. I couldn't believe he said that.

Mr. Russert. The President, quote, ''refuses to believe the press does the things that they do only because of happenstance. He's just convinced there is some general global conspiracy out to ruin his life and make him miserable.''

The President. He must have been tongue in cheek when he said that. He couldn't have been serious when he said that.

Mr. Russert. Do you think we do a good job? Have we been fair to you?

The President. On balance, yes. I think—first of all, I don't think there has ever been a President of either party and any philosophy that didn't think that he should have gotten a better press. So that just goes with the territory. I think there have been rather dramatic changes in press coverage over the last 20 years, particularly in the Washington press, which bear some examination and evaluation by those of you who are in the press. But I don't think that the President gets anywhere by making any comments on the press.

I believe in the first amendment. When President Jiang of China was here, I was pushing freedom of the press with him. And I said that it would be hard to find anybody that had been beat up much more than I have in the press, but I still thought the country was stronger when we were free to speak. I raised the freedom of press issues when I was in Latin America recently.

I think it's one of the best things about this country. And how it should be done and

whether it's being done in the most responsible and effective way can only be determined by members of the press themselves in our system, because that's the only way you can keep it free.

I don't hate all the press and all that business. I think Mike was a little tongue in cheek there.

President's Place in History

Mr. Russert. George Washington, the American Revolution; Abraham Lincoln, the Civil War; Franklin Roosevelt, World War II; Ronald Reagan, the cold war: What will be Bill Clinton's legacy, absent a war? And, two, are Presidents as consequential now as they were before the end of the cold war?

The President. Oh, yes. I think they are but in different ways. First, I think a President's legacy is ultimately determined by—after he's gone from office, and maybe after he's gone from this Earth, when people can read all the records and see the real significance of what happened with the benefit of hindsight and without any prejudice for or against.

I can tell you, when I came to this office, I ran because I thought this was a profoundly important time in our history, moving into a new era and a new century, changes in the way we work and live and relate to each other, relate to the rest of the world. And I had a vision for what I wanted America to look like when I left office. I wanted this to be a country where there was opportunity for every person responsible enough to work for it, where our country was still the leading nation for peace and freedom and prosperity, and where, with all these differences we've got, we're still coming together as one America. That's my vision. I hope someday some scholar will say it was my legacy.

Mr. Russert. Kennedy had the Cuban Missile Crisis. LBJ had civil rights. Bill Clinton has what?

President's Future

The President. He had to make America work in a new world. We had to relate to a global economy, a global society. I think that's what I'll be judged on: Did I help America transform itself so that we would still be the greatest nation in the world in a global economy, a global society with the most diffuse and different population, diverse population in our history?

Mr. Russert. We asked our people across the country what you would do when you left office at the ripe old age of 54, and this is what they said. They volunteered—50 percent, you give speeches and work for causes, pretty much like former Presidents; 15 percent said go into private business; 14 percent said teach at a university; 13 percent said run for another office. Will Bill Clinton ever run for another office?

The President. I don't know. I might run for the school board someday.

Mr. Russert. But not the U.S. Senate?

The President. I don't think so.

Mr. Russert. How about the Supreme Court?

The President. I don't think so. I'm a little bit too much of an activist. I love studying the law, and I used to be a law professor, you know, and I taught constitutional law——

Mr. Russert. And William Howard Taft went from the Presidency——

The President. He did.

Mr. Russert. ——to chief judge of the Supreme Court.

The President. He did. But I think I'm a little too active for it. And I think the—I might like to do everything that was on that list in some form or fashion. What I want to do is to be useful to my country, to advance the causes of peace that I've worked for around the world, whether it's in Ireland or the Middle East or Bosnia. I want to help build these structures to deal with terrorism and environmental crises and all of that. I want to help children realize their potential if they're forgotten here at home or abroad.

But I don't want to be underfoot. I don't want to be under some President's foot. If I can help my country and if a President wants to ask me to help, I'll show up and do it.

Mr. Russert. But you might run for office?

The President. I might like to be on the school board someday——

Popular Perception of the President

Mr. Russert. Let me show one last graphic up here, and this is a fun one. We asked,

what is the image you have of Bill Clinton? Forty-two percent said playing the saxophone; 40 percent, running in jogging shorts; 7 percent, playing golf; 6 percent, eating at McDonald's.

The President. It's funny, I haven't eaten at McDonald's a single time since I've been President. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Russert. But playing golf. How many mulligans do you take in the average 18 holes?

The President. One now.

Mr. Russert. One mulligan?

The President. Yes.

Mr. Russert. And what's your handicap?

The President. Twelve, thirteen, something like that. I'm playing—it's better than it was when I became President, mostly because I've gotten to play with a lot of good golfers, and they've taught me a lot.

Mr. Russert. Mr. President, we have to take another quick break. We'll be right back with more of "Meet the Press" right after this.

[*The network took a commercial break.*]

Retrospective

Mr. Russert. Fifty years ago this week, November 6, 1947, NBC's "Meet the Press" first traveled the airwaves. For a half-century it has presented interviews with the top U.S. and international leaders, questioned by many of the Nation's best journalists. This morning we will salute all the outstanding individuals who have made "Meet the Press" the longest running television program in the world. And we offer this look back at 50 years of history in the making, just some of the more than 2,500 programs that offered viewers across America a weekly window to the world.

[*A videotape of highlights from the first 50 years of "Meet the Press" was shown.*]

Running for the Presidency

Mr. Russert. Mr. President, was it a dream for someone from Hope, Arkansas, to join that galaxy of international leaders?

The President. It was an amazing review of the last 50 years and it seems impossible sometimes that I was part of it, but I'm very grateful for the chance I've had to serve, and I'm grateful, frankly, for the program that you and your network have put on for 50 years. I relived a lot of my own life and the life of our Nation and the world looking at that. You should be very proud of that.

Mr. Russert. In May of 1991 Bill Clinton was on "Meet the Press"—[*laughter*]—and asked about the '92 election. Let's take a look.

The President. What did I say?

[*A videotape excerpt of the May 1991 broadcast was shown.*]

"Q. Deep inside, do you think there is a good chance that a Democratic candidate could win the White House?

"Governor Clinton. No.

"Q. Not a chance but a good chance.

"Governor Clinton. Today? No. A year and a half from now? Maybe."

The President. That's a good brief answer.

Mr. Russert. You won.

The President. I did.

Mr. Russert. But back in May of '91 you weren't so sure.

The President. No, and I hadn't even decided to run then. And when I did decide to run, I think my mother was the only person who thought I had a chance to win. But that's the miracle of the American system. The thing that we have in Presidential campaigns, if you become the nominee, is that everybody hears your message.

Mr. Russert. When you first started running in '92, was it kind of a trial run for '96, and——

The President. Oh, no.

Mr. Russert. You really thought you could win?

The President Absolutely. I had—what I think is most important, if you run for President, is you have to know what you want to do if you win. You have to have a passionate desire to change the direction of the country, and I did. I had some very definite ideas, and so I thought, I'm going to do this because I think it's important. If I win, fine. If I don't, I'll be proud I tried.

Mr. Russert. Before you go, Mr. President, we have compiled a book, "Fifty Years of History in the Making: Meet the Press," in which you are prominently mentioned as

the third sitting President to join us on ''Meet the Press.''

The President. Great.

Mr. Russert. We thank you for celebrating our 50 years——

The President. Thank you.

Mr. Russert. ——and welcome you back anytime.

The President. I've got one for you, too.

Mr. Russert. Oh, no.

The President. The new book on the Buffalo Bills.

Mr. Russert. Oh, God, here it is.

The President. Signed by the author.

Mr. Russert. And I have promised I will remain moderator of ''Meet the Press'' until the Buffalo Bills win the Super Bowl, which means I'm going to be here a very long time.

The President. You'll still look very young.

Mr. Russert. President Bill Clinton, thank you very much for joining us.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview was recorded at 7:30 p.m. on November 8 at the NBC Studios for broadcast at 10:30 a.m. on November 9. In his remarks, the President referred to President Saddam Hussein of Iraq; President Jiang Zemin of China; President Fidel Castro of Cuba; and actress Ellen DeGeneres. The President also referred to the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM).

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Major Narcotics Producing and Transit Countries

November 9, 1997

Dear Mr. Chairman: (Dear Ranking Member:)

In accordance with the provisions of section 490(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (FAA), as amended, I have determined that the following countries are major illicit drug-producing or drug-transit countries: Afghanistan, Aruba, The Bahamas, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Hong Kong, India, Iran, Jamaica, Laos, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Taiwan, Thailand, Venezuela, and Vietnam. These countries have been selected on the basis of information from the March 1, 1997, International Narcotics Control Strategy Report and from other U.S. Government sources.

This year, I have removed Lebanon and Syria from the list. Both countries were placed on the majors list ten years ago on the basis of important, illicit opium cultivation in Lebanon's Beka'a Valley, a region under the control of Syrian occupation forces. Evidence that Syrian troops at the time were protecting and facilitating drug cultivation, production, and transportation led to the inclusion of Syria on the list beginning in 1992, however, Lebanon and Syria jointly began a campaign to eradicate the more than 3,400 hectares of Beka'a Valley opium poppy cultivation.

This effort has been effective, since U.S. Government surveys have detected no current opium poppy cultivation. Though both countries are transit areas for South American cocaine, and small laboratories in Lebanon reportedly refine Southwest Asian opium into heroin destined for Europe and the West, there is no evidence that any of these drugs reach the United States in quantities that significantly affect the United States. I have removed both countries from the majors list this year and have placed them on the watch list, with the understanding that they will be once again listed as major illicit drug producers or transit countries, should the evidence warrant.

Netherlands Antilles. Analysis of the trafficking patterns in the region indicates that there is continuing drug activity taking place around the Netherlands Antilles, especially in the vicinity of St. Maarten. Although at present there is only anecdotal information, it is possible that significant quantities of U.S.-bound drugs are involved. If I determine that drugs entering the United States from the Netherlands Antilles do so in sufficient quantities as to affect the United States significantly, I will add the Netherlands Antilles to the list of major illicit drug-transit countries.

Turkey and other Balkan Route Countries. Although I remain concerned over the large volume of Southwest Asian heroin moving through Turkey and neighboring countries to Western Europe along the Balkan Route, there is no clear evidence that this heroin

significantly affects the United States—as required for a country to be designated a major transit country. In the event that I determine that heroin transiting Turkey, Bulgaria, Greece, the former Republic of Yugoslavia, Bosnia, Croatia, the Former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia, or other European countries on the Balkan Route significantly affects the United States, I will add the relevant countries to the majors list.

Cuba. Cuba's geographical position astride one of the principal Caribbean trafficking routes to the United States makes it a logical candidate for consideration for the majors list. While there continue to be some credible reports that trafficking syndicates use Cuban territory (including waters and airspace) for moving drugs, it has yet to be confirmed that this traffic carries significant quantities of cocaine or heroin to the United States.

Central Asia. There have been recent probes of potential cultivation sites in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, traditional opium poppy growing areas of the former Soviet Union. These probes did not show significant opium poppy cultivation. If ongoing analysis reveals cultivation of 1,000 hectares or more of poppy, I will add the relevant countries to the majors list.

Major Cannabis Producers. While Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, the Philippines, and South Africa are important cannabis producers, they do not appear on this list since I have determined, pursuant to FAA section 481(e)(2), that in all cases the illicit cannabis is either consumed locally or exported to countries other than the United States, and thus such illicit cannabis production does not significantly affect the United States.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Jesse Helms, chairman, and Joseph R. Biden, Jr., ranking member, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; Ted Stevens, chairman, and Robert C. Byrd, ranking member, Senate Committee on Appropriations; Benjamin A. Gilman, chairman, and Lee H. Hamilton, ranking member, House Committee on International Relations; and Robert L. Livingston, chairman, and David R. Obey, ranking member, House Committee on Appropriations. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 10.

Remarks on Fast-Track Trade Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

November 10, 1997

The President. Good morning. Ladies and gentlemen, as you know, we have postponed the vote in the House of Representatives on renewing fast-track authority to strengthen our ability to expand exports through new agreements. I'm disappointed, of course, that this step was necessary because we worked very hard and we're very close to having the requisite number of votes. But early this morning it became clear to me that if the matter were taken to a vote there was a substantial chance that we would not get the votes necessary to pass the bill.

Let me begin by saying a profound word of thanks to Speaker Gingrich and to the leadership team in the House who worked with us on this, and on the Democratic side, to Representatives Fazio and Matsui and the others who were helping them. This was a partnership for the national interests, and I am very grateful for what they are doing.

I think most of you know what happened. We have been having a big debate in our party for several years on the question of trade and its role in our economic future. Even though we clearly have a majority of the Democratic mayors and Governors and we had a majority in the Senate, we don't have a majority in the House who agree with the position that I have taken. We worked hard to overcome their objections, and we didn't succeed. And because we didn't have more Democratic votes, we then had to get a bigger share of the Republican vote. That brought into play the controversy over international family planning and the so-called Mexico City language.

Had we been able to resolve that, I think we could have gotten enough votes on the Republican side to go with the Democrats' votes we had to pass the bill. Clearly, I think we could have. But we simply were not able to do that. And I say that without undue criticism of anyone. The people who took the

position that they could not give their votes to the fast-track legislation believe very deeply in principle that we should change our family planning funding. I, on the other hand, believe that it would have been wrong for me to mix the two issues and to compromise what I believe in principle. And in the end this matter could not go forward because of that disagreement.

But what we're going to do now is to regroup a little bit and find a way to succeed, and I think we'll be able to do that. I also know, from my extensive work now in the House, that there are a large number of House Members who are interested in trying to find some constructive resolution of this matter, and I think we may well be able to do that. I expect that we will successfully press forward with this issue in this Congress and at the appropriate time. So I'm not particularly concerned about the long run; I think we'll be able to prevail.

Today, let me say again, I think it's important that all of us do more to make the case. This country is in good shape. We have 13½ million more jobs; we have a 4.7 percent unemployment rate; we know that a third of that growth has come from trade. We know that the countries that are willing to enter into agreements with us in the kinds of areas of agreement that we need to push on a regional and a worldwide basis will lower barriers more in other countries than they will in our country.

But we also know that the benefits of trade are often not seen as directly tied to trade. When a plant expands or a new contract is signed, and whenever a plant closes down, generally it's easy to tie it to trade whether trade had anything to do with it, or not. So we have some more work to do.

But on balance, based on where we are now, I'm quite optimistic that we will ultimately prevail in this Congress. And I'm very pleased again with the good partnership that we had with Speaker Gingrich and the House leadership team and with the Democrats who helped us. And so we're just going to go forward. I think it's clear to everybody that America's leadership in the world depends upon America's continuing economic leadership, and this, therefore, has to be only a temporary obstacle because, in the end, we always find out a way to do what's right for America, to maintain our leadership, and maintain our economic growth.

Situation in Iraq

Q. What did you think—[*inaudible*]—to make a move on Iraq? And how do you assess the situation now?

The President. Well, first of all, as you know, the United Nations U–2 plane was not fired upon in its flight. But—and that's a good thing, but it does not change the larger issue which is that the U.N. inspections have been stopped by Saddam Hussein. So the next step is to get a very strong resolution from the United Nations manifesting the determination of the international community to resume those inspections. And that should happen shortly, as the report is made from the people who went to Iraq. And then we will have to go about manifesting that, demonstrating our determination to start those inspections again.

Q. Do you have any fear for the safety of those Americans who are in Baghdad? And what kind of unambiguous action did you signal yesterday that you expected out of the Security Council?

The President. Well, of course, I'm concerned about the Americans. I'm concerned about the other United Nations personnel who are there. I'm concerned about all of them. But again, I am trying to work with Mr. Butler and with the United Nations on a daily basis to do what seems right and best. And it was the judgment of the United Nations people and Mr. Butler that they ought to stay as long as they had a chance to resume their work and that they wanted to do that. But I assure you, I'm quite concerned with the safety of all the people that are there on behalf of Americans and on behalf of the world community trying to keep this weapons of mass destruction program from being restarted.

I believe we are considering every aspect of this issue. We spent all weekend working exhaustively on it, and we're going to watch it very carefully in the days ahead.

Fast-Track Trade Authority

Q. Mr. President, on fast track, you said that the people who decided to vote no on

this because they believed in principle about family planning are sincere. Do you think the Democrats who decided to vote no on fast track are sincere, or as you suggested in the past, that, in fact, they're knuckling under to political pressure from labor?

The President. Well, I think some of them are generally opposed to it. I think some of them really do believe that we would have gotten all the jobs we've gotten and we would be raising incomes and lowering unemployment and growing the economy if we had a more protectionist trade policy, and that we wouldn't have lost any jobs that have gone away in the economy. I think some of them really believe that. I don't believe that. And I think the evidence is on my side on that argument.

And then I think some of them were, in effect, voting their district, voting their concerns. They're afraid or concerned, at least, that the trade issue is much misunderstood and easily subject to misunderstanding. Was there some politics in it? Of course, there is. But there's politics in every tough vote that has been held in the Congress and any legislative body in my lifetime. I did not question their integrity. I questioned the judgment, and I do believe that there was some who felt that it was a politically impossible vote but that the right thing to do was for me to have the authority and go forward, based on my conversations.

What I think we have to do is try to let the temperature go down here and unpack this and go back to what is actually at stake. The Democratic Party, insofar as it is saying that we ought to inject labor issues and environmental issues into our international negotiations as part of our strategy to expand trade and economic partnerships, that is a positive thing. We can disagree about how we should do that, but I think that's a positive contribution of our party.

Insofar as we're saying that we should do more and do it more quickly to help people who do lose their jobs, whether it's from trade or technological changes, or whatever, to start new lives and to resume successful careers, I think that is a positive thing. And what we need to do is sort of unpack the politics and the emotions and the substance and try to go back and put this together in a way that allows us to have a big bipartisan majority in the House for a constructive fast-track authority that enables us to move forward on all these fronts. And I think we'll be able to do it.

Q. A lot of people are going to say this is the second most serious defeat you've suffered, after health care. Do you feel——

The President. No, there's a big difference.

Q. Do you feel you could have handled it better? Do you think you could have started earlier, or is this just a nut you couldn't crack unless you caved in on Mexico City?

The President. Well, I think in the end—let me say again, I think in the end we could have passed the bill if the Mexico City thing had been resolved. But I simply couldn't do that. I mean, I just couldn't do it. To me, first of all, I think it's wrong to mix these things. And secondly, I feel as strongly in principle on one side of the issue as the people in the House who otherwise might have voted for fast track do on the other. The prior problem was that we have, as I said, we had—look at the Senate vote—we have a majority of Senate Democrats for fast track, a huge majority of the mayors and Governors who are Democrats. We don't have a majority in the House. And I don't know whether—what we could have done differently.

Let me just say this. I think the bill that's there before them now, had we been able to persuade everybody involved that that bill should have been there months ago, maybe that would have made a difference. But it's easy to second-guess these things. The main thing is—the difference between this and health care was that health care was all caught up in politics and partisanship in even a more profound way, and there were big vested interests that had a stake in basically performing reverse plastic surgery on the proposal we made, and when it was dead, it was dead.

This is not dead. I will be very surprised if we are not successful in developing a bipartisan, constructive, successful approach to fast track before this Congress is over. This is a big difference here. I feel that this is entirely different. And keep in mind, it's also occurring in a different context. It's occurring in the context of the country doing well, the

economy being strong, and the Congress continuing to do productive things.

So I'm going to sign a bill, an appropriations bill that has the biggest increase in education in decades, that funds the America Reads program, our program to put computers in schools, increased scholarships for people going to college, and that makes a huge step toward establishing national academic standards and national testing, something that everything thought was dead just about 10 days ago, and we worked out.

So I'm basically very upbeat as we move toward the break for Thanksgiving and Christmas about the capacity of the Congress to work together and to work with me and to get this done. I wish we'd been able to pass it right now, but I expect it to pass.

Q. What about this week? You said this session, but do you mean this year?

Q. When? In the spring?

The President. I'm sorry, what did you say?

Q. You said you expect it to pass this session, but what about this year? Any hope this week?

The President. First of all, we've been up for a couple of days working on fast track and dealing with Iraq, and you will, I hope understand why we can't make a judgment about that. We will bring it back up at the appropriate time and when we think we can pass it. But we're very close now, under the most burdensome of circumstances. So all we need is a few breaks to have more than enough votes to pass it. And what I would like to do is to bring it back up at a time when we can pass it with a big vote and a much stronger vote from both parties. And I think there's every change that we will be able to do that. And I look forward to it, and I expect it to happen.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Saddam Hussein of Iraq; and Richard Butler, executive chairman of the United Nations Special Commission.

Opening Remarks at the White House Conference on Hate Crimes

November 10, 1997

The President. Thank you. I don't see that I need to say much, do you? [*Laughter*] Thank you, Cheunee.

Audience member. You murdered Vince Foster and it's not a hate crime.

The President. We have the first amendment even here. But I think the hate is coming from your way, not mine.

President Trachtenberg, and members of the administration, Senator Kennedy, Members of the House. And let me also say that in addition to all of you who are here, there are thousands of people at satellite-link conferences all over the country.

We have heard today two moving personal testimonies, from a person who gave his life in law enforcement and from a young person just beginning her adult life but having already lived a lifetime of experiences that we wish she had never endured. They both teach us in different ways that our families and our country can only thrive if they're free from the fear of crime and violence. And we have to do everything we can to give them that security. That's the main reason we decided to hold this White House Conference on Hate Crimes.

As I said this morning to those of you who were at the breakfast, all over the world we see what happens when racial or ethnic or religious animosity joins with lawlessness. We've seen countries and people and families torn apart. We've seen countries go from peace to wholesale internecine slaughter in a matter of months. We've seen people rise up and fight each other over issues that they thought had been dormant for centuries.

But even in America we hear too many stories like the ones Cheunee told us, too many stories like the 13-year-old African-American boy nearly beaten to death when he rode his bicycle through the wrong neighborhood, the gay American murdered as he walked home from work, the Asian-American who lost her store to a firebomb hurled by a racist, the Jewish-American whose house of worship was desecrated by swastikas.

We hear too many of these stories—stories of violent acts which are not just despicable acts of bias and bigotry, they are crimes. They strike at the heart of what it means to be an American. They are the antithesis of the values that define us as a nation. They have nothing to do with freedom or equality or respect for the law, and most importantly, they prevent us from respecting one another.

Last year I asked the American people to begin a great national conversation on race, to come together, across all the lines that divide us, into one America. We know we can only fight prejudice by fighting the misunderstanding and the ignorance and the fear that produce it. One of the things that I hope will come out of this year is a national affirmation that violence motivated by prejudice and hatred, as Cheunee said, hurts us all. Anybody who thinks that in the world of today and tomorrow, that he or she can hide from the kind of poison that we see in various places in our country, is living in a dream world. Whether we like it or not, our futures are bound together, and it is time we acted like it.

The first thing we have to do is to make sure our Nation's laws fully protect all of its citizens. Our laws already punish some crimes committed against people on the basis of race or religion or national origin, but we should do more. We should make our current laws tougher to include all hate crimes that cause physical harm. We must prohibit crimes committed because of a victim's sexual orientation, gender, or disability. All Americans deserve protection from hate.

I want to thank Senator Kennedy and Senator Specter, who will soon introduce legislation to achieve these goals, and I want to tell you that I will do my best to help them see this legislation become the law of our land. Thank you, Senators.

The second thing we have to do is to make sure our civil rights laws are consistently and vigorously enforced. Under Attorney General Reno's leadership, the Justice Department has taken aim at hate crimes with more prosecutions and tougher punishments. Starting today, every United States Attorney in our country will establish or expand working groups to develop enforcement strategies, share best practices, and educate the public about hate crimes. This national hate crimes network will marshal the resources of Federal, State, and local enforcement, community groups, educators, antiviolence advocates, to give us another powerful tool in the struggle against hate crimes.

I'm also pleased to announce that we will assign over 50 more FBI agents and prosecutors to work on hate crimes enforcement. And the Justice Department will make its own hate crimes training curriculum available to State and local law enforcement training centers all around America.

Finally, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Justice Department are launching an important new initiative that will help victims of housing-related hate crimes bring action against their attackers and get money damages for the harm they suffer.

When it comes to enforcing civil rights laws, let me also remind you that we need strong leadership. I have nominated Bill Lann Lee to head the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice because I'm convinced he'll provide that leadership. [*Applause*] Thank you. He is a son of Chinese immigrants who has seen the damaging force of discrimination. He has dedicated his career to fighting for equal rights, without regard to ideology or political party. Everyone who heard him in the Senate was impressed with his background, his record, his demeanor, his capacity, and yet we are being told that the Senate will not be allowed to vote on him because he supports his own President's position on affirmative action. Now, with all respect, if we have to wait until we get a head of the Civil Rights Division who is opposed to affirmative action, that job will be vacant for a very long time. We had an election about that.

On the other hand, let's not forget, this is but a tiny slice of what the Civil Rights Division does. We have laws on the books against discrimination that 90 percent of the American people support, and they need to be enforced vigorously by somebody who embodies the American ideal. It is wrong to deny this man that job because he agrees with the policies of his President on that issue. It is wrong.

All I ask the Senate committee to do is just to send his name out. They don't even have to make a recommendation; just let the Senate vote. Let all 100 Senators stand up and be counted in the full view of the American people and let them know their stand.

Let me also say that in addition to enforcement, in addition to pushing for new laws, in addition to training our own people and others better, let's also admit one thing—we have a lot of law enforcement officials who have worked on this—a lot of hate crimes still go unreported. I see a lot of you nodding your head up and down. If a crime is unreported, that gives people an excuse to ignore it.

I'm pleased to announce that today for the first time the National Crime Victimization Survey used by the Justice Department will finally include questions about hate crimes, so we can report them on a national basis along with others. It may seem like a small addition, but it will yield large results. It will give us a better measure of the number of hate crimes, and it will increase what we know about how they occur.

Let me say, lastly, all of us have to do more in our communities, through organizations like the one that Cheunee was part of in putting into Brooklyn High School, and in our own homes and places of worship to teach all of our children about the dignity of every person. I'm very pleased that the Education and the Justice Departments will distribute to every school district in the country a hate crimes resource guide. The guide will direct educators to the materials they can use to teach tolerance and mutual respect. And also the Justice Department is launching a Web site where younger students can learn about prejudice and the harm it causes.

Children have to be taught to hate. And as they come more and more of age and they get into more and more environments where they can be taught that, we need to make sure that somebody is teaching them not to do so.

I wouldn't be surprised if today some of the skinheads that threw rocks and bottles at Cheunee when she was a little girl have grown out of it and are frankly ashamed of what they did. I wouldn't be surprised if some of them weren't ashamed of it on the day they did it, but they just wanted to go along, to get along, to be part of the group. But some of the people who were subject to that, some of the people who were on the bus with her or on the street with her, are not here today to make the speech she gave. I'll bet you some of the people were scarred in ways that they never got over.

So as important as it is to enforce the law, to punish people, to do all this—all this is very important—the most important thing we can do is to reach these kids while they're young enough to learn. Somebody is going to be trying to teach them to hate. We want to teach them a different way. And in the end, if we all do our part for that, we can make America one nation under God.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:20 p.m. in the Dorothy Betts Marvin Theater at George Washington University. In his remarks, he referred to Stephen J. Trachtenberg, president, George Washington University, and Cheunee Sampson, Duke University student who introduced the President.

Remarks During the White House Conference on Hate Crimes

November 10, 1997

[*The panel discussion is joined in progress.*]

The President. Reverend Kyles said, this is a dynamite panel. [*Laughter*] I think they were very good. Thank you all very much.

Even though we tried to put the Republican on after the kid, he did pretty well, didn't he? [*Laughter*] That was so funny. [*Laughter*] You know, as good as Arizona was to me, I would never do anything like that. [*Laughter*] But you made the best of a difficult situation, because you did a good job, Raymond.

Let me ask you all something. We've heard from people who work in enforcement, whether it's an attorney general or a police chief. We've heard from people who work in writing the laws. We've heard from an educator who's trying to systematically keep these things from happening in the first place and deal with it. We've heard from a minister who has given his whole life dealing with

these matters. We've heard from a remarkable citizen here who changed the whole psychology of a community. We've heard from a young man who had an opportunity to have a remarkable experience, and he made, I thought, a very interesting point, which he deftly went by, but I don't think we should miss it. He said that he went to a very diverse school where there was a lot of continuing social segregation. And he had an opportunity to escape that on his project where he went to Israel.

In various aspects, I guess most of us who have lived any length of time have been dealing with one or another of these issues our whole lives. It's been my experience, when I see some form of bigotry or hatred manifest in a particular person, that there's usually one of three reasons that this person has done something bad. One is just ignorance and the fear it breeds: I don't know this person who is different from me, I'm afraid, and I manifest this fear in bigotry or violence or something. We see that a lot with the gay and lesbian issues now, you know, where people are at least unaware that they have ever had a family member or a friend or someone who was homosexual, and they are literally terrified.

Then there are some people—and I saw this a lot when Secretary Riley and I were kids growing up in the South—there are some people who really have an almost pathological need to look down on somebody else because they don't have enough regard for themselves, and so they think somehow they can salvage self-regard by finding somebody that at least they think is lower down than they are.

And then there are people who have been brutalized themselves and who have no way of dealing with it, no way of coming out of it, and they return brutality with brutality. There may be others, but that's been my experience.

Anyway, I ask you that to make this point—I announced a series of measures that we would take in my opening remarks, but you're in all these things. What advice do you have for me, for the Attorney General, for the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Agriculture—who deals, interestingly enough, with some important aspects of this—and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation—I think I've mentioned them all—and the Members of Congress—what is the most important thing the Nation can do through the National Government? What should we be focusing on? If you could give me advice—you've been very good to talk about your own experience and what you're trying to do—if you could give me advice in a sentence about what you think we ought to do to move the ball down the road to help deal with this, what advice would you give us? What advice would you give to Senator Kennedy and the House Members that are here? What should we be doing at the national level?

Sheila, you want to go first? [*Laughter*] You're good at this, so I think—everybody else deserves a chance to think. You're good at this; you have to go first. [*Laughter*]

[*Sheila James Kuehl, speaker pro tempore, California State Assembly, emphasized the power of laws to express morality and the strength of a coalition of diverse people. She then identified assembly majority floor leader and conference participant Antonio R. Villaraigosa as a confirmed heterosexual.*]

The President. There's a man who wants to be identified. [*Laughter*]

[*Ms. Kuehl praised Mr. Villaraigosa for associating himself with the gay and lesbian community in supporting California's employment nondiscrimination legislation.*]

The President. Anybody else want to answer that question?

[*Education Secretary Richard Riley asked about preventing hate through character education, the arts, and sports. Peter Berendt, principal, Mamaroneck Avenue Elementary School, Mamaroneck, NY, responded that educators should encourage artistic expression as an opportunity to celebrate diversity.*]

The President. Raymond, talk a little more about this whole issue of having an integrated school that's socially segregated. What bothers you about it, and what do you think we can do about it?

[*Raymond Delos Reyes, student at Franklin High School, Seattle, WA, described his experience that students, when not in class, tended to associate with people of their own race. He then suggested that this issue should be addressed by group rather than individual efforts.*]

The President. Don't you think you almost have to have an organized effort to do it? There would almost have to be some sort of club or organization at the school, because if you think about it, your parents are still pretty well separated. Now, we all work together more than we ever have before, just like you go to school together. But most neighborhoods are still fairly segregated. Most houses of worship are still fairly segregated. We're making more progress on it, but I think you almost have to organize your way out of this.

I guess that's why I asked you the question I did earlier, because every time this issue is confronted, we can point to Billings and the stirring story of a menorah in every window. But somehow we have to find a disciplined, organized way out of this, so that we reach every child in an affirmative way before something bad happens and so that at least—I don't think there is anything bad with people hanging around with members of their own ethnic group in a lot of different ways. I think that's a good thing. I just think that people also really, really need systematic opportunities to relate to people across racial and ethnic and other lines. And my own opinion is that—just from my own experience is that unless there is an organized effort in your school to do it, it's not going to happen, because if you just wait for people spontaneously to go out at recess, lunch, or after school, it's just not going to happen. It's too much trouble. There's too much psychic risk in it.

And I hope you'll be able to do something about it, because I really respected you for raising it. It's a big problem in every school that I have ever been to in this country.

[*Grant Woods, Arizona's Republican attorney general, said that law enforcement provided justice but did not address the underlying cause of hate crimes. He suggested that leaders and schools must educate children to provide a counterbalance to the negativity often presented by popular culture.*]

The President. Tammie, you told your story about the brick coming through the window at your child's bed. Were there similar manifestations of bigotry among the children in the schools, or was it mostly older people? And is there anything going on now in the Billings schools to try to offset this?

[*Tammie Schnitzer, of the Billings, MT, Coalition for Human Rights Foundation, responded that the attitudes of not only children but of adults, institutions, and the media need to be changed. Police Chief Arturo Venegas of Sacramento, CA, stated that leaders must present a united front and that recent progress should not be taken for granted. Rev. Samuel Billy Kyles, pastor of the Monumental Baptist Church, Memphis, TN, praised efforts of the religious community and the President's visit to a rebuilt Tennessee church for focusing attention on the problem of church burnings. Ms. Kuehl emphasized that legislation concerning hate crimes should not exclude hatred based on sexual orientation or gender.*]

The President. Once we cross the great sort of intellectual and emotional hurdle that might be presented to some with Senator Kennedy and Senator Specter's bill, I frankly think the next big problem will be a practical one, Sheila—you talk about ranking the categories—I think there is a practical question, which you can help with because you've written the law, which Grant can help with because Arizona has a law. But the Attorney General and I, we will have to answer a lot of questions about this law, about not whether or not rape is motivated by hate or not, but whether or not if we include all these categories in the law, we will in effect be lumping into Federal law enforcement a lot of crimes that are actually being prosecuted now at the State and local level through the existing criminal justice system in a way that will clog the system because we're trying to be politically sensitive, instead of actually going out now and covering offenses where people are getting away with murder by abusing people because they're gay or they're disabled or whatever they're doing.

That, I think—it's a practical question, but we need your help in getting through that. You have a law like that in Arizona. You wrote a law like that in California. And that's what we're going to be asked when we go up there to defend Senator Kennedy's bill; that's where we're going to be hit—"Aren't you just creating a whole new category of Federal crimes that are being prosecuted anyway at the State level?" and all that sort of stuff. And if you will help us, I think that will be very good.

General Reno, do you want to say anything before we wrap up?

[*Attorney General Janet Reno stressed the need to improve cooperation between Federal and local authorities to report, investigate, and prosecute hate crimes. Police Chief Venegas advocated bringing the resources of the Federal Government to bear on the issue.*]

The President. Thank you.

Secretary Riley, do you want to wrap up for us?

[*Education Secretary Riley concluded the panel and thanked the participants.*]

The President. Thank you very much.

Ladies and gentlemen, as you know, we're going to break for lunch now, and then the whole conference will resume. Again, I want to thank President Trachtenberg and George Washington, but I mostly want to thank all of you, because the real answer to our success in this endeavor is obviously that we all have to work together. And all of you can strike new energy into this entire endeavor around the country. We will take our initiatives that we outlined today—we urge you to give us more ideas—but you are actually the heart and soul of this endeavor, and a lot of you have stories that I wish all the rest of us could sit and hear today.

Thank you for being here, and thank you for being a part of the conference.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:15 p.m. in the Dorothy Betts Marvin Theater at George Washington University.

Remarks at a Screening of Ken Burns' "Lewis and Clark"

November 10, 1997

Thank you very much. Please be seated. Welcome to the White House. To Ken and to his daughters; Dayton Duncan and his family; Harry Pierce, the vice chair of GM; Elizabeth Campbell, founder of WETA; Michael Jandreau, the chairman of the Lower Brule Sioux tribe; and of course, a special word of welcome to Stephen Ambrose, whose magnificent book inspired this great film that Ken has done. To all the historians and actors who brought this story to life, you're all welcome here.

I have looked forward to this night since February when Ken Burns came to screen his great film on Thomas Jefferson. That night I asked him to come back when the new film was done so we could set up Lewis and Clark artifacts in the foyer, the way Jefferson did. They're out there—actually, he had them here in the East Room at one point. But I hope you've had a chance to go out and see them, and if you haven't, I hope you will see them. They are the actual, real McCoy. And I wasn't sure at the time I said we would produce them whether we could or not, how many there were, and what they would look like. But I'm well pleased, and I hope that you will be when you get to see them.

I also thought we ought to watch the film here in the East Room where the expedition really began. Meriweather Lewis lived and worked in the East Room when he was Jefferson's personal aide. Mr. Jefferson's office was just down the hall, and he actually had carpenters create two rooms for Lewis on the south side of the East Room here, where Abigail Adams used to hang her wash. There. [*Laughter*]

Over dinner, Jefferson tutored his protege in geography and the natural sciences, broadening his horizons so that Lewis and Clark eventually could broaden the Nation's. It's not hard to see why Ken Burns embraced the Lewis and Clark story. The journey of

learning he embarks on with each new subject is really quite like Lewis' journey of discovery.

And if Ken Burns is the filmmaking Meriwether Lewis, then perhaps Dayton Duncan is the wise William Clark of this project. Like Lewis and Clark, Ken and Dayton have been good friends for a decade before they started this recent journey and became even better friends along the way.

Looking back with new perspective on the story of Lewis and Clark exemplifies what Hillary and I had in mind when we announced the White House Millennium Program in August. Celebrating our new millennium will be an international event, but we'll also mark it in a uniquely American way, by highlighting American creativity, innovation, and our insatiable desire to explore, as we're doing here tonight.

Lewis and Clark were America's foremost explorers, not only mapping out the contours of a continent but also, in profound ways, the frontiers of our imagination. In that way, they are the forebears of those who have given us the recent Mars expedition, those who are building the international space station, those who are hunting for the mysteries of the human genome, those who are looking for answers to the challenge of global climate change.

We are grateful that Ken and Dayton, that Stephen Ambrose, Gerard Baker, James Ronda, Gary Moulton, and others have helped to enrich our appreciation of Lewis and Clark. That is a very precious gift to future generations. Over the next 3 years, we hope to inspire many others to offer similar gifts in celebration of a new century and a new millennium. We want to encourage all Americans to participate in the millennium celebration in ways that help us to honor our past and imagine the future. And we'll launch a cultural showcase here at the White House to highlight our artists, our scholars, our visionaries.

But I don't want to get ahead of ourselves. Tonight we're here to see "Lewis and Clark." And for that I turn to the incomparable Ken Burns.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:10 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Ken Burns and Dayton Duncan, coproducers of the film; author Stephen E. Ambrose; Gerard Baker, Superintendent, Little Bighorn National Battlefield Monument; and James P. Ronda and Gary E. Moulton, program advisers.

Remarks at a Veterans Day Ceremony in Arlington, Virginia

November 11, 1997

Thank you very much. Secretary Gober, members of the Cabinet, members of the Joint Chiefs, General Foley. Commander Hitchcock, thank you for your example and for that magnificent address. Leaders of our veterans services organizations, ex-prisoners of war, Gold Star Wives and Mothers, veterans, members of the Armed Forces, my fellow Americans.

Almost 42 million Americans have served in our Armed Forces over the great history of our country. More than 25 million of them are still with us today. That is a remarkable gift for which we can be grateful, for today we pay tribute to the men and women who offered the highest form of service to America. In a world of constant change and uncertainty, we can know with certainty that today America is free, secure, and prosperous because of the gift of your service.

For different reasons, in different ways, in different wars, and in times when we were not at war, Americans of all backgrounds have donned our Nation's uniform and pledged their lives to maintain our freedom. From Belleau Wood to Normandy, from Iwo Jima to Inchon, from Khe Sanh to Kuwait, all the veterans we honor today gave something to serve. Many gave their lives. Others bear the burden of injury for the rest of their days. Still others made it through with bodies intact but lives changed forever, perhaps none more than our prisoners of war.

In this century alone, more than 142,000 Americans were held in prison camps or interned. Seventeen thousand died during the ordeal. The many ex-POW's here today know better than anyone the precious value of freedom because they have paid the price of losing their freedom. Let us never forget their very special sacrifice. And let us never waver for a moment in our common efforts to make a full accounting for all our MIA's.

As President, you all know I am charged with the performance of many ceremonial duties, but there is not a single one more important than this chance to express the pride and the profound gratitude of all Americans for all you have done. In a wonderful sense, our veterans are ordinary Americans, but there is nothing ordinary about your patriotism.

Our veterans have won victories for freedom for over 200 years now. And it's worth pointing out, this year especially, that those victories have not all occurred beyond our borders; some have occurred within them, as we remembered twice this fall. First, in Little Rock, in my hometown, where the Army helped to end the integration crisis 40 years ago and remind Americans that what we are pledged to do, and what you have donned the uniform for, is to defend freedom and equality for all. And here in Arlington, with the unveiling of the Women in Military Service for America Memorial, we gave long overdue thanks to the 1.8 million women veterans who have served our country. Both these events reaffirm the powerful truth that we must be, always, one America.

Around the world democracy is on the march. Former adversaries are now our partners. We stand on the cusp of a new century and a new millennium that holds the promise, but, as Commander Hitchcock reminded us, not the guarantee, of an unprecedented peace and prosperity. The benefits the world enjoys today belong in no small measure to America's veterans. To make the promise of peace and prosperity a reality in a new era, America, with its special ability and its special responsibility, must continue to lead for peace and freedom against aggression and tyranny.

At this very moment, our men and women in uniform are doing just that. In the Balkans, after 46 months of the bloodiest, most dehumanizing conflict since World War II in Europe, 23 months of peace forged at Dayton have put Bosnia on the hard path to lasting stability. We have seen steady progress in recent months, elections held, public safety enhanced, the economy gaining strength and creating jobs for people who were desperately poor and unemployed, refugees returned, war criminals brought to justice. All that was possible because our troops and their allies are maintaining a stable and secure environment in Bosnia.

And in the Persian Gulf, our pilots are patrolling the no-fly zones in Iraq, making it clear to Saddam Hussein that another move against Kuwait or Saudi Arabia would be a big mistake and helping to enforce the international community's sanctions against Iraq. Saddam's efforts to rebuild his weapons of mass destruction and his interference with the United Nations inspectors who are keeping him from doing so are unacceptable.

I want every single American to understand what is at stake here. These inspectors, since 1991, have discovered and destroyed more weapons of mass destruction potential than was destroyed in Iraq in the entire Gulf war. They are doing what they should be doing. They must get back to work, and the international community must demand it.

In meeting today's challenges we must seize tomorrow's opportunities. Veterans Day, as we all know, began as a tribute to Americans who fought for freedom in Europe in World War I, when we learned that Europe's fate and America's future were joined. Throughout this century, from World War II to the cold war, each time Europe's freedom and security were endangered, America rose to the challenge.

Now we have to have the opportunity to escape this century's cycle of aggression and instability in Europe and to build something that has literally never existed before, an undivided, peaceful, democratic Europe. In July, we in NATO invited Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to begin the process of joining our alliance. Their entry into NATO and our partnerships with Europe's other new democracies, and historic accords with Russia and Ukraine, will make America safer, NATO stronger, and Europe more united and stable.

I am gratified that all our leading veterans organizations strongly support enlarging NATO. It is one of the most fitting tributes we can pay to America's veterans because it will help to ensure that the horrors of war in this century are not visited upon Americans in the next century.

It is our solemn obligation to preserve the peace that so many of you in this audience

and throughout our country sacrificed so very much to build. And when our Senate considers this question early next year, I hope they will remember the lessons our veterans have taught us, that Europe's security is vital to our own, that allying with Europe's democracy is our best sword and shield, and that it is far, far better to prevent wars than to wage them.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have learned that the world will never be completely safe for democracy, as President Woodrow Wilson hoped for on the eve of our entry into World War I. There will always be threats to our well-being, to the peaceful community of nations to which we belong. Indeed, in the years ahead, we will see more and more threats that cross national borders: terrorism, weapons of mass destruction proliferating around the world, the growth of organized crime and drug trafficking. We will have to find new ways to meet these new security threats.

But let us not forget today that, thanks to the valor of our veterans, the world is safer today from complete destruction than it has been in a long, long time. And let us resolve to maintain the skill and professionalism of today's Armed Forces and to honor those presently in uniform with our support. And it will remain that way.

Thirty-six years ago, on this day, at this place, a President who lies buried in this cemetery spoke to the America people. John Kennedy said, "There is no way to maintain the frontiers of freedom without cost and commitment and risk." So today, let us do more than observe a few moments of silence and just return to ordinary business. Let us truly reflect on the sacrifices made by our veterans to advance freedom and democracy. And let us rededicate ourselves to the hard work done in this country to bring us where we are today, knowing that these gains and future ones will require continued cost, commitment, and risk. And let us never forget those who gave their lives that our Nation might live free, secure, and at peace.

I do believe that the next 50 years can be the brightest chapter in America's rich history and the best time in all of human history if we do our part to honor and follow the example of those whom we honor today.

God bless them and their families, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:33 a.m. at Arlington National Cemetery. In his remarks, he referred to Maj. Gen. Robert T. Foley, USA, commander, U.S. Army Military District of Washington; and Wayne Hitchcock, national commander, American Ex-Prisoners of War.

Remarks at a Memorial Service for Representative Walter H. Capps

November 12, 1997

Laura, the staff and friends and admirers of Walter Capps. The first time I met Walter, he was not a Congressman. As a matter of fact, he was a man who had run for and been defeated for Congress. I knew he must be a special man because Laura was working for us, just next to my office, and I knew he had to have been a special father.

So I met this guy, and I thought, this man is entirely too nice to be in Congress anyway. [*Laughter*] Besides that, he speaks in complete sentences and paragraphs. [*Laughter*] He would never get along in Washington in the 1990's; he's happy all the time. [*Laughter*] I don't think he has a mean bone in his body. Well, suffice it to say, when he ran again I was elated, and even happier when he won.

For me, the defining image of the 1996 campaign will always be that magnificent day at the University of Santa Barbara when we were up on the hill and there were 15,000 or more people there, mostly students. It was a sunny day looking out on the ocean, and there was Walter Capps on the stage with me, beaming. You know, he wasn't exactly an experienced campaigner, and he used to joke that I had actually had to grab him and teach him how to smile and wave to a crowd from a stage. He was up there—he said, "I never had a crowd like this before. I never had a crowd like this before." [*Laughter*] I said, "Walter, this is easy. You just go up, put one arm around me and wave the other arm." [*Laughter*] "It's easy; you can do this."

I say this to make a point you have already heard from every previous speaker. The things I taught him were superficial things; the things that he taught us were deep and

enduring things. And he seemed to naturally be upbeat, harmonious, uniting. I try to do that, but some days it's a real effort for me. I think it came out of the depths of his soul. I think he was at ease with the consequences of whatever could happen to him. Most people in politics are full of anxiety with the consequences of whatever could happen to them.

He believed in his party, but principles were more important. He liked victory, but values were more important. And he knew that the mind was a wonderful thing, but the heart was more important.

I can only tell you that, for me, perhaps the most important thing was that whenever I saw him, he made me prouder to be in public service. He made me want to stand a little taller. He was always so incredibly ingratiating and humble, and he—"It was such a big thing to be in the White House," and "I'm so proud my daughter works for the President" and all that stuff, you know, but he made me feel better being around him.

He sent a message to young people that public service is a noble thing and that people who commit themselves to it can make positive changes. He was an instant and consistent rebuke to the cynicism that some people try to make their way with in this day and age, especially when they talk about the political system. He taught us about our common humanity, and he left us all a little better than we would have been. And if we remember not only what he said but how he lived, he'll make us a lot better than we would have been.

Hebrew says, "We are surrounded by a cloud of witnesses, so let us run with patience the race that is before us." He had a remarkable way of being avid, eager, almost lusty about everything he was trying to take in in life, and yet underneath there was this calm patience. He had one thing I wish I could have, that I wish we all could—that has already been discussed—and that is, every moment seemed enough and self-contained, and he was always there. The lives we live in Washington leave us so crammed-headed, half the time we're not there in whatever is happening to us. Walter Capps was always there.

For me, because my daughter is the most important person in the world to me and to Hillary, his role as a father meant a lot, and Laura is now a part of our family. But the integrity and the constancy that he brought to that role is something you could see in every single thing he did. So we only had him a little less than a year, and we feel a little cheated. But maybe the lesson from God through Walter to us is: It wasn't me; it was you. And we should be a little more like him every day. That will be his great and enduring gift, not only to us but to the United States.

May God bless his memory and his family.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:39 p.m. at the Cannon House Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Representative Capps' daughter Laura, Staff Director for the Office of Speechwriting at the White House.

Statement on the United Nations Security Council Resolution on Iraq

November 12, 1997

I welcome the prompt, clear, and strong resolution by the United Nations Security Council condemning Iraq for obstructing the work of international weapons inspectors and defying the will of the international community. With one voice, the Security Council has made it clear that Iraq's actions are unacceptable; that it must submit to investigations into Baghdad's ballistic missile, biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons programs; and that sanctions will remain in place until Iraq cooperates. For Iraq, there is one simple way out of the box Saddam Hussein has put it in: Comply with the will of the international community.

Notice—Continuation of Emergency Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction

November 12, 1997

On November 14, 1994, by Executive Order 12938, I declared a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United

States posed by the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons ("weapons of mass destruction") and the means of delivering such weapons. Because the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States, the national emergency declared on November 14, 1994, and extended on November 14, 1995 and November 14, 1996, must continue in effect beyond November 14, 1997. Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), I am continuing the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12938.

This notice shall be published in the *Federal Register* and transmitted to the Congress.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 12, 1997.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:40 a.m., November 12, 1997]

NOTE: This notice was published in the *Federal Register* on November 13.

Message to the Congress on Weapons of Mass Destruction

November 12, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

On November 14, 1994, in light of the dangers of the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons ("weapons of mass destruction"—(WMD)) and of the means of delivering such weapons, I issued Executive Order 12938, and declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*). Under section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), the national emergency terminates on the anniversary date of its declaration, unless I publish in the *Federal Register* and transmit to the Congress a notice of its continuation.

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I am advising the Congress that the national emergency declared on November 14, 1994, and extended on November 14, 1995 and November 14, 1996, must continue in effect beyond November 14, 1997. Accordingly, I have extended the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12938 and have sent the attached notice of extension to the Federal Register for publication.

The following report is made pursuant to section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), regarding activities taken and money spent pursuant to the emergency declaration. Additional information on nuclear, missile, and/or chemical and biological weapons (CBW) nonproliferation efforts is contained in the most recent annual Report on the Proliferation of Missiles and Essential Components of Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Weapons, provided to the Congress pursuant to section 1097 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102–190), also known as the "Nonproliferation Report," and the most recent annual report provided to the Congress pursuant to section 308 of the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–182), also known as the "CBW Report."

Chemical and Biological Weapons

The three export control regulations issued under the Enhanced Proliferation Control Initiative (EPCI) remained fully in force and continue to be applied in order to control the export of items with potential use in chemical or biological weapons or unmanned delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction.

Chemical weapons continue to pose a very serious threat to our security and that of countries friendly to us. On April 29, 1997, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (the "Chemical Weapons Convention" or (CWC)) entered into force with 87 of the

CWC's 165 signatories as original States Parties. The United States was among their number, having deposited its instrument of ratification on April 25. As of November 5, 104 countries had become States Parties.

Russia did not complete its legislative approval process in time to be among the original CWC States Parties. In our March meeting in Helsinki, President Yeltsin did, however, assure me of his understanding of the importance of the CWC to Russia's own security. On October 31, 1997, the Russian Duma (lower house) approved ratification of the CWC. On November 5, 1997, the Russian Federation Council unanimously approved the CWC and the Russian government deposited its instrument of ratification. Russia's ratification makes it possible for Russia to join the United States in playing a leadership role in ensuring that all of the Convention's benefits are realized.

Given Russia's financial situation during this difficult period of transition to a market economy, serious concerns have been raised about the high costs of environmentally sound destruction of the large stocks of chemical weapons Russia inherited from the former Soviet Union. Through the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, we are working with Russia to help address these complex problems, and we will continue to do so now that Russia has ratified the CWC.

The Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) has been established to achieve the object and purpose of the CWC, to ensure the implementation of its provisions and provide a forum for consultation and cooperation among States Parties. The executive organ of the OPCW, the Executive Council, has met five times since May to oversee decisions related to *inter alia* data declarations, inspections, and organizational issues. The United States plays an active role in ensuring effective implementation of the Convention.

The CWC is an ambitious undertaking by the world community to ban an entire class of weapons of mass destruction. Its members have committed themselves to totally eliminating chemical weapons stocks and production facilities, prohibiting chemical weapons-related activities, banning assistance for such activities and restricting trade with non-Parties in certain relevant chemicals. Destruction of U.S. chemical weapons stocks is moving forward. Other CWC States Parties have now taken on a similar task, and we are working hard with the other members of the CWC to make membership in this treaty universal.

The United States is determined to ensure full implementation of the concrete measures in the CWC that will raise the costs and the risks for any state or terrorist attempting to engage in chemical weapons-related activities. The CWC's declaration requirements will improve our knowledge of possible chemical weapons activities, whether conducted by countries or terrorists. Its inspection provisions provide for access to declared and undeclared facilities and locations, thus making clandestine chemical weapons production and stockpiling more difficult, more risky, and more expensive.

Countries that refuse to join the CWC will be politically isolated and banned from trading with States Parties in certain key chemicals. The relevant Treaty provision is specifically designed to penalize in a concrete way countries that refuse to join the rest of the world in eliminating the threat of chemical weapons.

The United States also continues to play a leading role in the international effort to reduce the threat from biological weapons. We are an active participant in the Ad Hoc Group striving to create a legally binding protocol to strengthen and enhance compliance with the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (the "Biological Weapons Convention" or (BWC)). This Ad Hoc Group was mandated by the September 1994 BWC Special Conference. The Fourth BWC Review Conference, held in November 1996, commended the work done by the Ad Hoc Group and urged it to complete the protocol as soon as possible but not later than the next Review Conference to be held in 2001. A draft rolling text was introduced by the Chairman at the July Ad Hoc Group session. Work is progressing on insertion of national views and clarification of existing text, largely drawn from the consultative phase of Ad Hoc

Group work since 1994. Three-week sessions are scheduled for January, July, and September of 1998. Another 2-week session will be scheduled for either March or December of 1998. Early completion of an effective BWC protocol is high on our list of nonproliferation goals.

The United States continues to be a leader in the Australia Group (AG) chemical and biological weapons nonproliferation regime. Last year, the United States supported the entry into the AG of the Republic of Korea, which became the group's 30th member in time for the October 1996 plenary.

The United States attended this year's annual AG plenary session from October 6–9, 1997, during which the Group continued to focus on strengthening AG export controls and sharing information to address the threat of CBW terrorism. At the behest of the United States, the AG first began in-depth political-level discussion of CBW terrorism during the 1995 plenary session following the Tokyo subway nerve gas attack earlier that year. At the 1996 plenary, the United States urged AG members to exchange national points of contact for AG terrorism matters. At the 1997 plenary, the AG accepted a U.S. proposal to survey all AG members on efforts each has taken to counter this threat.

The Group also reaffirmed the members' collective belief that full adherence to the CWC and the BWC is the best way to achieve permanent global elimination of CBW, and that all states adhering to these Conventions have an obligation to ensure that their national activities support this goal.

AG participants continue to seek to ensure that all relevant national measures promote the object and purposes of the BWC and CWC. The AG nations reaffirmed their belief that existing national export licensing policies on chemical weapons-related items fulfill the obligation established under Article I of the CWC that States Parties never assist, in any way, the acquisition of chemical weapons. Given this understanding, the AG members also reaffirmed their commitment to continuing the Group's activities now that the CWC has entered into force.

The AG also reaffirmed its commitment to continue to provide briefings for non-AG countries, and to promote regional consultations on export controls and nonproliferation to further awareness and understanding of national policies in these areas.

During the last 6 months, we continue to examine closely intelligence and other reports of trade in chemical weapons-related material and technology that might require action, including evaluating whether sanctions under the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991 were warranted. In May 1997, we imposed sanctions on seven Chinese entities and one Hong Kong company for knowingly and materially contributing to Iran's CW program through the export of dual-use chemical precursors and/or chemical production equipment and technology. In September 1997, we imposed sanctions on a German citizen and a German company determined to have been involved in the export of chemical production equipment to Libya's CW program.

The United States continues to cooperate with its AG partners in stopping shipments of proliferation concern. By sharing information through diplomatic and other channels, we and our AG partners have been successful in interdicting various shipments destined to CBW programs.

Missiles for Weapons of Mass Destruction Delivery

During the reporting period, the United States carefully controlled exports that could contribute to unmanned delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction and closely monitored activities of potential missile proliferation concern. We also continued to implement U.S. missile sanctions law, in cases where sanctionable activity was determined to have occurred. In August 1997, we imposed sanctions against two North Korean entities determined to have engaged in missile proliferation activities. Similar sanctions imposed in May 1996 remain in effect against two entities in Iran and one entity in North Korea for transfers involving Category II Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) Annex items.

During this reporting period, MTCR Partners continued to share information about proliferation problems with each other and with other potential supplier, consumer, and

transshipment states. Partners also emphasized the need for implementing effective export control systems. This cooperation has resulted in the interdiction of missile-related materials intended for use in missile programs of concern.

The United States was an active participant in the MTCR's June 1997 Reinforced Point of Contact Meeting (RPOC). At the RPOC, MTCR Partners engaged in useful discussions of regional missile proliferation concerns, as well as steps the Partners could take to increase transparency and outreach to nonmembers.

In July 1997, the United States also played a leading role at the Swiss-hosted MTCR workshop on the licensing and enforcement aspects of transshipment. The workshop was successful in focusing attention on the enforcement problems raised by proliferators' misuse of transshipment and fostered a productive exchange of ideas on how countries can better address such activity.

The United States worked unilaterally and in coordination with its MTCR Partners to combat missile proliferation and to encourage nonmembers to export responsibly and to adhere to the MTCR Guidelines. Since the last report, we have continued our missile nonproliferation dialogue with China, the Republic of Korea (ROK), North Korea (DPRK), and Ukraine. In the course of normal diplomatic relations, we also have pursued such discussions with other countries in Central Europe, the Middle East, and Asia.

In June 1997, the United States and the DPRK held a second round of missile talks, aimed at freezing the DPRK's indigenous missile development program and curtailing its missile-related export activities. The DPRK appeared willing to consider limits on its missile-related exports, in return for sanctions-easing measures, but did not engage in discussion of limits on its missile development program. We intend to pursue further missile talks with the DPRK.

In July 1997, we held another round of nonproliferation talks with the ROK. These talks were productive and made progress toward facilitating ROK membership in the MTCR.

In response to reports that Iran had acquired sensitive items from Russian entities for use in Iran's missile development program, the United States intensified its high-level dialogue with Russia on this issue. We held a number of productive discussions with senior Russian officials aimed at finding ways the United States and Russia can work together to prevent Iran's ballistic missile development program from acquiring Russian technology and equipment. This process is continuing.

Nuclear Weapons

In a truly historic landmark in our efforts to curb the spread of nuclear weapons, the 50th U.N. General Assembly on September 10, 1996, adopted and called for signature of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), negotiated over the previous 2½ years in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. The overwhelming passage of this U.N. resolution (158–3–5) demonstrates the CTBT's strong international support and marks a major success for United States foreign policy. On September 24, 1996, I and other international leaders signed the CTBT in New York.

During 1997, CTBT signatories have conducted numerous meetings of the Preparatory Commission in Vienna, seeking to promote rapid completion of the International Monitoring System established by the Treaty. On September 23, I transmitted the CTBT to the Senate, requesting prompt advice and consent to ratification.

The CTBT will serve several United States national security interests in banning all nuclear explosions. It will constrain the development and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons; end the development of advanced new types; contribute to the prevention of nuclear proliferation and the process of nuclear disarmament; and strengthen international peace and security. The CTBT marks an historic milestone in our drive to reduce the nuclear threat and to build a safer world.

Formal preparations for the year 2000 Review Conference for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) began in 1997 with the first of three annual

Preparatory Committee meetings of the Parties to the Treaty. The United States is committed to working to ensure that the 2000 NPT review Conference will further strengthen the NPT and reinforce global nuclear nonproliferation objectives. Since the 1995 NPT Conference, eight additional states have joined the NPT, leaving only five states worldwide currently outside the NPT regime. The NPT Exporters (Zangger) Committee added China to its membership in 1997.

The Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) continued its efforts to upgrade control lists and export control procedures. NSG members confirmed their agreement to clarifications to the nuclear trigger list to accord with trigger list changes agreed to by the members of the NPT Exporters (Zangger) Committee, and the International Atomic Energy Agency published these understandings on September 16, 1997. The NSG also is actively pursuing steps to enhance the transparency of the export regime in accordance with the call in Principles 16 and 17 of the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference.

The NSG held an export control seminar in Vienna on October 8 and 9, 1997, which described and explained the role of the NSG (and the Zangger Committee) in preventing nuclear proliferation. The NSG also continued efforts to enhance information sharing among members regarding the nuclear programs of proliferant countries by (1) ''officially'' linking the NSG members through a dedicated computer network allowing for real-time distribution of license denial information, and by (2) creating a separate session for exchange of information on the margins of the NSG plenary meeting.

NSG membership will increase to 35 with the acceptance of Latvia. The ultimate goal of the NSG is to obtain the agreement of all suppliers, including nations not members of the regime, to control nuclear and nuclear-related exports in accordance with the NSG guidelines.

Expenses

Pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), I report that there were no expenses directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency in Executive Order 12938 during the semiannual reporting period.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 12, 1997.

Remarks at a Democratic Governors' Association Reception

November 12, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Loretta. Thank you, Katie. Thank all of you who had anything to do with this fundraiser. This is an exercise of true affection because Howard Dean would probably win next year if none of us gave him a penny. [*Laughter*] But I am delighted to be here.

Senator Leahy and I were standing back there when Howard was giving his remarks, and he said he suffered through 16 years of Republican leadership, the deficit was going up before I came in. And I said, ''You know, Pat, it was really only 12 years; it just seemed like 16.''

I'd like to say a special word of thanks, too, to Senator Pat Leahy, who is truly one of the finest people in the entire United States Congress and one of the most effective. Whether the issue is economic policy, agriculture policy, social policy, foreign policy, his passion to remove the scourge of landmines from the Earth, Pat Leahy is always there. And we can be proud that he represents not only the State of Vermont but all of America very well.

I'd also like to say that whatever it is that Howard Dean knows, or whatever it is that he eats for breakfast every morning, if I could give it to every other Democratic office holder and would-be office holder, we would immediately become the majority in the Congress and we would have about 35 Governors. I have to tell you, I think a big part of it is just producing for people, actually doing what you say you're going to do at election time. And I very much appreciate what he said about what we've tried to do here in Washington.

I love to do fundraisers and events for Democratic Governors or the Democratic

Governors' Association in Washington because one of the things that I learned when I moved to Washington and what I feared was that people don't think that those of us who have been Governors exist out there. And we might as well be in a zoo somewhere.

When I came to Washington, I would read editorials from the prominent newspapers saying that if you cared about the deficit and crime and welfare, you were stealing Republican issues. And I said, now, wait a minute. The last time I checked, the debt of this country quadrupled under a Republican President, crime was going up when I took office, and the welfare rolls were expanding. And since I've been in office, we've cut the deficit by 92 percent, crime has gone down every year, and the welfare rolls have dropped by 3 million. I think those are American issues the Democratic Party has done very well on, and I don't understand all this.

Out in the country, you know, Democrats care about the deficits and welfare reform and safe streets. And you know what? Democrats care about them in Washington, too. We passed a crime bill in 1994 overwhelmingly with Democratic support, with a little Republican support. We passed the economic program in 1993 only with Democrats. And we began the welfare reform effort through the executive branch, as Howard Dean said, then I vetoed two bills first because I refused to take away the guarantee of health care and nutrition from children and I wanted to have enough money for child care if we were going to require people to go to work. So we got it right and the results were good for America, and I'm proud of that.

But one last point I want to make, this has been a very good year for the United States in Washington. We had an enormous effort to pass the balanced budget that has things that I think every Democrat in this country and every American ought to be proud of. It's the biggest investment in health care for poor children since 1965—Howard talked about that—biggest investment in education since 1965; biggest investment in helping open the doors of college to all Americans since the GI bill 50 years ago; substantial reforms of Medicare, including efforts to improve what we're doing in diabetes that the diabetes foundation says are the most important advances in the care of diabetes since insulin was developed 70 years ago. We have added 12 years to the Medicare Trust Fund and given our seniors more choices. This was a big deal.

We also are working on expanding NATO to ensure our partnership in security in Europe. We've passed the Chemical Weapons Convention, a big issue. One of the big disputes we're having with Saddam Hussein now and these inspectors is that these inspectors in Iraq have found enough potential chemical, biological, and incipient nuclear technology, more than was destroyed in the Gulf war. We want to wipe the prospect of chemical warfare off the face of the Earth. We don't want a bunch of terrorists with laboratories in briefcases going from airport to airport wreaking havoc in the world of the 21st century that our children will live in. We took a big step toward that. So this has been a good year.

But in addition to my affection for Governor Dean and my gratitude to the people of Vermont for voting for Bill Clinton and Al Gore twice by big margins and my desire to help members of my party, I want—I think it's very important that you understand that even though sometimes I get the feeling around here many people don't remember that the Governors or the mayors or the county officials, for that matter, are really out there doing a lot of things—the Governors are especially important for the strategy that I'm pursuing for America to succeed.

We got $24 billion for children's health; that's good. What's step two? The Governors have to design a program that works. And I promise you every Governor with any sense in this country without regard to party is going to wonder what Howard Dean is going to do with the money because they know that Vermont has done the best job of expanding health care coverage for children. So it matters who the Governor is.

You can put more money into education, but the Governors have to decide how it's going to be spent. We won a huge battle, which we're going to be really highlighting in the next couple of days when we sign the appropriations bills, to get the Congress, after months and months of contentious

fighting, to embrace the notion that we ought to have national standards of academic excellence and national exams in reading and math for elementary students and eighth graders. But what happens afterwards? Education is the primary province of the States. The Federal Government can facilitate national excellence in education; the Governors have to ensure it.

In the environment, we're trying to clean up 500 toxic waste dumps and prove we can have clean air, clean water, and safe food and grow the environment. We can provide funds, we can have Federal standards, but in the end, the specific work is largely done in the States.

And as we move into this new era where we have to have more flexibility, more partnerships, and more common sense, in which we want to reject the kind of ideological false choices we're often confronted with in the political debates here, the partnership that exists and the quality of it and the quality of the people that do the work at the State level—the partnership with the Federal Government will be critical in terms of how Americans actually get to live and what kind of world our children actually grow up in. That's what this is about.

So in so many ways the governorship is more important than ever before. We have tried to give more responsibility to the States. We've also tried to give them more things to do. And it has succeeded in places like Vermont, which have had visionary leadership.

I can only hope and pray that every Governor will do the job that I know that he will do in health care, in education, in the environment, in building a solid future for our children. You're going to help him to do it by your presence here tonight, and I'm very grateful to you.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:47 p.m. in the Colonial Room at the Mayflower Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Loretta Bowen, legislative and political director, Communications Workers of America; Gov. Howard Dean of Vermont, chair, and Katie Whelan, executive director, Democratic Governors' Association.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner

November 12, 1997

Well, I hardly know what to say. [*Laughter*] You have unwittingly uncovered how Elizabeth came to be appointed an ambassador. In 1992, these 10 guys came to see me from Washington, and they said, "If you can make Smith Bagley hush for 3 years, we'll support you for President." [*Laughter*] I'll never look at you the same again. I'll always think of you as the president of the American Women's Club, for the rest of my life. [*Laughter*]

I can see, this is going to be on Pat Robertson's television show tomorrow night. There's something brewing here. [*Laughter*]

I'd like to thank Smith and Elizabeth, first of all, for opening their home to us. This is a beautiful, beautiful place, and a very interesting place. I got a little history of the house tonight. If you haven't gotten it, I think you should. I'd also like to thank you, Elizabeth, for your truly extraordinary service in Portugal. You did a great job, and I'm grateful. And thank you for making Hillary and Chelsea feel so welcome over there.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have not a long talk to give tonight. I'm feeling rather nostalgic today. We were talking around the table—I spoke today, earlier, at the memorial service for Congressman Walter Capps, who was a particular friend of mine because his daughter, Laura, has worked for me for several years and used to work as George Stephanopoulos' assistant. So she was literally in the room next to the couple of rooms I occupy along with the Oval Office in the White House.

He was about 62 years old and only served 10 months in Congress. He was a college professor for over three decades, and he got elected in '96, after having been defeated in '94. But he was a wonderful, wonderful human being and a very close friend of ours. And he, like me, absolutely idolized his daughter, and so he used to hang around the White House all the time—even when Congressmen shouldn't have been there—just to catch a glimpse of his sweet child.

All these eulogies today were talking about how Walter Capps was always in a good

humor and always basically felt relaxed and at peace and was so unpolitical in the Washington sense of the term—and also, that even though he was in his early sixties, how utterly completely devoid of any kind of cynicism he was, which I think is an admirable thing.

Well, anyway, I got myself in the right frame of mind. And then right before I left to start my rounds this evening, I spent an hour and a half with my political director, Craig Smith, who is here with me, and we sat around a table, along with Mickey Ibarra and Maria Echaveste who also work in the White House, with—I don't know—12 or 15 young people, all under 30. And there was an Indian-American State legislator from Minnesota who is one of four South Asians in State legislatures around the United States. There was a young Hispanic city councilman from Tucson who persuaded his wife that they should delay their honeymoon so that he could come to this meeting with me. I personally thought that was going a little far. [*Laughter*] There was a young woman who is the head of the Future Farmers of America in South Dakota. There was a young Native American woman who had a degree in physics and was going back to study to teach physics to children on Indian reservations in the United States. It was a very impressive group of people—a number of others.

And we just went around the room, and they said whatever they wanted to say to me. They asked me whatever they wanted to ask. There was a young African-American man who is a Rhodes Scholar who went to Jackson State University in Mississippi. And they talked about a lot of different things, but I left the meeting feeling really good about our country, that we had young people like that and that, contrary to a lot of the stereotyping about Generation X, they didn't have a bit of cynicism, and they were quite upbeat about their future, and they were very determined to see that their generation did its part in meeting the problems of our time. They were all especially interested in citizen community service, which I found was very moving.

I say that by way of background because we are coming to the end of the year; I guess Congress will go home in the next day or two when we—we've got a few little disputes outstanding. And then we'll resume again around the time of the State of the Union in January.

And I feel a great deal of gratitude this year. We have the lowest unemployment rate we've had in nearly a quarter of a century, lowest inflation rate in 30 years. The deficit has been reduced by 92 percent before the balanced budget kicked in on October 1st—92 percent reduction from the day I took office. We have cleaner air, cleaner water, safer food, and we're cleaning up more toxic waste sites than ever before. The crime rate has gone down; the welfare rolls have had a record drop. And I think, more importantly, people really know down deep inside American can work again, that we can really make this thing work.

Your presence here tonight is important because it's very important, as we get ready to go into an election season, that we do our dead-level best to make sure people understand what the real choices are before them and what policies we have adopted that are—for instance, the Republican Party would never have adopted, and people can make a judgment about whether they're right for America.

But if you take this balanced budget bill, for example, if there had been a Republican President and a Republican Congress, they might have adopted a balanced budget bill, and it would have had a capital gains tax in it. It might have had the $500-per-child tax credit, even if they controlled the Presidency and both Houses. It never would have had the tax credits for all forms of higher education after high school that effectively opened the doors of college to all Americans. It never would have had the biggest increase in education since 1965, with funds to put computers in all the classrooms of the country. It certainly would not have had the biggest increase in child health since 1965.

I doubt very seriously that it would have had the Medicare reforms we had and the Medicaid reforms we had. The American Diabetes Association said that the diabetes changes were the most important things since the discovery of insulin 70 years ago. We added 12 years to the Medicare Trust Fund and covered more women for

mammographies; did a lot more work in testing prostate cancer, which is I think the most under-researched and under-treated major form of cancer in America today now, now that we've more than doubled the efforts that we're making in breast cancer. And I'm very grateful for that, and the country will be stronger because of it.

We passed the Chemical Weapons Convention in a bipartisan fashion. We got bipartisan support to expand NATO, and that's good.

And we're heading into Thanksgiving with—tomorrow, I believe, I'm going to sign the appropriations bill which finally, finally secures a victory I've been working for since the State of the Union: Congress has agreed to let us proceed to establish national academic standards, not Federal Government standards but national academic standards, and have voluntary tests in reading and mathematics for the fourth and the eighth grades. So I'm very, very happy about that. They also fund our America Reads program, which is now in 800 colleges around America. We have tens of thousands of college kids going out into schools every single week now—more than once a week—teaching young people to read. So it's a good thing, and I feel very good about it.

As we look ahead next year, we've tried to set the framework for what we still have to do. We're about to appoint—the congressional leaders in both parties and I—members to a Medicare commission that will attempt to come up with a bipartisan long-term solution to the Medicare problem so that when my generation retires we won't bankrupt our children and prohibit them from taking care of our grandchildren.

We're now working full steam ahead, hoping we can reach an agreement with other countries in Kyoto about how the wealthier countries of the world can together reduce the threat of global warming and climate change without having to give up economic growth. I am absolutely positive, based on the evidence, that it can be done if we can organize ourselves properly to do it.

We had a great conference on hate crimes yesterday, which I think will lay the foundation for our continuing efforts to reconcile people across all the lines that divide us in this country. And not very long ago, Hillary and I hosted the first White House Conference on Child Care ever, which I think is one of the great outstanding social issues of our time.

One of the young men who was at our meeting today said, ''You know what I'm worried about?'' He said, ''I'm worried about how I'm supposed to feel secure in a world where I might get laid off at any time and a lot of my friends don't have any health insurance. And I want to have children, but I want to know how I'm supposed to feel secure.'' And so we had this interesting discussion about what security meant when I was his age. I said, ''You know, when I was your age''—he was about 20, I think—''I took it for granted that my folks would have the jobs they had as long as they wanted them.'' I mean, they might get laid off in a recession or something, but people generally had one job and they kept it for their careers. And if they were lucky, they had health insurance on the job; and if they didn't, health care wasn't all that expensive anyway. And so we talked about that. And we talked about how for a long time you knew at least if you could get an education you could have security. And he said, ''Well, I'm not even sure Social Security will be there for me.'' And I said, ''It will be there for you. I know that people say your generation doesn't believe it—it will be there. We have to—it's another thing we're going to work on.''

But if you think about what I've been doing, a lot of what I've been trying to do is to prepare a way for us to get into the future so that that young man and people in his generation can feel a sense of social security in a time dominated by global economics, global technology, rapid changes and oftentimes big changes in the workplace.

One of the reasons we had as much trouble with the fast track as we did—and I still believe we'll succeed in getting some fast-track authority in this Congress—but one of the reasons we had the trouble we did is that people feel—you know, it might have nothing to do with trade—they pick up the paper three days before the vote and see that Levi Strauss is laying 10,000 people off. And then today they see Eastman Kodak is laying 10,000 people off. And one man in Louisiana

who said, ''I'm an ardent free trader,'' had to deal with the fact that one company laid 2,400 people off in his congressional district right before he got ready to vote on this.

Now, how do we create an atmosphere of security there? Everybody knows that the economy is in good shape today, but they're still looking at tomorrow. The one thing we cannot do is to say, we're not going to trade with the world; we're going to run away; we're going to freeze everything in place—because we can't freeze everything in place. We can't. We did a study, the Council of Economic Advisers did, which said that 80 percent of our job loss was due to technological change, 20 percent due to trade and business failures, where people just stop buying your product or service. So a lot of this is just intrinsic to the changing economy, which means we have to have a new definition of security in a more dynamic world.

What would that be? First of all, everybody's got to have access to a good education, and people have to have access to education for a lifetime. If people my age lose their jobs, they have to be able to get a good education to go back to work. You have to set up a system of lifetime learning that operates at higher levels of excellence at critical points than sometimes it does today.

Secondly, people have to have portability of health insurance and portability of retirement. It's not enough to secure Social Security because most people can't live on just Social Security—at least, they can't maintain their lifestyle on Social Security.

Now, we have actually done quite—I've been trying, under Democratic and Republican Congresses now, for 5 years to pass what I called my ''GI bill of rights'' which would set up—go a long way toward setting up a system of lifetime learning, because if you're eligible for public aid and you lose your job, what I think we ought to do, since nearly everybody in America lives within driving distance of a community college, is just give people a certificate and let them take it wherever they want and get whatever training they want—and take a lot of the Government programs out of it and let the educators and the marketplace decide. That's what—I'm trying to do that. The tax credits that we gave to college students, though, or to their parents, to pay the cost of college also go to adults who have to go back to school.

We have made health insurance somewhat more portable with the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill, although there is increasing evidence that there are people, lots of people, working in America where their employers are offering health insurance, but they still don't feel they can afford to buy it. And there are a lot of younger people now who are worried sick that they work in places where they can't buy health insurance. And they don't need it most of the time, but if they have a car wreck or develop a serious illness, they'll really be in trouble if they don't have health care. So I intend to keep doing more on that. We're going to add 5 million kids to the rolls in this budget; we're going to do more.

Perhaps in an area—kind of unheralded—where we've done the most good in the last 5 years is in protecting and making more portable pension plans. In December of '94, I signed the legislation which stabilized 40 million people's pensions and outright saved 8.5 million people's pensions that were under water. Since then, we have slowly but surely added provisions that make it easier for people to get a pension, private pension, 401K plan, and then take it around if they move from place to place.

The next big challenge is child care. Every family I know with school-age children, even people with very high incomes, has—every single family I know, without regard to income, has felt some significant tension at some point in their children's lives between their obligations at work and their obligations at home. And I think we are really going to have to work hard to find the way—the Government can't afford all this—we've got to find a way to have a quality child care network in America that's safe and affordable. We've got to have—we've got to do more than we've done so far on the family leave law, and we've got to have more flexible working hours so that people, if they earn overtime—if they work overtime—a lot of people in this country, keep in mind, have to work overtime. It's a part of their job; they have to do it. And a lot of people want to work overtime. But if you have children, you

ought to be able to take your overtime in cash or time at home. I strongly believe that.

These are the sort of things we need to be thinking about. These are the kinds of things that will create a new sense of social security in a highly dynamic economy. And I'm convinced if we deal with our long-term challenges like climate change and entitlements, if we continue to work on education, if we try to build a country where you can balance family and work, and then if we keep working on trying to solve this problem of how we can celebrate our diversity and still be bound together as one America, I think things are going to work out pretty well for this country, for that group of young people.

And what I'm hoping people will say when our time here is done—it won't be so long now—I keep telling my eager Republicans bashing me around, they ought to just relax; time is taking care of a lot of their problems—[*laughter*]—that people will say that we are really prepared for a new century, we are really prepared for a new era, we really have a chance to create a country where there's opportunity for everybody responsible enough to work for it, where we're coming together, and where we're still leading the world for peace and freedom.

And we have been able to do that in no small measure because there was a core of people in our party—not just in the Congress but among the Governors and mayors—who believed that we could be faithful to our values and still embrace new policies for the new times, and that it would work. And I don't think anyone can seriously argue that we're not better off today than we were 5 years ago. And you'd have to be pretty disingenuous to say that the policies of our administration had nothing to do with it. So I feel good about it.

But I just tried to have a little conversation with you tonight—this is the things that I'm thinking about, and I'm feeling a little mellow because I went to my friend's memorial service today, and I feel very reassured because of the young people I saw today. But the last thing I'd like to say is, I think what you have done here in supporting this party is a good thing. And I disagree with those who say that people in both parties who support their political convictions with their financial support are doing a bad thing. I disagree with that.

And I passionately believe we should change the campaign finance laws. I also believe if we want to make it work, we're going to have to change the media availability laws, because most of us do not—most of us in public life don't spend our time hitting on people like you in private life repeatedly because it's all we want to do in office. This is not a demand—people don't just sit around thinking, I think I'll raise a lot of money and then go throw it out a window somewhere. This system we have was driven by the increased cost of communicating with the public, primarily through the electronic media, although not entirely. And if we want it to work, in the absence of a Supreme Court decision which allows us to limit the size of contributions that people make to their own campaigns—wealthy people—or that limit the amount of money you can spend on a campaign—the only way to make it work is to provide, in exchange for the willingness to observe certain limits, to provide free or reduced air time.

And so I want to say to you, I think you have done a good thing. I think our country is better because of what you have done. I want you to help our party in the '98 elections. I believe if we have a clear, unambiguous agenda to try to create the kind of framework for life in the 21st century I talked about, that our people running for Congress will do quite well.

But I also hope you'll continue to help us reform the campaign finance laws. But I want you to understand—you know this, a lot of you who have been with us a long time, you know that what is driving this is the cost of communicating with the voters. And every time we see an election where only one side is doing the communicating, I know of no example where the voters ignored the person who was talking to him or her the most and instead embraced the person who was totally silent—although there have been times when I wanted to do that myself, as a voter. I know of no example where that, in fact, occurred.

I'd also like to thank you, Mr. Grossman, for your willingness to take on a very difficult job at a tough time and to do a good job of it, and I'm very grateful to you.

And again I say to all of you, this is an act of high citizenship, what you're doing. And we cannot afford to let the American people become skeptical or cynical about this endeavor just at the time when our country is on a roll. And if we do the right things, it will stay on a roll and we'll be able to have a positive impact on all the good people in the rest of the world who are trying to make the most of their freedom, too. That's what you're part of, and when you go home tonight, I want you to be proud of it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:29 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts Elizabeth F. Bagley, former U.S. Ambassador to Portugal, and her husband, Smith; former Assistant to the President for Policy and Strategy and Executive Assistant to the Chief of Staff George R. Stephanopoulos; and Steve Grossman, national chair, Democratic National Committee.

Remarks on Signing the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998

November 13, 1997

You may have to consider a move from math to public service. [*Laughter*]

Well, thank you, Philip and Tina Israel. Thank you, Kikuyu Shaw. Mr. Vice President, Secretary Riley, Secretary Herman, Deputy Secretary Thurm, all the Members of Congress who are here, and Mrs. Udall, thank you for coming.

Ladies and gentlemen, before I make my remarks about this legislation that we have all worked on, I'd like to say a few words about yesterday's United Nations Security Council resolution on Iraq.

Plainly, it sent the right message: Comply now with the U.N. resolutions and let the UNSCOM inspection team go back to work. Iraq's announcement this morning to expel the Americans from the inspection team is clearly unacceptable and a challenge to the international community.

Let me remind you all again—I will say this every time I discuss this issue—these inspectors, in the last 6 years, have uncovered more weapons of mass destruction potential and destroyed it than was destroyed in the entire Gulf war. It is important to the safety of the world that they continue their work. I intend to pursue this matter in a very determined way.

I think it's fair to say that this is one of those days in public service that these Members of Congress in both parties work for and live for and put up with a lot of the hassles of public life for. We have been on a journey for the last 5 years to a new century that is now just around the corner, driven by a vision to provide opportunity to everybody who is responsible enough to work for it, to continue to lead the world for peace and freedom and prosperity, and to bring our people together, across all the lines that divide us, into one America. And we're clearly making progress. Our economy is the strongest in a generation; crime, welfare, and unemployment are falling.

I think all of us believe that the best way to sustain and build on that progress is to make sure that all of our people have a world-class education. In my State of the Union Address, I challenged our people to join me in a nonpartisan effort to make sure that every 8-year-old can read, every 12-year-old can log on to the Internet, every 18-year-old can go on to college, every adult can continue to learn for a lifetime. For the very first time, I feel that we are determined to finish that part of our journey.

Congress and the United States of America have answered the call. When I sign this bill into law, I will have the privilege of signing into the record books what is plainly the best year for American education in more than a generation.

First, we are taking historic steps to make sure that every child in America can meet the high national standards of academic achievement that the Israels spoke about so that every children can master the basics. This bill represents a genuine breakthrough in what is now quite a long effort by many people to achieve national academic standards in the United States. For the first time, we will have workable and generally agreed-upon standards in math and reading. And for the very first time, Congress has voted to

support the development of voluntary national tests to measure performance in fourth grade reading and eighth grade math. The tests will be created by an independent, bipartisan organization and will be piloted in schools next October.

The importance of this cannot be overstated. Our children rise with the expectations we set for them. We know that every child can meet high standards if we set them and measure our progress against them. I want to especially thank Senator Bingaman and Representative Miller and everyone else who worked on this particular part of the legislation.

This legislation also takes concrete steps to help our children meet the standards and, indeed, to achieve all our national education goals. It will help every 8-year-old in America read on his or her own by funding the America Reads challenge and expanding national service so that our AmeriCorps members can recruit trained literacy tutors for our schools. Already, over 800 colleges and universities and numerous other organizations are providing tens of thousands of volunteer tutors that are going into our schools every week to help make sure our children can read. We can give our children the extra attention and practice they need so that we can assure that they'll be able to read independently by the end of the third grade if we continue to pursue this.

Second, the bill takes significant steps to ensure that every 12-year-old can log on to the Internet. I must say, I had ambivalent feelings when I realized that Mr. Israel was logging on to the Internet and reading what was on the website about the exam. Some day somebody may figure out how to find the actual exam on the website. [*Laughter*] But I was glad to know you were. This measure nearly doubles—nearly doubles—our national investment in education technology. It puts us well on the way to connecting every classroom and library to the information superhighway by the year 2000, something the Vice President has made a particular commitment to.

And I want to emphasize something else, because I met with a group of young people yesterday in their twenties who were hammering me on this. They said, ''What difference will it make if you connect every classroom in the country to the information superhighway if the teachers aren't trained to use the technology, and the kids know more than they do?'' So I want to emphasize that a big part of this legislation provides investments to make sure that our teachers have the training they need to maximize the use of this new technology.

Third, the bill, along with the college tuition tax credits I signed into law this summer and the improvements in the college loan program we have been implementing since 1993, will make it possible for every 18-year-old who's willing to work for it to go on to college. And it gives us the chance to make the 13th and 14th years of education as universal as a high school diploma is today. This measure includes the largest increase in Pell grant scholarships in two decades, raising the maximum grant, and serving an additional 220,000 students.

I might add that the Congress—and I thank the members of this committee who are here—has added in the last two budgets another 300,000 work-study positions as well.

The bill also promotes innovation and expands public school choice, helping parents, teachers, and community leaders to open some 500 new charter schools and clearing the way for 3,000 such schools by early in the next century. It recognizes that learning begins in the earliest years of life and significantly expands investment in Head Start. It challenges teachers to reach higher standards along with students and honors those who do by helping 100,000 more teachers seek certification for the National Board of Teacher Standards as master teachers.

Let me emphasize the significance of the 100,000 figure. The year before last, there were only 500 teachers in the entire country who had been certified as master teachers. Because of the unique training and performance required to gain this certification, it is our firm belief—and I know Secretary Riley believes this—if we can get one master teacher certified in every school building in America, it will change the entire culture of teaching across the country and elevate the quality of education dramatically. So this is very important.

The bill brings more to our efforts to build the discipline and order and safety and positive activity into the lives of our children, with $40 million to help schools stay open late, on the weekends, and in the summer, to help keep young people off the streets and out of trouble, along with job training for out-of-school youth. Now, let me emphasize the importance of this. Most juvenile crime is committed between the hours of 3 in the afternoon and 7 at night. While the crime rate has dropped in America dramatically, it's only in the last 2 years that it's begun to level off among young people.

But we ought to look at this in a positive way. This is an opportunity to take kids who otherwise don't have the institutional support they need, who are capable of getting a good education and being good, productive citizens, and giving them the institutional framework within which to do that. It also helps a lot of them whose parents have to work until later in the evening and cannot be at home.

So it may sound like a little money, but a little money given to a school on a tight budget for this purpose can make all the difference in the world in the lives of a lot of our young people. So I'm very pleased by that. And again, I want to thank all the Members who are here for what they have done.

I hope now we will use this momentum in education to take some new steps, to pass finally a ''GI bill'' for America's workers that would enable us to give a certificate to any American who needs it to take to the nearest educational institution to learn new skills to reenter the workplace, and to meet the quiet crisis of crumbling and crowded school buildings across America. We have more children in our schools than at any time in our history, with serious overcrowding problems and serious building deterioration problems, which I believe we should help to address.

Let me say, finally, that this bill continues our efforts to strengthen families on many other fronts. It expands educational opportunity for recent immigrants, children with disabilities, children growing up in our poorest neighborhoods. It significantly increases funding for biomedical research, from cancer to Parkinson's disease—and we're particularly glad to have Mrs. Udall with us today—to the astonishing human genome project. And I would like to thank Congressman Porter and Congressman Obey and Congressman Spratt for the work that they have done on this particular thing. And I would like to especially thank Congressman Upton for the work that he's done on the Parkinson's issue. This is a remarkable, remarkable bill with an astonishing bipartisan commitment to keep our country on the front ranks of medical research.

Finally, it will help to make new, very powerful AIDS therapies more available to needy patients. Along with the FDA reform legislation this Congress has passed that we will be signing in the next several days, moving promising medical therapies to market more quickly in a more efficient way and then making them more available to the people that need them can change the lives and improve the quality as well as the length of lives for many, many tens of thousand of our fellow Americans.

And believe it or not, with all these issues on the education checklist and all the things I just mentioned in health care, these are just some of the important provisions in this bill that honor our duty to prepare our people for the future. As much as any bill I have signed, as much as any bill the Congress has passed in recent years, this bill genuinely does fulfill our strategy of opportunity for all, responsibility from all, a community of all Americans. I am very proud to sign it into law.

And again, let me thank every single person in this room who had anything to do with its enactment, but especially, let me thank the Members of Congress who are here for working together in good spirit and honest and principled compromise to hammer out this truly remarkable bill.

Thank you very much.

Now I'd like to ask the Members of Congress and the people from the executive departments and our speakers to join me up here while we sign the legislation.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:29 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to fifth grade student Philip Israel, who introduced the President, and his mother, Tina; Kikuyu Shaw, a junior at Howard University; and Norma Udall, wife of former Representative

Morris K. Udall. H.R. 2264, approved November 13, was assigned Public Law No. 105–78.

Statement on Signing the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998

November 13, 1997

Today I have signed into law H.R. 2264, the "Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998."

This Act provides over $80 billion in discretionary budget authority to fund important education, training, and health programs. I am pleased that H.R. 2264 funds a number of my highest domestic priorities at or above my request.

The Act provides $29.6 billion for the Department of Education, which will allow us to prepare tomorrow's leaders for the challenges of the future. I am very pleased to see such strong support for Education programs by the Congress, support I hope will only grow stronger in the coming years. First, I am pleased that the Congress has voted to fund the development of voluntary national tests linked to high academic standards in reading and math. I am also very pleased that the Act increases the maximum Pell grant award to my request of $3,000. This increase, in conjunction with a $1.4 billion increase in funding, will ease the burden of increasing college costs for low- and middle-income families. Finally, I am very pleased that the Act nearly doubles the Federal investment in educational technology and funds 500 new Charter Schools. I am concerned, however, about the inadequate funding provided for my America Reads Challenge literacy initiative in FY 1998. I am committed to working with the Congress to enact authorizing legislation for a child literacy initiative that will use the $210 million contingently provided in the bill for FY 1999.

The Act provides $33.8 billion for the Department of Health and Human Services, providing large increases to a variety of important public health programs. Funding for biomedical research through the National Institutes of Health is increased dramatically. Support for AIDS programs, including programs to assist in the acquisition and provision of break-through AIDS treatments, is stronger than ever. Funding provided in the Act for Head Start moves us closer to achieving my goal of placing 1,000,000 children in Head Start by the year 2002. Head Start provides early childhood development and other social services to children, and this funding level will allow the program to add at least 36,000 new slots.

The Department of Labor receives $10.7 billion for FY 1998. This will provide strong support for important programs such as assistance to dislocated workers, Summer Jobs, and Job Corps. My Administration will work with the Congress to ensure enactment of training reform legislation by July 1, 1998, to use the $250 million provided as an advance appropriation in FY 1999 for targeted projects to improve employment among out-of-school youth in high poverty areas. The Act also funds critical worker protection programs, championing the rights of the men and women who keep America working.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 13, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2264, approved November 13, was assigned Public Law No. 105–78.

Statement on Congressional Action on the "Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997"

November 13, 1997

I am pleased that the Senate and the House of Representatives have passed historic, bipartisan legislation to promote adoption and improve our Nation's child welfare system, giving our Nation's most vulnerable children what every child deserves—a safe and permanent home. I very much look forward to signing the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 into law.

This legislation makes clear that children's health and safety are the paramount concerns of the public child welfare system. I am particularly pleased that the bill incorporates my administration's recommendations to provide

states with financial incentives to increase the number of children who are adopted and to make other changes in Federal law that will make adoption easier and move children more rapidly out of foster care and into permanent homes. The legislation also strengthens support to States for services that help families stay together when that is possible and promote adoption when it is not. Most important, this legislation will help us meet the goal of doubling, by the year 2002, the number of children who are adopted or permanently placed each year.

I want to thank the many Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives who worked so hard on this bipartisan achievement, but I particularly want to thank the Congressional leadership and the sponsors of this legislation, Senators Chafee and Rockefeller and Representatives Camp and Kennelly, for their commitment. And I would like to add a special work of thanks to the First Lady for her tenacity and dedication to this important issue.

I can think of no better way to celebrate National Adoption Month than to sign this legislation into law.

Message to the House of Representatives Returning Without Approval Legislation To Override of a Line Item Veto

November 13, 1997

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 2631, ''An Act disapproving the cancellations transmitted by the President on October 6, 1997, regarding Public Law 105–45.''

Under the authority of the Line Item Veto Act, on October 6, 1997, I canceled 38 military construction projects to save the taxpayers $287 million. The bill would restore all of the 38 projects.

The projects in this bill would not substantially improve the quality of life of military service members and their families, and most of them would not likely use funds for construction in FY 1998. While the bill does restore funding for projects that were canceled based on outdated information provided by the Department of Defense, I do not endorse restoration of all 38 projects.

The Administration remains committed to working with the Congress to restore funding for those projects that were canceled as a result of data provided by the Department of Defense that was out of date.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 13, 1997.

NOTE: The President's remarks on signing the statement and message to the Congress on line item vetoes of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998, dated October 6, were published in the Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, Volume 33, Number 41, pp. 1501–1503.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting the Report on the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization

November 13, 1997

Dear Mr. Chairman: (Dear Mr. Ranking Member:)

I transmit herewith the 6-month report required under the heading ''International Organizations and Programs'' in title IV of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, 1996 (Public Law 104–107), relating to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO).

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Ted Stevens, chairman, and Robert C. Byrd, ranking member, Senate Committee on Appropriations; and Robert L. Livingston, chairman, and David R. Obey, ranking member, House Committee on Appropriations.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With President Ernesto Zedillo of Mexico and an Exchange With Reporters

November 14, 1997

Iraq

Q. Mr. President, are you willing to extend the no-fly zone across the remainder of Iraq?

President Clinton. Let me first of all say that I believe that the Secretary-General and our team, the United Nations team, made the right decision in withdrawing the team of inspectors there and not just leaving them there. But the real issue here is, how can we stop Saddam Hussein from reconstituting his weapons of mass destruction program, and what will achieve that goal. Any specific tactic will be designed to achieve that goal.

The world has got to understand that he had a weapons of mass destruction program, that he is one of the few people who has ever used chemical weapons against both his enemies and his own citizens, and that there will be a big market for such weapons out there among terrorists and other groups.

This is not just a replay of the Gulf war; this is not throw a man who invaded a country, Kuwait, out of the country and reestablish territorial integrity. This is about the security of the 21st century and the problems everybody is going to have to face dealing with chemical weapons.

So as you know, I don't think it's appropriate for me to speculate about what we might or might not do with specific options, but I think that we have to steel ourselves and be determined that the will of the international community, expressed in the United Nations Security Council resolutions, will have to prevail.

This is simply—it's too dangerous an issue that would set too powerful a precedent about the impotence of the United Nations if we didn't proceed on this in the face of what I have considered to be one of the three or four most significant security threats that all of our people will face for the next whole generation—this weapons of mass destruction proliferation. We've got to stop it.

Q. Given that, sir, are you willing to let the situation last where he's able to manufacture weapons of mass destruction with no one on the ground watching? And if I may ask a second question, sir, why are you ordering a second aircraft carrier into the Gulf region?

President Clinton. Well, I'm ordering the carrier in there because I think it's appropriate under the circumstances. And let me say on the first question that one of the reasons the United States has supported the U.N. decision to continue the flights is that if we're not on the ground, it's been more important that we observe what we can in the air. And we are working this very hard.

We also—I want to say this is a United Nations endeavor, a United Nations resolution we want to implement. We want very much to work with our allies. We want to make sure that we've done all we can to see that they agree with us about the gravity of the situation, and I expect—the Secretary of State is meeting with a lot of the foreign ministers over the next several days, and I will be talking to a number of heads of state, and we'll keep working this. I don't want to put a timetable on myself, because it's not just me, but we're working it hard.

Q. With the inspectors out, Mr. President, does he have some reason to believe that he's gotten his way?

President Clinton. Well, if he does, that would be a mistake. And of course, what he says his objective is, is to relieve the people of Iraq, and presumably the government, of the burden of the sanctions. What he has just done is to ensure that the sanctions will be there until the end of time or as long as he lasts. So I think that if his objective is to try to get back into the business of manufacturing vast stores of weapons of mass destruction and then try to either use them or sell them, then at some point the United States, and more than the United States, would be more than happy to try to stop that.

But if his objective is to lift the sanctions and to divide the coalition and get people more sympathetic with him, I think that he has undermined his objective because we could never, ever agree to any modifications of the larger economic sanctions on Iraq as long as he's out of compliance. And by definition, that's the way the U.N. resolution works. When I say "we" there, I mean the whole world community. So I would think he would not be furthering his objectives, if his stated objectives are his objectives.

[*At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.*]

President Clinton. Buenos dias.

Q. Hi, Mr. Clinton. How are you?

President Clinton. I'm fine, thank you.

Mexico-United States Cooperative Drug Efforts

Q. President Clinton, how are you going to convince people in Congress that the United States—[*inaudible*]—it is a fact, the consumption on drugs, and also narco-traffickers inside of the United States, and convince people that only see Mexico as the bad guys?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, I don't think that's quite fair. I think that Congress has targeted a number of other countries in a more focused way where the problem is not primarily the transit of drugs, but is the production of drugs, so I wouldn't agree with that.

I do believe that, as least for our administration, we have been very clear that the reduction of demand and dealing with the infrastructure of drugs in the United States has to be a key part of our strategy, and we intend to implement that. I think the real issue—what we should be focusing on is how we can work together in our mutual interest, because drugs present a threat both to the United States and to Mexico.

My objective in working with Congress is to try to get a united American position without regard to party, where we should have partnerships with all of the countries that are also beset by this problem in one way or the other, and we should work together on all aspects of it. That's what I believe we should do.

Fast-Track Trade Authority

Q. President Clinton, are you going to be pushing for the fast track approval?

President Clinton. I think that this is not the last chapter in this story. I believe that you will see some more movement early next year, and I wouldn't be too discouraged. Keep in mind, we had—our preliminary vote in the United States Senate had almost 70 percent of the Senators and majorities of both parties in the U.S. Senate in favor of extending fast track. And I believe there is a working majority in the House of Representatives for a good proposal. We're going to work it hard over the holidays and see what happens.

But I would urge our friends throughout Latin America not to overreact to the House vote, that this story is not over yet.

Q. Do you see your failure to get fast track as a referendum of NAFTA?

President Clinton. I think that—no, first of all, I don't, because fast track doesn't have anything to do with NAFTA. That's the first thing. We have our agreement, and we're implementing it and we're working at it. So in a strict sense, it has nothing to do with NAFTA. And there are no two countries anywhere in our hemisphere—indeed, there are no two countries anywhere else in our world—that have the same relationship with either one of us that we have with each other, with so much promise and so many challenges. So NAFTA is not fast track.

But I personally believe that our relationships and our individual economies are stronger because we passed NAFTA than they would have been if we hadn't passed NAFTA. And I think there is enough recent history—you just go back over the last 25 years and look at what's happened in times of economic difficulty either in Mexico or the United States, and you look at all kinds of other issues—we are cooperating across a wider range of issues than ever before; we have a more integrated economic partnership than ever before; we are working on more labor and environmental issues than ever before. So my view is that we did the right thing to pass NAFTA and that both the United States and Mexico are in better shape today than they would be if we hadn't done it. That's what I believe.

But I also have made it clear to Congress that I think there are two separate issues.

[*At this point, two questions were asked and answered in Spanish, and a translation was not provided.*]

Mexican Economy and Democracy

President Clinton. I'd just like to make one comment about the question—you just asked him about the financial crisis, right? I think it is an indication of the strength and the direction that President Zedillo and his administration have taken that Mexico has done quite well in these last difficult weeks. It also, I think, is clear support for the decision that I made a couple of years ago to enter a partnership with Mexico when it was in difficulty, because I felt very strongly that the potential of the Mexican economy and

the Mexican people was very great, and that President Zedillo was pursuing the proper course.

And I would hope that—it's not for me to say, but if I were a Mexican citizen, I would be very pleased with the performance of Mexico and its economy and its markets over the last several weeks in what has been a very challenging time for the world. And I think we need to focus—instead of focusing on the changes in these markets on a daily basis, our goal should be to work with all of the developing countries and all the sort of booming economies to make sure their underlying fundamentals are right.

If the underlying fundamental economic policies are correct, then over time the markets will follow that, and that should be the key. I think Secretary Rubin and his colleagues did a good thing to try to stabilize the situation in Asia, for example, but the long-term goal is, if the fundamentals are right, eventually you will have good markets and a good economy. That's the most important thing, is to have a good economy for ordinary people.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—economy? In Mexico?

President Clinton. Where?

Q. In Mexico or the developing economies?

President Clinton. I just have to say, to me, just as an observer and a passionate supporter of democratic government over my lifetime, that of course Mexico has a lot of challenges. But if you look at this transformation you've made to a multiparty democracy, it's quite amazing that it's happened in a way that we've seen stability maintained, government's freedom to pursue a responsible economic course maintained. It's been very impressive to all of us who are on the outside looking in that Mexico has made a dramatic change in its political system, which I think will stand you in very good stead over the long run.

We find our competitive system—although none of us who are in office like competition—but our system has stabilized America over the long run. I think Mexico will be stabilized by the political transformation, but it's amazing that it's happened so quickly and so well. And so for me, the political developments there have been interesting and very impressive, very hopeful.

Q. You don't see any obstacles——

President Clinton. There are always obstacles. There will always be obstacles.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:20 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at the Signing Ceremony for the Organization of American States Hemispheric Arms Trafficking Convention

November 14, 1997

Thank you very much, Mr. Gurria, Secretary General Gaviria, President Zedillo, distinguished permanent representatives of the Organization of American States, to all my fellow Americans who are here, and especially to two Members of our Congress, Senator Dodd and Congressman Gilman.

Today our 34 democracies are speaking with one voice, acting with one conviction, leading toward one goal, to stem the flow of illegal guns, ammunitions, and explosives in our hemisphere. Three years ago at the United Nations, the United States called on others to work with us to shut down the gray markets that outfit terrorists, drug traffickers, and criminals with guns.

Here at home we have prohibited arms dealers from acting as middlemen for illicit sales overseas, strengthened residency requirements for gun purchasers, banned foreign visitors from buying guns here in the United States, tightened export licenses to make sure that legally exported weapons are not diverted to illegal uses. But in an era where our borders are all more open to the flow of legitimate commerce, problems like trafficking in weapons and explosives simply cannot be solved by one nation alone.

Last May in Mexico, President Zedillo and I pledged to work together for a hemisphere-wide agreement to curb the illegal arms trade. I thank President Zedillo for Mexico's leadership. Mr. Secretary General, I thank

you and the OAS member states for concluding this agreement in record time. We understand the magnitude of the problem. In the last year alone, thousands of handguns and rifles, hundreds of thousands of rounds of ammunition destined for illegal export have been seized in our nations.

The illegal export of firearms is indeed not just a hemispheric but a worldwide problem and demands an international response. Last year, the United States Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms received approximately 30,000 requests just from OAS member states to trace weapons used in crimes. Gun trafficking is an issue of national security for all of us and a matter of neighborhood security for the Americas.

This convention will neither discourage nor diminish the lawful sale, ownership, or use of guns, but it will help us to fight the unlawful trade in guns that contributes to the violence associated here in America with drugs and gangs.

If we want also here in America to see the powerful trend of democracy and free markets and peace in our hemisphere continue, we must also help our neighbors to fight the illegal trade in guns so that the foundations of democracies will not be eroded by violent crime and corruption.

Now, this convention mandates four key steps to achieve our common goals:

First, it requires countries to establish and maintain a strong system of export, import, and international transit licenses for arms, ammunitions, and explosives to make sure that weapons won't move without explicit permission from all the countries concerned.

Second, other nations will join us in putting markings on firearms, not only when they're made but also when they're imported. If guns are diverted from legal purposes, we will then be better able to trace their path and find out exactly when and how they got into the wrong hands.

Third, nations will adopt laws that criminalize illicit arms production and sales as we have already done, so that those who seek to profit from illegal trade in guns know they will pay a stiff penalty in jail.

Fourth, we will step up every level of information sharing from common routes used by arms traffickers to ways that smugglers are concealing their guns and tips on how to detect them. If we work together, we can put the black market in weapons out of business.

Let me say in a larger sense to all of you that this agreement underscores the new spirit of the Americas and the new dynamism of this organization. The mood of the negotiations was not one of recrimination but of cooperation on behalf of a common goal. We need more of that. Our hemisphere is setting a new standard for the world in taking on global challenges: last year, with our pathbreaking convention against corruption; today with this arms trafficking agreement. Together, we're showing the way of the 21st century world: democratic partners working together to improve the prosperity and security of all their people.

I'm especially pleased to be joined today, and to join you today, with President Zedillo. The United States and Mexico are working hard to forge a true partnership founded on mutual respect, a partnership as broad as our border is long. We see it taking shape in the creation of NAFTA, in our common commitment to the Firearms Convention, in our alliance against drug-trafficking, in our work with other American nations to increase multilateral cooperation and strengthen our hemispheric institutions to combat the scourge of drugs.

Over the last 2 days, the United States and Mexico have reached an agreement on extradition that will allow cross-border criminals to be tried in both countries while the evidence is still fresh. We've pledged to build a new Rio Grande bridge to help link our people together. We've taken an important step to fully demarcate our common border, and agreed to promote environmental commercial cooperation. We've agreed also to work together to combat climate change, because developed and developing countries must reduce greenhouse gas emissions, together, that are warming the atmosphere.

Witnessing the signing of this important convention, I am especially proud of the renewed vitality of the OAS and the renewed deep cooperation between the United States and Mexico. It can make a difference for our entire community of nations—to build a better, safer future for all our people.

And now I'd like to ask you to join me in welcoming our good friend President Ernesto Zedillo of Mexico.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:32 p.m. in the Hall of the Americas at the Organization of American States. In his remarks, he referred to Jose Gurria, Mexican Secretary of Foreign Affairs, and Cesar Gaviria, Secretary General, Organization of American States.

Declaration of President Clinton and President Zedillo

November 14, 1997

We met to carry forward the mature partnership between our two governments, marked by mutual respect, to review progress on the work program launched at our last meeting in Mexico City in May, and to continue our personal contacts in order to spur further cooperation on issues of vital importance to our citizens.

Since our meeting six months ago:

- We have concluded negotiations in the Organization of American States of an hemispheric convention against illegal firearms trafficking, originally proposed by Mexico and strongly endorsed by the two of us at our meeting in Mexico City last May.
- We have concluded a Protocol to our Extradition Treaty, which will permit temporary extradition to allow cross border criminals to be tried in both jurisdictions while the evidence is still fresh. We exchanged instruments of ratification of our Maritime Boundary Treaty, thereby taking an important step to fully demarcate our common maritime border.
- We have concluded a Memorandum of Intent on Environmental Commercial Cooperation.
- The team of researchers commissioned by our two governments has completed its binational study on migration, and submitted its report.
- The High Level Contact Group submitted to us an Executive Summary of the Joint Counternarcotics Strategy which we mandated in our bilateral Alliance Against Drugs.
- Under the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) trade between our two countries continues to expand, enriching our societies and employing an ever-larger number of our workers. Thus, since we last met, Mexico has become the United States' second largest market, while the United States remains Mexico's largest market.

Looking to the future, we agreed to work together in the international negotiations on climate change. Our governments will promote the growth of electronic commerce and development of the Internet. We confirm our commitment to the goals of our bilateral Alliance Against Drugs, and to the development of measures through which we can appraise our efforts in our common fight. We will work to expand hemisphere-wide counternarcotics cooperation and to strengthen the Organization of American States' capacity to support this priority task. We will promote the preparatory work and successful conclusion of the special session of the UN General Assembly to enhance global cooperation against illicit drugs.

We have achieved progress in the implementation of our May 6 *Joint Declaration on Migration:*

- We have agreed on appropriate procedures at the border and inside the US for the orderly and safe repatriation of Mexican nationals with full regard for their dignity and human rights and the principle of family unity.
- We have enhanced the capacities of the eight liaison mechanisms at border cities to promote protection of migrants and safety along our common border.
- We have taken actions between Mexican Consuls and Immigration and Naturalization Service Directors to improve consular protection in pursuance of the agreements signed by both governments.
- We agreed to a new cooperative agenda which will explore and respond to the linkage between migration and development in both countries.
- We instructed our officials to work with the conclusions of our binational study on migration to involve communities on

both sides of the border in a consultative process designed to produce innovative approaches to common challenges and opportunities for development to our mutual benefit, and to report back to us within a year.

- Finally, we call on the academic communities of both countries to join us in this effort.

On *the border,* we will continue to work toward a new vision of cooperation in this dynamic and challenging region, in order to make it safer, more promising for families and communities and enriching for both countries. Through the identification of model-projects in the areas of public safety, environmental protection, urban infrastructure, and cultural life, we endeavor to promote economic, social, and cultural development for the benefit of our communities. Among others, we welcomed projects such as the one currently taking place in the San Diego/Tijuana area for the comprehensive management of solid waste; and initiatives for the facilitation of border crossings, like the upcoming construction of the Rio Grande bridge at Eagle Pass/Piedras Negras.

On *drug control,* we reiterated our commitment to the goals of our bilateral Alliance Against Drugs, to the development of concrete measures by which we can determine if our common efforts against drugs are succeeding, and to their full implementation in full respect for the sovereignty and territorial jurisdiction of both nations. We also agreed on the need to further bolster efforts to reduce the demand for illicit drugs, as part of a comprehensive approach to anti-narcotics cooperation. We acknowledged Mexico's efforts on eradication, interdiction and combating criminal organizations. We agreed on the need for effective action against drug corruption on both sides of border, for the development of closer law enforcement cooperation, and to ensure the safety of law enforcement officers of both countries, along with safeguards for shared information.

We have arranged for a conference of demand control experts from our two countries in March to determine how we can most effectively share our expertise and pool our resources, particularly in the area around the border.

Antinarcotics maritime and air cooperation and coordination, with full respect for each others jurisdiction, have led to an increase in drug seizures at sea and an increase in the amount of drugs seized by Mexican authorities in Mexican territory. Training of the personnel required for specialized anti-drug law enforcement units has continued apace and we have brought pressure on the major drug trafficking organizations.

On *macroeconomic issues,* we agreed that Mexico's strong reforms since 1995—backed by U.S. and international support—have helped to restore financial strength and put the Mexican economy in healthy condition. We discussed Mexico's economic and financial situation in light of recent turbulence in emerging markets and acknowledged that continued strong policies will help preserve and expand these accomplishments.

Trade between our two countries has continued to increase, promoting high growth and generating additional jobs in both countries. As a natural consequence of this dynamic trading relationship, issues of concern in several sectors have arisen, which we discussed and on which we instructed our officials to continue to seek resolution. We also reaffirmed our commitment to continue our cooperation in labor and the environment.

We agreed that the Internet represents an important new tool for expanding commerce, promoting education, research and development and enhancing the delivery of social services, particularly in remote areas. We will consult domestically and explore in the appropriate international fora key issues related to the promotion of a legal and commercial environment in which this medium can flourish, encouraging our private sector to lead in its development. We instructed our experts to meet to carry out this pledge.

On *environment,* we confirmed agreement to promote sustainable development in the border area and to seek the support of our border communities and the private sector in reaching the goals of Border XXI. We also confirmed agreement on indicators to assess and advance progress on water, solid and hazardous waste, air and natural resources along the border. We welcomed steps taken by the Border Environmental Cooperation Commission (BECC) and by the North

American Development Bank (NADBank) to address the need for new wastewater treatment facilities in Tijuana and Ciudad Juarez.

On *climate change,* we agreed that developed countries like the United States must lead by reducing emissions and developing countries like Mexico should be willing to participate in an appropriate global regime. We affirmed our support for joint implementation as a means for using market mechanisms to promote private sector initiatives and investments in clean energy, energy efficiency and reforestation. Countries should take on responsibilities under the climate treaty that are appropriate to their level of development and fully consistent with sustainable economic growth and development. We reaffirmed our support for the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the principle of common but differentiated responsibility. We have instructed our representatives to consult closely on this issue as we approach the Kyoto conference.

On *hemispheric and multilateral issues,* we highlighted the importance of education in the agenda of the Summit of the Americas. We welcomed our negotiators' success in achieving a hemispheric firearms trafficking convention and pledged to support its early ratification. We expressed our support for restraint and transparency in arms transfers. We also agreed to work together to promote hemispheric cooperation in law enforcement and anti-corruption efforts.

We discussed the importance of new multilateral initiatives in counternarcotics including multilateral assessment of progress achieved by all hemispheric countries toward meeting their respective national goals. We are convinced that illicit drugs represent a worldwide problem which requires international cooperation and that each nation assumes fully its own responsibility. Therefore, we pledged to work together to ensure the success of the United Nations' Special Session on Illicit Drugs in June, 1998. We commended the work done by both governments in the fulfillment of our commitments and instructed our officials to increase their efforts in the achievement of our common goals.

We are convinced that two neighbors and partners, like the United States and Mexico, can address even the most complex issues through mutual respect, constructive dialog and cooperation.

Remarks on the Situation in Iraq

November 14, 1997

Two days ago and again last night, the United Nations Security Council sent a clear, unanimous message to Iraq: Stop obstructing the international weapons inspectors who are the eyes and ears of the world on your weapons of mass destruction capability.

Instead of complying with the unequivocal will of the international community, Saddam chose to expel the weapons inspectors from Iraq, and in so doing, to defy the United Nations. Saddam has spent the better part of the last two decades and much of the wealth of his nation not on providing for the needs and advancing the hopes of the Iraqi people but on a program to build an arsenal of the most terrible weapons of destruction—nuclear, chemical, biological—and on the missiles to carry them to faraway places.

The U.N. inspectors have done a remarkable job of finding and destroying the weapons and the weapons potential he was hiding and preventing him from building new weapons. These quiet inspectors have destroyed more weapons of mass destruction potential over the last 6 years than was destroyed in the entire Gulf war. Their work is important to the safety of Saddam's neighbors and, indeed, to people all around the world. It must be allowed to continue.

Today and in the days ahead, the United States will work intensively with our allies and our friends in the region and around the world to convince Iraq to comply with the will of the international community as expressed in the United Nations resolution.

Meanwhile, the U–2 missions over Iraq must continue. Without inspectors on the ground, it is more important than ever to monitor events from the air. And we will maintain a strong military presence in the Gulf. To that end, I have ordered today the aircraft carrier *George Washington* to the region as a prudent measure to help assure that we have the forces we need for any contingency.

This is a crisis of Saddam's making. It can be unmade only when he can no longer threaten the international community with weapons of mass destruction.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:46 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Statement on Congressional Action on Immigration Legislation

November 14, 1997

During my trip to Central America in May, I pledged to address the circumstances of Central Americans who were treated unfairly by last year's immigration bill. The bill's strict new rules threatened to uproot hundreds of thousands of people who came to our shores fleeing violence and persecution. In July, I transmitted to the Congress a legislative proposal that offered relief to these people. I am very pleased that the Congress has now passed provisions that do just that.

In the 1980's, a large number of Central Americans sought refuge in the United States because of the civil war and human rights abuses that then plagued that region. As I noted during my trip, the United States has a particular obligation to help these people because they and their families have now established deep roots in our communities and because sending them home in large numbers at this time would very likely disrupt the important progress these countries have made towards peace, democracy, and economic reform. As a result of these new provisions, these people may now be considered for permanent status under more generous rules than were imposed by the recent immigration bill.

Nevertheless, I am concerned about several aspects of this legislation. First, I am troubled by the fact that it treats similarly situated people differently. The Central Americans covered by this bill fled similar violence and persecution; they have established similarly strong connections to the United States; and their home countries are all fledgling democracies in need of our assistance. The relief made available to these people should be consistent as well. I believe, however, that these differences can be minimized in the implementation process.

I am also concerned about the plight of certain Haitians who are not covered by this legislation. Before we helped restore democracy to Haiti, many Haitians were also forced to flee their country because of persecution and civil strife. They deserve the same treatment that this legislation makes possible for other groups. We will seek passage of legislation providing relief to these Haitians early in the next session of Congress and take appropriate administrative action while we pursue this solution.

Finally, I believe that Congress should not have continued to permit the application of new, harsher immigration rules to other persons with pending cases. Changing the rules in the middle of the game is unfair, unnecessary, and contrary to our values. We intend to revisit this issue at the earliest opportunity.

Statement on Signing the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998

November 14, 1997

I have signed into law today H.R. 2107, the "Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998."

This Act provides funding for the Department of the Interior, various programs of the Department of Energy, the Forest Service (Department of Agriculture), the Indian Health Service (Department of Health and Human Services), the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, and several other agencies. It funds several of my Administration's priorities, which were highlighted in the Bipartisan Budget Agreement (BBA): priority Federal land acquisitions, National Park Service (NPS) operations, NPS base land acquisition, Everglades restoration, and Tribal Priority Allocations in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA).

The National Endowment for the Arts will continue to provide active and visible support to important American arts communities and is funded at $98 million, $1.5 million below the FY 1997 level. The Act also provides $111 million for the National Endowment for

the Humanities. I remain concerned, however, about the low level of funding for these agencies that provide important cultural, education, and artistic programs for communities across America.

The $699 million provided in H.R. 2107 for priority Federal land acquisitions and exchanges is an extraordinary accomplishment agreed to in the BBA. These funds, in addition to the amounts provided for regular land acquisition, will allow the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to protect nationally important treasures—including Yellowstone National Park and the largest privately held stand of ancient redwoods in northern California—from unacceptable environmental threats. It is important that the decision of the Congress to allow a portion of this appropriation to be used for critical maintenance projects and other purposes not be seen as a precedent for the allocation of moneys for such purposes from the Land and Water Conservation Fund in the future. These problems, while meriting attention, are not appropriate uses of the funds. Finally, the bill includes an unjustified transfer of millions of dollars of mineral rights to the State of Montana—I intend to use my line-item veto authority to cancel the dollar drain on the Treasury that would result from this unwarranted action.

The Act provides $1.2 billion for operation of our national park system. This funding, an increase of more than 6 percent over the amount provided for FY 1997, will enable the NPS to improve on the high-quality service at existing national parks, including five new parks established in 1996. Funding is provided at my requested level for Everglades restoration. This will support our efforts to restore this rare and delicate ecosystem to environmental health. The Act also provides $1.3 billion for operation of our national forest system (6 percent over FY 1997), and full funding for other land management agencies that provide recreation, conservation, and development opportunities to all Americans.

My Administration has moved away from past policies that primarily emphasized timber cutting at the expense of the environment and blatantly violated environmental laws. This Administration stands for protecting the environment as well as jobs. For example, my Pacific Northwest Forest Plan, in place for over 3 years, encompasses this new approach of managing our national forests based on sound science. This plan helps to ensure that these forests can continue to provide multiple benefits to the public for the long-term, including timber harvest, wildlife, fisheries, recreation, and clean water. Another approach we are proud of is employing Habitat Conservation Plans, such as that in the Headwaters Forest agreement, which are based on sound science and that fully comply with the Endangered Species Act. We can and do protect economic and environmental interests.

Unfortunately, the Act includes several provisions that attempt to interfere with the responsible management of our national forests. These Forest Service riders in the bill reflect increasing efforts by the majority in the Congress to micromanage forest management decisions and to prevent the use of scientifically based information to guide land stewardship. These provisions clearly are an attempt to return to forest management by politics rather than science and full public participation. This is a grave disservice to the people of the United States.

For example, the bill includes a provision to restrict the ability of the Forest Service to start new revisions of national forest land management plans to bring them up to date with new science, until the agency publishes new planning regulations. The Congress clearly seeks to force the Administration to release forest planning regulations that have not yet been finalized because of our concerns over the regulations' impact on the Forest Service's ability to improve its environmental performance. Instead, USDA has established an independent Committee of Scientists to review the regulations and provide recommendations for their improvement. I have directed the agency to proceed expeditiously with this scientific review and to use its findings to guide its effort in rewriting forest planning direction. Until the new regulations are published, the agency will proceed with protecting the environment by conducting the necessary environmental analysis and updating forest plans to continue

the Administration's science-based management policy to the maximum extent allowed under the rider.

The Congress also continues to interfere with the Administration's efforts to promote ecosystem management and a greater understanding of the natural resource management issues affecting areas like the interior Columbia River Basin—an area characterized by forest health, watershed, and endangered species problems. Cumbersome requirements to delay a science-based plan for the Basin could potentially shut down every forest in that region, hurting communities and families dependent on these forests for their livelihood. This action may benefit a few special interests, but it injures both the environment and the economy.

In addition, the Conference Report for this Act directs the Forest Service to continue the use of so-called ''purchaser road credits'' for commercial timber roads on national forests. I have proposed to eliminate these credits, which amount to an unneeded subsidy for companies buying public timber. Contrary to the views expressed in the Conference Report, many in the Congress have acknowledged the adverse environmental impact that decades of timber road building have caused to our land and water. Therefore, I will again propose elimination of purchaser road credits next year while holding counties and small businesses harmless and have asked the Secretary of Agriculture to take the necessary administrative steps to be prepared to implement the Administration's proposal in FY 1999. Further, the Forest Service is developing a scientifically based policy for managing roadless areas in our national forests. These last remaining wild areas are precious to millions of Americans and key to protecting clean water and abundant wildlife habitat, and providing recreation opportunities. These unspoiled places must be managed through science, not politics.

The Act contains funding of $612 million for energy conservation activities. While I am pleased that this includes modest increases for mitigating global climate change and for the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles, it is still a $96 million reduction from our request that will slow our planned progress in both of those areas.

The Act provides $757 million for reservation-level BIA Tribal Priority Allocation programs as agreed to in the BBA. This will enable Tribes to allocate funding for essential programs, such as social services, law enforcement, housing improvement, scholarships, and road repair.

While I am pleased that the Congress has funded the Tribal Priority Allocation programs at the level I requested, I am concerned that provisions in the Act will limit the ability of sovereign Alaskan tribes to exercise their self-determination as to how health services are provided. These provisions contradict my Administration's longstanding support of self-determination for tribal governments set forth under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Act. It is my understanding that the Secretary of Health and Human Services can review any proposal submitted to the Indian Health Service for contracting primary care services against the statutory declination provisions in section 102 of the Indian Self-Determination Act.

Section 129 of the Act prohibits the Secretary of the Interior from approving new class III tribal-State gaming compacts without prior approval of a State. This section properly construed, clarifies that State approval is governed by State law. I am advised that this section does not prohibit the Secretary from conducting a rulemaking to establish a process to govern situations in which a tribe and a State cannot agree on a tribal-State compact. This section is acceptable because it is not inconsistent with the established national policy set forth in the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 14, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2107, approved November 14, was assigned Public Law No. 105–83.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

November 8

The President announced his intention to nominate David M. Mason to serve as a Commissioner on the Federal Election Commission.

November 11

In the morning, the President traveled to Arlington, VA. He returned to Washington, DC, in the afternoon.

November 12

In an afternoon ceremony in the Oval Office, the President received diplomatic credentials from the following Ambassadors: Hersey Kyota of Palau; Stasys Sakalauskas of Lithuania; Joris Michael Vos of The Netherlands; Warnasena Rasaputram of Sri Lanka; Noureddine Mejdoub of Tunisia; Dimitrij Rupel of Slovenia; Jesus Reyes-Heroles of Mexico; Christopher Meyer of the United Kingdom; Ahmed Djabir of Comoros; and Koby Arthur Koomson of Ghana.

The President announced his intention to appoint Vera C. Rubin as Chair, and Alfred Y. Cho, Arthur M. Jaffe, and Mario J. Molina as members of the President's Committee on the National Medal of Science.

The White House announced that the President will meet with President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakstan at the White House on November 18.

November 13

In the evening, the President held a reception in the State Dining Room for House Democrats who supported him on fast-track trade legislation. Later, he hosted a private dinner for President Ernesto Zedillo of Mexico in the Residence.

The White House announced that the President and Hillary Clinton will spend the Thanksgiving Day holiday at Camp David, MD.

November 14

In the late afternoon, the President traveled to Las Vegas, NV, arriving in the evening.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted November 7 [1]

Donald J. Barry,
of Wisconsin, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, vice George T. Frampton, Jr., resigned.

Robert T. Dawson,
of Arkansas, to be U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, vice H. Franklin Waters, retired.

Joan Avalyn Dempsey,
of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of Central Intelligence for Community Management (new position).

Alan Greenspan,
of New York, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 5 years (reappointment).

Winter D. Horton, Jr.,
of Utah, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2002, vice Carolyn R. Bacon, term expired.

Elaine D. Kaplan,
of the District of Columbia, to be Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, for the term of 5 years, vice Kathleen Day Koch, term expired.

Wilma A. Lewis,
of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, vice Eric H. Holder, Jr., resigned.

Robert J. Shapiro,
of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs, vice Everett M. Ehrlich.

[1] These nominations were not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Withdrawn November 7 [1]

James S. Ware,
of California, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, vice J. Clifford Wallace, retired, which was sent to the Senate on June 27, 1997.

Submitted November 8

Ronald M. Gould,
of Washington, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, vice Robert R. Beezer, retired.

Sam A. Lindsay,
of Texas, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Texas (new position).

Barry G. Silverman,
of Arizona, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, vice William Cameron Canby, Jr., retired.

Orson Swindle,
of Hawaii, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1997, vice Roscoe Burton Starek III, term expired.

Donna Tanoue,
of Hawaii, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the remainder of the term expiring October 3, 2000, vice Ricki Rhodarmer Tigert, resigned.

Donna Tanoue,
of Hawaii, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of 5 years, vice Ricki Rhodarmer Tigert, resigned.

Mozelle Willmont Thompson,
of New York to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1996, vice Christine A. Varney, resigned.

Joseph Robert Brame III,
of Virginia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring August 27, 2000, vice James M. Stephens, term expired.

Sarah McCracken Fox,
of New York, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1999, vice John C. Truesdale.

Cyril Kent McGuire,
of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement, Department of Education, vice Sharon Porter Robinson, resigned.

Withdrawn November 8

Joseph Robert Brame III,
of Virginia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1999, vice John C. Truesdale, which was sent to the Senate on October 28, 1997.

Sarah McCracken Fox, of New York,
to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring August 27, 2000, vice James M. Stephens, term expired, which was sent to the Senate on January 9, 1997.

[1] This withdrawal was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released November 8

Fact sheet: Gulf War Illnesses

Released November 10

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Released November 12

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry: Meeting With President Nazarbayev of Kazakstan

Released November 13

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Special Envoy to Latin America Thomas F. (Mack) McLarty, NSC Senior Director for Inter-American Affairs Jim Dobbins, and Office of National Drug Control Policy Director Barry McCaffrey on the upcoming visit of President Ernesto Zedillo of Mexico

Released November 14

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Chief of Staff Erskine Bowles, National Security Adviser Samuel Berger, Office of Management and Budget Director Franklin Raines, National Economic Council Director Gene Sperling, Council of Economic Advisers Chair Janet Yellen, and Domestic Policy Adviser Elena Kagan on Iraq and the first year of the President's second term

Transcript of remarks by President Zedillo at the signing ceremony for the OAS Hemispheric Arms Trafficking Convention

Fact sheet: OAS Convention Against Illicit Firearms Trafficking

Acts Approved by the President

Approved November 9

H.J. Res. 104 / Public Law 105–69
Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes

Approved November 10

H.R. 2013 / Public Law 105–70
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 551 Kingstown Road in South Kingstown, Rhode Island, as the "David B. Champagne Post Office Building"

H.J. Res. 105 / Public Law 105–71
Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes

S. 1227 / Public Law 105–72
To amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify treatment of investment managers under such title

Approved November 12

H.R. 2464 / Public Law 105–73
To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt internationally adopted children 10 years of age or younger from the immunization requirement in section 212(a)(1)(A)(ii) of such Act

S. 587 / Public Law 105–74
To require the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands located in Hinsdale County, Colorado

S. 588 / Public Law 105–75
To provide for the expansion of the Eagles Nest Wilderness within the Arapaho National Forest and the White River National Forest, Colorado, to include land known as the Slate Creek Addition

S. 589 / Public Law 105–76
To provide for a boundary adjustment and land conveyance involving the Raggeds Wilderness, White River National Forest, Colorado, to correct the effects of earlier erroneous land surveys

S. 591 / Public Law 105–77
To transfer the Dillon Ranger District in the Arapaho National Forest to the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado

Approved November 13

H.R. 2264 / Public Law 105–78
Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998

H.R. 79 / Public Law 105–79
Hoopa Valley Reservation South Boundary Adjustment Act

H.R. 672 / Public Law 105–80
To make technical amendments to certain provisions of title 17, United States Code

H.R. 708 / Public Law 105–81
To require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study concerning grazing use and open space within and adjacent to Grand Teton National Park, Wyoming, and to extend temporarily certain grazing privileges

S. 931 / Public Law 105–82
Marjory Stoneman Douglas Wilderness and Ernest F. Coe Visitor Center Designation Act

Approved November 14

H.R. 2107 / Public Law 105–83
Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998

H.J. Res. 106 / Public Law 105–84
Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes

United States Government Printing Office

SUPERINTENDENT
OF DOCUMENTS

Washington, D.C. 20402

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
Penalty for private use, $300

BULK RATE
Postage and Fees Paid
U.S. Government Printing Office
PERMIT G-26