Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, May 25, 1998
Volume 34—Number 21
Pages 883–956

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

Cuban Independence Day, radio remarks—933
Group of Eight Summit—898
Maryland, U.S. Naval Academy commencement address in Annapolis—944
Northern Ireland Peace Accord referendum, radio remarks—936
Proposed "Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act"—948
Radio address—886
Senate ratification of North Atlantic Treaty Organization enlargement protocols—936
Sons of Italy Foundation, reception—943
Switzerland, World Trade Organization in Geneva—926
Tobacco legislation, urging congressional action—931
U.S. Air Force Academy Falcons, presentation of the Commander-in-Chief Trophy—942

Bill Vetoes

"District of Columbia Student Opportunity Scholarship Act of 1998," message—935

Communications to Congress

See also Bill Vetoes
Burma, message transmitting notice—925
Cyprus, message transmitting report on U.S. citizens missing in—951
Czech-U.S. treaty on mutual legal assistance in criminal matters and documentation, message transmitting—952

Communications to Congress—Continued

Inter-American Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles, message transmitting with annexes and documentation—952
International Labor Conference, message transmitting convention and documentation—926
Mexico-U.S. extradition treaty, message transmitting protocol and documentation—941
National Endowment for the Humanities, message transmitting report—941
North Atlantic Treaty Organization, enlargement
  Cooperation of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to conditions of membership, messages certifying—940
  Senate ratification of protocols, message—938
Tobacco legislation, letter—932

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
  Birmingham, United Kingdom—898
  Rose Garden—948
Interviews with Prime Minister Blair of the United Kingdom
  David Frost of the British Broadcasting Corporation in Weston-under-Lizard, United Kingdom—887
  John King of the Cable News Network in Weston-under-Lizard—894
News conference with European Union leaders in London, United Kingdom, May 18 (No. 159)—909

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

Editor's Note: The Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents is also available on the Internet on the *GPO Access* service at http://www.gpo.gov/nara/nara003.html.

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.*

Joint Statements

European Union/United States Summit
Caspian Energy—922
Declaration on Common Orientation of Non-Proliferation Policy—921
Shared Objectives and Close Cooperation on Counter-Terrorism—919
Transatlantic Partnership on Political Cooperation—923
Group of Eight Summit
Birmingham Group of Eight Summit statements—897, 901
Summit Communique—903
United States-Japan Joint Statement on Electronic Commerce—884

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

European Union
European Commission President Santer—909, 919, 921–923
European Council President Blair—909, 919, 921–923
Japan, Prime Minister Hashimoto—884
United Kingdom, Prime Minister Blair—887, 894, 909

Notices

Continuation of Emergency With Respect to Burma—925

Proclamations

National Maritime Day—939
Prayer for Peace, Memorial Day—950
World Trade Week—883

Statements by the President

Indonesia, resignation of President Soeharto—934
Mexican bankers involved in laundering drug money, indictment—925
Washington Conference on Humanitarian Demining—934
World Trade Organization meeting, conclusion—934

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—956
Checklist of White House press releases—955
Digest of other White House announcements—953
Nominations submitted to the Senate—954

Proclamation 7097—World Trade Week, 1998

May 15, 1998

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

The American economy is experiencing its longest period of sustained growth in more than a generation, with more than 15 million new jobs, the lowest unemployment rate since 1970, and the lowest inflation rate in more than 30 years. Much of this economic expansion can be attributed to our overseas trade. Today, America is the world's leading exporter. Our exports sustain 12 million jobs—jobs that on average, pay more than jobs not tied to exports. The extraordinary vigor of America's economy reflects the 1998 theme of World Trade Week: ''Exporting Pays Off.''

Our unparalleled capacity to develop and market high-technology products and processes has given us a strong competitive edge in the international marketplace in everything from aerospace to agriculture. Americans have led the world into the Information Age, and we are poised to lead it into an exciting new era of electronic commerce. Also central to our success in the global economy has been our ability to open foreign markets for American goods and services. During the past 5 years, my Administration has negotiated more than 240 new trade agreements and strengthened efforts to eliminate unfair trading practices in order to help American workers and businesses compete in an international arena that is open and fair and where trade rules are enforced.

To keep America growing, and to maintain our leadership in the global economy, we must expand our exports. We must sustain our advantage in information and other technologies by creating a business climate that encourages investment, by continuing our support of education and research in basic science and technology, and by ensuring that American workers are the best-educated and best-trained work force in the world. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that we will need more than a million new high-skilled workers during the next 10 years to power the information technology field. We must provide working Americans with the skills and training they need to seize these promising employment opportunities.

Our exports and our economic strength depend upon our access to an open, stable, and growing world market. The nations of the world are becoming increasingly intertwined in a global economy. We must continue our efforts to remove foreign barriers to American goods and services, to open new markets, and to keep them open. This week, I will travel to Geneva, Switzerland and address the World Trade Organization to underline just how important free and open trade is to our future prosperity. Fast-track trade authority has been a crucial tool in this endeavor in the past, and it will become increasingly important to our ability to compete in the future with other countries for new markets, new contracts, and new jobs. This traditional trading authority will empower us to negotiate pro-growth, pro-American trade agreements that will maintain the momentum of our economy and ensure that American workers and American businesses can compete on a level playing field with the rest of the world.

America's leadership in building an open, fair world trade system is paying off in rewards for entrepreneurial initiative, higher wages for working Americans, incentives for technological advances and artistic creation, and prosperity for our Nation. By embracing the challenges of competing in the global marketplace in the 21st century, we can ensure continued growth for American businesses, prosperity for working Americans, and a brighter future for us all.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim May 17 through May 23, 1998, as World Trade Week. I invite the people of the United States to observe this week with ceremonies, activities, and programs that celebrate the potential of international trade.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifteenth day of May, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-eight, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-second.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:30 a.m., May 19, 1998]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on May 20. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

United States-Japan Joint Statement on Electronic Commerce

May 15, 1998

Electronic commerce will be an engine of economic growth in the Twenty-first Century, with the potential to invigorate economies by enhancing productivity, streamlining distribution, and revamping corporate structures.

Electronic commerce will enhance the standard of living of citizens in the United States and Japan, as well as the rest of the globe, by creating new, high-paying jobs and opportunities. Small and medium-sized enterprises, in particular, will benefit from new opportunities to sell their products to a worldwide market.

The Governments of the United States and Japan recognize the importance of working together to promote global electronic commerce. We support and endorse the following fundamental principles and policies, which should guide the development of electronic commerce.

I. General Principles

1. The private sector should lead in the development of electronic commerce and in establishing business practices.

2. Both governments should avoid imposing unnecessary regulations or restrictions on electronic commerce. Government actions, when needed, should be clear, transparent, and predictable to the private sector.

3. Governments should encourage effective self-regulation through codes of conduct, model contracts, guidelines, and enforcement mechanisms developed by the private sector.

4. Cooperation and harmonization among all countries, from all regions of the world and all levels of development, will assist in the construction of a seamless environment for electronic commerce.

II. Policy Issues

5. Tariffs.

There are currently no customs duties on electronic transmissions. The United States and Japan will work toward a global understanding that this duty free environment should remain, for free trade in electronic commerce will promote the growth of electronic commerce and economic growth worldwide.

The United States and Japan welcome the announcement of the Quad Ministers to work toward a comprehensive work program in the WTO on the trade-related aspects of electronic commerce, and both nations will actively participate in this process. In the meantime, both nations will adopt a standstill, as outlined in the Quad statement, that preserves the current practice of not imposing customs duties on electronic transmissions.

6. Taxes.

We will actively participate within the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development to work toward developing framework conditions for the taxation of electronic commerce. Close cooperation and mutual assistance are necessary to ensure effective tax administration and to prevent tax evasion and avoidance on the Internet.

7. Electronic Authentication/Electronic Signatures.

Governments should support the development of a global framework that will recognize, facilitate and enforce electronic transactions worldwide. Authentication methods and technologies are developing rapidly, and the range of uses is expanding. The United States and Japan support the development worldwide of legal structures that will support a variety of authentication methods and technologies, as well as a variety of implementation models. As nations review their own legal framework to address authentication methods, including digital signatures, they should observe the following principles:

a. The efforts of the private sector in constructing rules and guidelines should be encouraged.
b. Electronic signatures should be recognized as functionally equivalent to handwritten signatures, and acceptable for legal purposes.
c. Furthermore, parties to a transaction should have the opportunity to prove in court that the authentication technique used in the transaction is valid.
d. Parties to a transaction should be permitted to determine the appropriate technological and business methods of authentication for their transaction.
e. Governments should take a non-discriminatory approach to electronic signatures and authentication methods from other countries.

8. Privacy.

Ensuring the effective protection of privacy with regard to the processing of personal data on global information networks is necessary as is the need to continue the free flow of information. With regard to frameworks for personal data protection, governments and businesses should consider consumers' concern about their private information. Since content, usage, and the method for collection of private information differ from industry to industry, means for privacy protection should be considered by each industry. Enforcement mechanisms would be developed and implemented by the private sector, including preparing guidelines and developing verification and recourse methodologies, and supported by the public sector. If data in a certain industry is highly confidential, legal methods can be considered for that industry.

9. Content.

Content should be transmitted freely across national borders in response to a user's request. The Internet will promote cultural diversity by expanding the selection and reach of low cost distribution options for content, so trade barriers to the free flow of content should be avoided. Governments should not impose stronger restrictions on content on the Internet than exist in the real world. In instances where users do not wish to receive certain types of content, such as that which is unsuitable for children, filtering/blocking systems or other tools should be made available. On-line service providers should not be asked to monitor all the content being transmitted over their network, but should be expected to work with domestic law enforcement authorities as well as with their international counterparts to stem the transmission of illegal content.

10. Electronic payments.

Developments in this area should recognize the importance of private sector leadership, and should promote both a competitive market for and user confidence in electronic payment systems.

11. Intellectual Property Rights.

Growth of electronic commerce depends on the adequate protection of intellectual property rights including industrial property rights and copyrights. The global protection of patents concerning infrastructure of electronic commerce is essential for the progress of electronic commerce. The protection of copyrights will be assisted by the prompt ratification and implementation of the WIPO Copyright Treaty and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty.

12. Domain Name System.

In order to reach its full potential, the system for registering, allocating and governing domain names should be global, fair and market-based and reflect the geographically and functionally diverse nature of the Internet. The said system should also give business the confidence that trademark rights are

to be protected by establishing a self-regulatory regime on a global basis.

13. Consumer Protection.

Electronic commerce should afford consumers the same level of protection as is provided in other forms of commerce.

III. Future Work

We will continue to work together to support the development of global electronic commerce in the future, through:

14. Close policy coordination between the United States and Japan to promote electronic commerce.

15. Continuing substantive bilateral discussions at the experts level on issues regarding electronic commerce.

16. Encouraging private sector leadership through dialogue and cooperation between the private sectors of both countries, for example, the Working Group on Electronic Commerce of the U.S.-Japan Business Council.

17. Close cooperation between the United States and Japan at international fora—which may include, for example, WTO, OECD, WIPO, UNCITRAL and APEC—to support the development of global electronic commerce.

NOTE: This statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 15 but was not issued as a White House press release. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue. An original was not available for verification of the content of this statement.

The President's Radio Address

May 16, 1998

Good morning. This week I want to speak to you about a matter of grave concern to the United States and the international community: India's nuclear test explosions. These tests were unjustified and threaten to spark a dangerous nuclear arms race in Asia. As a result, and in accordance with our laws, I have imposed serious sanctions against India, including an end to our economic assistance, military financing, and credit or loan guarantees.

I'm at the G–8 summit of the major industrial powers in Birmingham, England, where the major nations here, along with friends and allies around the world, have joined us in condemning India's actions

This is especially disappointing to me because I have long supported stronger ties between the United States and India. After all, India will soon be the world's most populous country. Already it has the world's largest middle class and 50 years of vibrant democracy to its credit. And America has been immeasurably enriched by the contributions of Indian-Americans who work hard, believe in education, and have really been good citizens.

For all these reasons, the United States and India should be close friends and partners for the 21st century. And they make it all the more unfortunate that India has pursued this course at a time when most nations are working hard to leave the terror of the nuclear age behind. So in this instance, India is on the wrong side of history.

Over the past few years, we've made remarkable progress in reducing nuclear arsenals around the world and combating the spread of nuclear weapons. Building on the work of the Reagan and Bush administrations, we entered that START I treaty into force, lowering both Russian and American nuclear arsenals. And we ratified START II to go further. Now, when Russia's Parliament approves START II, we'll be on course to cut American and Russian nuclear arsenals by two-thirds from their cold war height.

We also work with Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan to return to Russia the nuclear weapons left on their land when the Soviet Union broke apart. We extended indefinitely and unconditionally the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which makes it harder for states that do not now possess nuclear weapons to acquire them. And just last month, working with the United Kingdom and the Republic of Georgia, we helped to secure a small amount of bomb-grade uranium in the Republic of Georgia that could have posed a serious danger if it had fallen into the wrong hands.

Two years ago I was proud to be the first national leader to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, first proposed by President

Eisenhower, advanced by President Kennedy, and brought to conclusion by my administration working with almost 60 other nations. This treaty, called the CTBT, bans all nuclear explosions, thus making it more difficult for the nuclear states to produce more advanced and dangerous weapons and much harder for nonnuclear states to develop them in the first place. Already, 149 other nations have signed on.

The CTBT also strengthens our ability to detect and deter nuclear testing by other countries. That's a mission we must pursue, with or without this treaty, as India's actions so clearly remind us. The CTBT's global network of sensors and the short-notice on-site inspections it allows will improve our ability to monitor and discourage countries from cheating.

I submitted the treaty to the Senate last fall. Now it's all the more important that the Senate act quickly, this year, so that we can increase the pressure on, and isolation of, other nations that may be considering their own nuclear test explosions.

The Indian Government has put itself at odds with the international community over these nuclear tests. I hope India will reverse course from the dangerous path it has chosen by signing the CTBT immediately and without conditions. And India's neighbors can set a strong example of responsibility for the world by not yielding to the pressure to follow India's example and conduct their own nuclear tests. I hope they won't do that.

We have an opportunity to leave behind the darkest moments of the 20th century and embrace the most brilliant possibilities of the 21st. To do it we must walk away from nuclear weapons, not toward them. Let us renew our determination to end the era of nuclear testing once and for all.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 11:20 p.m. on May 15 at the Swallow Hotel in Birmingham, United Kingdom, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on May 16.

Interview With Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom by David Frost of the British Broadcasting Corporation in Weston-under-Lizard, United Kingdom

May 16, 1998

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Mr. Frost. Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. President, it's a great joy to be talking. And let's begin on the subject that's on everybody's minds today, the subject of Northern Ireland. The vote may be more perilously close than was hoped a week or 2 ago. What is your message that each of you have right now to persuade doubting Unionists or doubting Catholics to persuade? How would you both begin?

Prime Minister Blair. I think it's in many ways a battle between fear and emotion on the one hand and reason and hope on the other. And the fear and the emotion is totally understandable, but it is important that people vote for reason and hope. And I say that because people ask me for reassurances on certain of the key items of the agreement. They say, ''Reassure us that the IUC is not going to be disbanded or stop being a proper police force.'' I give that reassurance. That will be plain.

I give the reassurance, the absolute commitment that if the cross-community provisions in the agreement to exclude people from office if they engage in violence, if those don't work, then they will be changed. That will be in the legislation. I give the explicit commitment to people that decommissioning will be a factor that we take into account, a factor there, specified in the legislation, so that if people aren't abiding by the decommissioning arrangements of the independent commission on decommissioning then that can mean their exclusion or removal from office.

I give the explicit commitment that people, whether in the assembly or the shadow

assembly, cannot sit in office in Northern Ireland if they're engaged in the ballot box and the gun as a twin strategy.

Now, all those reassurances I can give. But in the end, it depends whether people are really wanting to give themselves the chance for stability and prosperity in the future, because the alternative is not where we are now. The alternative is for Northern Ireland to slip back. So I hope that people will take that chance for the future.

Mr. Frost. What's the reassurance? What's the message you want to get across?

President Clinton. Well, of course, the United States is the home of the largest Irish diaspora, you know, both Irish Protestants and Irish Catholics. And so I suppose outside of the people involved, we care more about it than any other people. And I've worked hard to create the conditions within which the Irish could make their own peace. And what I would like to say is, first, I'm convinced there will be a great deal of increased interest in and investment in, and partnership with, Northern Ireland if this matter can be carried forward.

Secondly, I have made it as clear as I can that anyone who abandons the peace—if this agreement is embraced, anybody who returns to violence is never going to be a friend of the United States. We won't tolerate it. We won't support it. We will do everything we can to affirmatively oppose it.

But finally—I remember when I went there in December of '95. I remember the looks on the faces of the people, especially the young people, the schoolchildren I spoke with, both the Protestant and the Catholic children. And I'd just like to ask the voters to imagine what will happen if they vote no, and what do they really have to lose by voting yes, by giving this a chance? I mean, their leaders came up with this plan. Prime Minister Blair worked very hard on it. Prime Minister Ahern did. But the leaders in Northern Ireland agreed to this plan. What have they got to lose, really, by trying it? Nothing. But they have a great deal to lose by walking away, and I hope that they won't walk away.

Mr. Frost. And you mention, in terms of investment and so on, there are ways in which the new Northern Ireland—you could help the new Northern Ireland?

President Clinton. Oh, absolutely. Of course, we try every year now. We have an International Fund for Ireland. We have a very active group of American citizens from both the Protestant and Catholic communities, Irish citizens who try to increase investment. But I can tell you that the wave of elation that will sweep the friends of Ireland in the United States, should this be accepted, will be enormous. And there will just be a lot more willingness to get involved here and try to help build a future.

Mr. Frost. And in terms of the people, Prime Minister, who say, well, you've got on the one hand Sinn Fein saying this is a step toward a united Ireland; you've got David Trimble saying on the other hand that this strengthens the Union. How can both be true?

Prime Minister Blair. Well, I think the point is the principle of consent—in other words, that you can argue your case, whether it's for Northern Ireland remaining inside the U.K. or a united Ireland—the principle of consent means you have to argue it by democracy, not violence. And so people are free to argue their case. But it's a way of arguing it that is peaceful.

And one of the strange things about the debate in Northern Ireland is that people aren't actually arguing now about the principle of consent. That was what for 50, 60 years divided people in Northern Ireland. People now accept that. They're not even arguing about the institutional structures, the cross-border bobbies, the Northern Ireland Assembly. That in a sense is agreed, as well. It is this fear and emotion, as I say. You see, prisoners is an example of it. And let me again try and go right to the heart of what I think people feel in Northern Ireland. They see the scenes of the Balcombe Street Gang or Michael Stone and they say, ''Well, this is wrong,'' and the ''no'' campaign then say, ''Oh well, the prisoners will be back on the street if you vote for this agreement.''

Again, the facts are these: Michael Stone and the Balcombe Street Gang were allowed out under provisions on day release made many, many years ago before I even came to government. It had nothing to do with the

agreement. Most of the prisoners now in jail in Northern Ireland will be out within a few years anyway. But they'll be out, of course, without the agreement and without stability if there's no vote.

So again, I understand the concerns that people have, but I do ask them to realize that if no is the vote next week, what is the future? What are we going to offer children in Northern Ireland?

President Clinton. You know, if I could just say sort of as an interested friend, an outside observer—as you know, I've been very involved in the Bosnian peace, in the Middle East peace process—I think, essentially, the people that are for this want a better future for their children and don't want any more violence and like the fact that there is now a process which has been agreed upon for moving forward. If you really listen to the arguments of the people that are against it—and I've tried to listen very respectfully—it is that they still don't trust those on the other side because of all the things that have gone before.

In 1993 Yitzhak Rabin, right before we signed the agreement between Israel and the PLO, said to me, ''I have spent my life as a soldier. I have killed a lot of these people, and they have killed a lot of my people. But,'' he said, ''Mr. President, you don't make peace with your friends. You make peace, and then you make friends.'' And I think that's important here. But in Northern Ireland the people live much more closely together. They have in some ways—they haven't killed each other in the way the Bosnians did. With all the horrible things, they can get over this if they just will—it's a little bit of a leap of faith, but the risks of doing it are so much less than the risks of walking away.

Mr. Frost. And I think that example is a very relevant one, of Yitzhak Rabin, because that is the problem with the moderate Unionists, some of them, who've got concern. I think you've dealt with the point about the prisoners. You said that a lot of them would be coming out in the next few years anyway, and that links in with their fear of decommissioning of arms and that, therefore, there will be lots of killers running around with arms and so on. But how do you respond to that?

Prime Minister Blair. Well, I respond to it by saying that we will make it quite clear, explicitly in the legislation, that the twin strategy of ballot box and gun is not going to be permitted. And that all the things, in terms of seats in the Northern Ireland executive, in terms of accelerated prisoner release, they can only happen if there's real peace, a real end to violence, an end to violence for good. Not temporarily—permanently, an end to violence.

I think it's possible that we can achieve that. But we've got to achieve it with people really making this agreement work. And all the time that we spent trying to put this together, it was agonizingly difficult. And yet in the end, I think there is the will out there amongst people in Northern Ireland; there is the hope to make it work.

Nuclear Proliferation in South Asia

Mr. Frost. We'll come back to that subject before the end of the conversation. But you've been examining a lot of other issues and two issues have come up to take up a lot of your time at this conference. And obviously, one of them is India and, obviously, a slight difference of emphasis on what you think should be done and what you have done than the other members of G–8. Why do you feel the way you do, Mr. President?

President Clinton. Do you mean why do I think that we should not only condemn the Indian action but take some economic action against India?

Mr. Frost. Yes.

President Clinton. I just think we need to do as much as possible to make it clear that in the world of today and tomorrow it is simply unacceptable to build a nuclear arsenal. And it is unrealistic to believe you can build one, and you won't use it under any circumstances. Therefore, the main purpose of doing it is to establish yourself as a great nation. That is not a way to define a nation's greatness in the 21st century. And I say that because I think the firmer we are here, the more likely we are to be able to persuade Pakistan, or perhaps other countries lining up behind Pakistan, that they should not test, that they should not try to become public members of the nuclear club. We need to move the world away from it.

I'm trying to get Russia to ratify START II now so we can dismantle our arsenals further and then go to START III and dismantle our arsenals further. I'm trying to take America and Russia in the opposite direction. I'm afraid in our own countries, we'll have people who say, ''Oh, we better not do that if India and Pakistan and other countries are going to build up their arsenals.'' It's just—it's not the way to the future.

Mr. Frost. And so the message to Pakistan—there's rumors that they may be testing next week in western Baluchistan, or whatever—would be that you would take—you feel you should take the same action against them if they did——

President Clinton. Well, under our law, we'll have no choice. In other words, it's an automatic under our law. But what I would say to them is, help us work with you to find a way, first of all, to guarantee your security without nuclear weapons, and secondly, to reconcile with India.

I mean, look at Pakistan and India. You've got one country with 950 million people, another country with nearly 140 million people. They are arguing principally over Kashmir, not entirely but principally. Now, if they could resolve this, if you look at the success of Indians and Pakistanis in the United Kingdom or in the United States and you look at the talent in those two countries and you realize if they would liberate themselves from this argument between themselves, it is quite conceivable that for the next 50 years they could have the highest growth rates and not just economic success but the richest and most textured quality of life on the Indian subcontinent of any place on the globe. And so I think they should be imagining a different future for themselves, both of them.

Have the rest of us failed to appreciate them as much as we should have? Probably. Have we failed to acknowledge India the incredible achievement of maintaining 50 years of democracy under the most adverse conceivable circumstances? Probably. We should do better. But the answer is not for India to become a nuclear power and then for Pakistan to match it stride for stride, and then for China to be brought in to support the Pakistanis and move troops to the Indian border, and then for Russia to come in and recreate in a different context the conflicts of the cold war. It is a nutty way to go. It is not the way to chart the future.

Mr. Frost. And in fact, you spoke to the Indian Prime Minister. Did you think that the optimists might have a point when they say that now they've done this test; maybe they'll sign the nonproliferation and the test ban treaties; they just needed to do this. So it's good news? Or is that just whistling in the wind?

Prime Minister Blair. Well, I certainly hope that they are prepared to do that, and there will be very, very strong pressure from the international community for them to come, unconditionally, into both treaties. And I think it's tremendously important they do so. Because as the President was saying, I mean, if we have nuclear proliferation in the world—India—then if Pakistan were again to defy what is a very, very strong plea to them from the rest of the world not to engage in this, then you've got the danger of other states as well. So I mean, we're dealing with extremely serious and threatening present dangers.

Situation in Indonesia

Mr. Frost. What about Indonesia—talking of serious and threatening dangers? I mean, there's not much that could be done, is there? I mean, you've all said you're not going to seek to get rid of Mr. Soeharto, although you probably wouldn't sob if he decided to step down of his own accord. But what is there that the rest of the world can do about a situation like that, or is it an example of where you can do nothing?

Prime Minister Blair. Well, I don't think you can do nothing. We can't interfere in their own internal politics, it is true, but a lot of the discussions that we have had over this past couple of days have been about we bring about greater stability in the financial systems of the world. Because the crisis in Asia that has rocked many of the economies there will have an impact right round the world—is already having, may have an even more serious impact in the future. So what we can do is try and devise the right architecture, if you like, for the financial systems of the world which lead to greater stability, more openness, more transparency, and

where we keep the advantages of global markets and trade, but try and make sure that that happens within a system that's properly regulated.

President Clinton. Keep in mind, Indonesia is the fourth or fifth largest country in the world in population. So, even though what we've seen on the television is very troubling, this is a vast country, the largest Muslim country in the world, with a very complex society that has been through a very traumatic several months. And I think it's important to point out that the world community has not been idle. We've been working hard since November—at least since November—to try to help Indonesia come out of its economic problems.

But we have felt all along that ultimately to build a stable modern economy and to avoid this crisis, there would have to be some way for the Government and the President to deal with all elements of society on some sort of democratic basis. And that's what our statement says. So what we want is to see Indonesia come out of this whole and healthy. They should decide the fate of all their leaders; it should be up to the people to decide. But this is not a hopeless situation yet. This is a great country full of talented people with staggering economic achievements in the last 30 years—staggering. So I think that what we have to do is to hope for the best and try to guard against the worst and keep working with them.

Asian Economies

Mr. Frost. And do you feel—you mentioned there as we led into that, the subject of the Asian situation. Mr. President, do you feel that the worst is over in the Asian economic crisis, that it's on the mend, or is still on the jaws of——

President Clinton. I think it's hard to generalize. I think the Philippines have done very well and a tribute to their leadership. Thailand is doing better. Korea is clearly coming back, which is very good, because it's a big part of the economy. And Malaysia is having a difficult time, but they have a lot of strong economic underpinnings. And Indonesia is the big question. The other thing, of course, is that Japan—Prime Minister Hashimoto is struggling mightily now to put together a package that will restore growth in Japan. If growth comes back to the Japanese economy, that will—because it so dwarfs the others in size, it will cure a lot of these problems.

Prime Minister Blair. I mean, the fundamentals are strong, actually, in the Asian economies, but we've just got to work together to put the right system around it so that both systems are helped.

Third World Debt Relief

Mr. Frost. Does all these other issues mean that you'll make less progress on the whole area of Third World debt at this G–8 than you both hoped, or can you catch up?

Prime Minister Blair. No. I think, in fact, we've had a very good meeting on Third World debt, and we've agreed on a number of specific measures, including greater help for countries, particularly if they're in a post-conflict situation or there's been conflict there, and for the highly indebted countries. Because for many of these countries—in Africa—the President has just been there recently and so knows better than most of us—but there is tremendous potential there. But they're struggling under this huge burden of debt. Often their political systems have been a tremendous handicap to them, but there is progress on the democratic front there. But we've got to give them the help that we can, whilst making sure that we're not just channeling aid, but we're actually making sure that that money, when it goes in, is going to be used properly and where we're trying to alleviate the debt burden so that they can come out of this situation of crisis that they've been in.

President Clinton. I think to be fair, when Prime Minister Blair took over the head of the G–8, one of his initiatives was to have the right kind of debt relief. And we have embraced now for a little more than a year a strategy for the highly indebted poor countries that says we will—we know we should do debt relief, but it won't do any good unless they do things to help themselves. So we'll have a structured system where we'll give much, much more help to the highly indebted poor countries that actually undertake their own reform, so that we

believe the debt relief will actually amount to money being invested in their future in a positive way.

And when I went to Africa, one of the things I saw was the countries with honest governments can channel the energy, the intelligence, the passion of a wonderful people and get a lot done. So I'm more optimistic about Africa than I was before I went there. But I do believe that we should help those who are trying to help themselves.

Prime Minister Blair. It's interesting. It's one of the great lessons of the 20th century that democracy and prosperity in the end go together.

The Euro and the Dollar

Mr. Frost. In terms of prosperity, one lightening question occurs to me. The euro—we're talking about the euro here—what will be the implications of a strong euro on the dollar, Mr. President? Could it be bad news for the dollar?

President Clinton. I don't think so. It could become sometime in the future an alternative currency. You know, people might trade in the euro as well as the dollar. It could become—a lot of transactions might be done in the euro as well as the dollar. But I don't see that as a threatening thing. I think anything that brings free people closer together and increases prosperity in a democratic way, that makes it more likely to be broadly shared, is positive.

So I think as long as that's what's going on—you know, Europe—a unified Europe it seems to me is still committed to freedom, still committed to openness, still committed to a certain generosity of spirit, and I think that has to be good for the world. What we're trying to do, slowly but surely, is to integrate political and economic and social systems of the world not in ways that diminish national sovereignty but that alleviate the problems of the world and enable us to tackle together those things we can't solve alone.

Advice for Prime Minister Blair

Mr. Frost. And you have a great working relationship, the two of you, but one difference between you, of course, is that Mr. President, you are in your second term and the Prime Minister is early in his first term. What is the most important advice to someone in their first time in order to get into their second term?

President Clinton. Oh, I think he's doing it. I think that—the most important thing I think he can do is to keep the commitments he made in the campaign and to stay in touch with the people and to not be deterred from doing the public's business. You know, people, when they hire you to do these jobs, they want you to work on their affairs. And then when you get in them, there's all sorts of static designed to break your concentration. You have to ignore it and stay at the business.

But I think my advice would be to—he had a very detailed theory about why he wanted to be Prime Minister and where he wanted Great Britain to go, and of course, I have a lot of sympathy with the ideas he put forward, and he's doing a good job of doing what he promised to do. And I think that's the most important thing. And then I think as—the more you get into it, then I think the more you begin to think about what's it going to be like when my children are my age; what's it going to be like when my grandchildren are here. And the more he serves, the more he'll have an impact on that as well.

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Mr. Frost. And along the way, one of the things you've both had to also conquer is to bring up your families under the glare of all that publicity when the children go to school and all of that. But that's fascinating.

Well, at the end of our time, let's return for a moment to where we began. Are you both confident—but not complacent as politicians always say—are you confident that the Northern Ireland people on Friday will take a decision which you believe passionately is the right decision, a positive decision, that they will feel the hand of history on their shoulder? Are you confident about that?

Prime Minister Blair. I mean, I am confident, but I do know that they are considering this really with their heart and their head, and they're going into tremendous detail. And I think that over this next few days it's important that people put their concerns to people like myself and, perhaps, particularly to me and that I answer those concerns, so

that people go in and vote yes, in a spirit of real optimism and confidence themselves about the future. And they can do that.

Mr. Frost. And do you have to have, or not—you don't have to have a majority of over 50 percent in each community in Northern Ireland, don't have to have that. Do you want that? Do you need it?

Prime Minister Blair. No, we don't have to have it, but I want as big a vote as possible in both communities. And I want this to be an agreement where we, for once and for all, we get rid of the zero-sum game in Northern Ireland politics which says if one side is happy with something, that means I'm unhappy. Both communities, both traditions, if you like, within Northern Ireland can be satisfied with this, because for the Unionists, the principle of consent is there; for the Nationalist community there is fairness and equity of treatment, the recognition of the Nationalist identity.

That's what this is—you know, I said this on Good Friday after that marathon negotiation we went through, that in the end it's not a fudge, this agreement; it is an historic settlement of Nationalist and Unionist aspirations. And what it means is that in a new world, 2 years off the millennium, where everything is changing around the Republic of Ireland, Europe, Britain, our relations with the rest of the world, where people can argue their case free in the knowledge that they can do so democratically rather than by resorting to violence—now, that's the historic settlement. And that's why I want as many people in both communities to come out and support it.

Mr. Frost. What are your thoughts, Mr. President? Are you confident? Can this be a win-win situation for both sides?

President Clinton. Oh, absolutely. There's no question in my view that, if they vote for the accord, it will turn out to be a win-win. I mean, think about where the world is going to be in 12 years. Just think about 12 years from now—2010. You will have a much more globalized economy; you'll have both Great Britain and the Republic of Ireland more involved in the European economy, more involved in the rest of the world, and more involved with each other, meeting at the tip of Northern Ireland, economically and psychologically, no matter what the legal framework is.

Now, the people that are at that vortex are going to have a very interesting, very rich, very good life if they vote to live it together. If they vote to stay apart, they're still going to be frustrated, distrustful, angry, and a little bit left out. And I think all of us, we have hope and fear inside. I say all the time, we all have little scales inside, and some days we wake up with hope weighing down, some days with fear weighing down. I think on election day the clearheadedness of the Irish people will prevail in Northern Ireland. I think that both communities will go in and vote for the future.

I just ask them to think about what the world will be like, what these islands will be like just 12 years from now, and what they want Northern Ireland to be. We know that democracies of diverse people are interesting places to be when your uniqueness is valued, but you understand that what you have in common as human beings is more important than what divides you. That's a fundamental thing we know. And I believe they'll accept that on election day.

Mr. Frost. Thank you so much. Because the other part of it is that when Mr. Willy Ross says, or is quoted as saying, ''Look, if there's a no vote, then they'll all just get in and renegotiate it.'' That's not on, is it?

Prime Minister Blair. Well, no. I mean, look, I always say to people, of course, ''We're here, and we'll try and pick up the pieces as best we can.'' But I mean it would be fundamentally wrong to say that to people. We would be in a situation, too, where it wouldn't be the status quo, where actually there is quite a lot of hope about, and people do feel they're making progress. We go backwards.

I mean the one thing I've learned in this whole process is if it doesn't go forward, it goes backwards. It never stays in the same place. So of course, we're the government, we pick up the pieces when everything goes wrong. But I think what the President has just said there, and has said as a visionist, what people can aspire to——

President Clinton. And the answer to that is, this agreement—I mean, I can see that even as an outsider—this agreement sets

up a framework to embody in a thousand ways the principle of consent. If he doesn't like some detail, then the people will be perfectly free to modify it in the future within the framework of the agreement. So why take the risk that this moment won't present itself again for another generation, when anything that he believes is wrong with it, if he thinks he can persuade a majority he's right, can be modified by the people themselves in the future?

Mr. Frost. Thank you, both, very much, indeed. Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. President, thank you so much.

President Clinton. Thank you, David.

Prime Minister Blair. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 4:37 p.m. in the Weston Park estate for later broadcast on "Breakfast With Frost" on BBC1 television. In his remarks, the President referred to Prime Minister Bertie Ahern of Ireland; President Soeharto of Indonesia; and Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto of Japan. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Interview With Prime Minister Blair by John King of the Cable News Network in Weston-under-Lizard

May 16, 1998

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Mr. King. Let me start by thanking both of you for sharing some time on what is obviously a very busy day. We're in the closing days of the campaign for the peace initiative in Northern Ireland, and suddenly there seems to be apprehension, a lot of opposition. You see some slippage in the public opinion polls, the critics saying that you see these people, terrorists, criminals, at rallies being hailed as heroes.

Each of you, if you could share your thoughts on what you think of the tone of the campaign, and do you share that apprehension? And how do you counter the message of those who say, vote no?

Prime Minister Tony Blair. I think before we get a vote as important as this, there is bound to be a lot of apprehension, consideration by people, and it's right that they treat this seriously, because it affects their future. And one of the fascinating things is there has been very little debate in this referendum campaign about the institutional structure, the Northern Ireland Assembly, the relationship with the Republic of Ireland, because the thing has wrecked every attempt to have a peace agreement in Northern Ireland for the past 50, 60 years. Instead, people are worried, as you say, about things like prisoners.

But as I say to people, when you look at the facts, these guys who were out on the platform the other day under day-release schemes, they were done years ago. The vast majority of prisoners will be out within a few years anyway. And in the end, people have got to look at the package as a whole and say, "What is the best for the future: to have stability and prosperity and the chance to bring up your children with some prospect of staying in Northern Ireland and doing well, or to slip back into the ways that Northern Ireland knew for decade upon decade of division and bitterness and hatred?"

President Clinton. I think some of the reservation has come from people who wonder: Well, is there some sort of trick here; can somebody have it both ways; can they be part of the political life of the country; and can they sort of condone violence? And I can tell you, at least from America's point of view, the answer to that is no. Anybody who resorts to violence will have no friends in the United States. I don't care what side they're on or what their heritage is or what their previous ties are.

And I think I can speak for the overwhelming majority of Irish-Americans in both the Catholic and Protestant communities, that all we have ever wanted was a just peace. This peace embodies the principle of consent. It gives the Irish people of both traditions the right to chart their future in Northern Ireland and to make of it what they will. I think if it is embraced, you'll see a big increase in involvement of Irish-Americans and other Americans eager to invest in Northern Ireland, eager to lift prosperity and to show people the benefits of peace.

And so I very much hope that they will take that leap of faith, and ask themselves a simple question: What is the downside risk of going forward? It is so much lower than

the downside risk of blowing this opportunity.

Mr. King. You at one point considered visiting at the end of this trip, going to Northern Ireland, to the Republic of Ireland, decided not, perhaps that it would be viewed as meddling. Now in the last 24 to 48 hours, you've decided to speak out again forcefully, publicly. Why did you feel that necessary? And in your view, what role can you play in that process?

And sir, what role do you think the people of Ireland will consider as they listen to the American President?

President Clinton. Well, I decided to speak out because I think that the people of Northern Ireland know that I care a lot about the peace process, that the United States has been involved in it, that we've tried to not only—I think it's important to point out—not only has Mr. Adams, the Sinn Fein leader, been to the United States a lot, but I have spent far more time with Mr. Trimble and other leaders, Unionist leaders, than any American President ever has.

I've tried to listen to both sides, to learn, to just encourage them to make their own peace and chart their own future. And so I think it's appropriate for me to speak out. I just was afraid if I went there—I can remember when people from outside used to come to my home State and try to influence elections. It never worked, because in the end voters instinctively know they have to live with the consequences of their decision. So that's different.

But if a journalist like you asks me a question about what I think the arguments are, I think that it's important for me to answer. And I hope that people on all sides of the issue will listen to what I have to say, because at least I have some experience here; I know something about this. I know something about what happened in Bosnia; I know something about what happened in the Middle East; I know something about people who are divided and the difference in peace and war, or peace and sort of purgatory with violence. And peace has unfailingly been better, in the toughest of circumstances.

Mr. King. As to people who actually get a vote listen to him, your friend—why should they listen to him?

Prime Minister Blair. I think people do listen because people know the President is sincere, deeply committed, and actually knowledgeable about what has happened in Northern Ireland. And I can say, right from the time I became Prime Minister, but actually before that when the President visited Northern Ireland in 1995 I think it was, that his visit made a huge impact. People felt that he was someone that understood. Perhaps more than any other American President, people really feel that President Clinton both understands, knows—and people, they can also feel his willing them to do well. And I think people certainly will listen to that very much.

Mr. King. As you look forward to this vote, take us back if you will. You have described this process as agonizingly difficult. In the last few hours, you had a series of transatlantic conversations—yourselves, Mr. President, you were on the phone with Mr. Adams I believe twice; Mr. Trimble at least once; John Hume. Can you take us inside those conversations—pacing, raising your voice? You had people on each side that, "Nevermind, I can't do this. I'm going to back out." How did you keep it together, and how did you interrelate personally as you went through this process?

Prime Minister Blair. Well, I don't think it was so much a question of raising our voice or—obviously, these are conversations that you have with people at a particularly difficult moment, and you don't go right back over them the whole time. But I think in many ways what I found was tremendously useful in respect to the President's intervention was that people did and do respect his views on it, because, obviously in part, he's the President of the United States, but actually it's more to do with him personally, having shown commitment all the way through, having listened to all sides in the conflict, and therefore having some standing because of this own personal commitment, some credibility, if you like, to say to people, "Look, the eyes of the world are upon us. Let's see if we can go for this thing and make it happen."

Mr. King. And as Thursday night turned to Good Friday, at any point did you think:

This isn't going to happen; it's going to collapse?

Prime Minister Blair. I'm afraid I thought that pretty regularly, at about hourly intervals. But in the end—I mean, what always comes back home to me is we're 2 years off the year 2000; there is so much happening in the world, so many changes that I've seen in the last 10 or 15 years of my lifetime. I can't believe 2 years off the millennium that a place like Northern Ireland, which has got this extraordinary potential, where the people are tremendous people, as you know if you've been there—I cannot believe we can't find a way to live with each other 2 years off the new millennium with all the changes in the world, with all the possibilities there are. So even though a lot of the time I was sitting there thinking, can we really make this happen, I have a sort of inner optimism about it.

Mr. King. And what was your message in those phone calls? You were probably half asleep as you started some of them.

President Clinton. Well, first of all, I just—when I talked to Prime Minister Blair or Prime Minister Ahern or George Mitchell, I was mostly listening. But when I talked to the parties, what I heard from them actually was very like what you're hearing from the general public now. It was sort of the darkness before the dawn. It was like, "Okay, we made this deal and, oh, there's a few things down the road that we'd like to improve," but what they really needed was not me to talk about the specifics, what they really needed was for me to remind them of the big picture, that it was time to join hands and jump off the diving board together and get in the pool and swim to shore.

And I say that not in a disrespectful way but in a respectful way. It's very hard, once you've been estranged from people for a long time, to overcome your fears and distrust. And as I have said repeatedly, I'll never forget Prime Minister Rabin telling me before Israel signed the agreement with the PLO, that everybody was reluctant to do it, but you don't make peace with your friends. You have to make peace with those and then make them your friends, because of the estrangement of the past. That's what I want people to think about.

If every voter in Northern Ireland says, "What are we going to look like in 2000, and what's it going to look like in 2010," Britain here—Mr. Blair is the President of the EU in this cycle. Britain leading the united Europe; Ireland a part of the united Europe with one of the best reforming economies, the Republic of Ireland; Northern Ireland, where Britain and Ireland join in some sort of fashion no matter what decision they make.

Now, they're going to be at the vortex of something very, very big, if they can just liberate themselves it could change the past. They don't have to give up their traditions; they can value them. They've agreed to the principle of consent. They have set up a mechanism by which they can chart their own future. What remains is really just to take the leap of faith and realize that the risk of going forward is infinitesimal, tiny, compared to the risk of letting this opportunity slip away.

Nuclear Proliferation in South Asia

Mr. King. We're short on time, so if I could ask each of you in closing, tensions in another part of the world have been a major theme of discussion here at your meeting, the Pakistani Prime Minister today saying he was disappointed in the communique relating to condemning India for the nuclear test. If I could ask each of you your reaction to that and how you see that process going forward in the days ahead.

Prime Minister Blair. It's a very strong statement in the communique, condemning the Indian nuclear tests and, what's more, putting strong pressure on India to sign up unconditionally for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the Non-Proliferation Treaty. And I urge Pakistan now, as we all do in our communique, not to follow them down that route because the world is a dangerous enough place as it is, and we fear for the future if these nuclear tests carry on.

President Clinton. Well, first, it's the strongest possible statement we could have gotten. Some of our members are philosophically opposed to the imposition of sanctions under virtually any circumstances. And as you know, the United States, Japan, Canada, perhaps others will follow, did impose

economic sanctions. But it's a strong statement. What we have now to do is to build on it. We have to tell the Pakistanis, ''If you're willing to not go down this road, which we believe is a loser, let's work together to try to define a way to protect your security without becoming a nuclear power.''

And we have to go back to the Indians and say, ''Let's find a way to protect your security and honor the greatness of your democracy without becoming a nuclear power. This is a bad thing, but let's minimize this. This is not a good thing for the world. The Russians and the Americans, we're trying to lower our nuclear arsenals. We're trying to make this problem go away for the world. And we do not need to just have a whole lot of other people with smaller nuclear arsenals on the assumption that they'll never be used. You can't do that.''

Mr. King. Thank you both.

President Clinton. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 5:10 p.m. in the Weston Park estate. In his remarks, the President referred to Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams; Ulster Unionist Party leader David Trimble; John Hume of the Social Democratic and Labour Party; George Mitchell, chairman of the multiparty talks in Northern Ireland; and Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif of Pakistan. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Birmingham Group of Eight Summit Statement

May 16, 1998

Drugs and International Crime

1. Globalisation has been accompanied by a dramatic increase in transnational crime. This takes many forms, including trafficking in drugs and weapons; smuggling of human beings; the abuse of new technologies to steal, defraud and evade the law; and the laundering of the proceeds of crime.

2. Such crimes pose a threat not only to our own citizens and their communities, through lives blighted by drugs and societies living in fear of organised crime; but also a global threat which can undermine the democratic and economic basis of societies through the investment of illegal money by international cartels, corruption, a weakening of institutions and a loss of confidence in the rule of law.

3. To fight this threat, international cooperation is indispensable. We ourselves, particularly since the Lyon summit in 1996, have sought ways to improve that cooperation. Much has already been achieved. We acknowledge the work being done in the UN, the EU and by other regional groupings. We welcome the steps undertaken by the G8 Lyon Group to implement its 40 Recommendations on transnational organised crime and the proposals G8 Justice and Interior Ministers announced at their meeting in Washington last December. By working together, our countries are helping each other catch criminals and break up cartels. But more needs to be done. There must be no safe havens either for criminals or for their money.

4. We have therefore agreed a number of further actions to tackle this threat more effectively:

—We fully support efforts to negotiate within the next two years an effective United Nations convention against transnational organised crime that will provide our law enforcement authorities with the additional tools they need.

—We agree to implement rapidly the ten principles and ten point action plan agreed by our Ministers on high tech crime. We call for close cooperation with industry to reach agreement on a legal framework for obtaining, presenting and preserving electronic data as evidence, while maintaining appropriate privacy protection, and agreements on sharing evidence of those crimes with international partners. This will help us combat a wide range of crime, including abuse of the internet and other new technologies.

We welcomed the FATF decision to continue and enlarge its work to combat money-laundering in partnership with regional groupings. We place special emphasis on the issues of money laundering and financial crime, including issues raised by offshore financial centres. We welcome the proposal to hold in Moscow in 1999 a Ministerial meeting on combating transnational crime. We agreed to establish Financial Intelligence

Units (FIUs) where we do not already have them, in line with our national constitutions and legal systems, to collect and analyse information on those engaged in money laundering and liaise with the equivalent agencies in partner countries. We agreed on principles and the need for adequate legislation to facilitate asset confiscation from convicted criminals, including ways to help each other trace, freeze and confiscate those assets, and where possible, in accordance with national legislation, share seized assets with other nations.

—We agree on the need to explore ways of combating official corruption arising from the large flows of criminal money.

—We are deeply concerned by all forms of trafficking of human beings including the smuggling of migrants. We agreed to joint action to combat trafficking in women and children, including efforts to prevent such crimes, protect victims and prosecute the traffickers. We commit ourselves to develop a multidisciplinary and comprehensive strategy, including principles and an action plan for future cooperation amongst ourselves and with third countries, including countries of origin, transit and destination, to tackle this problem. We consider the future comprehensive UN organised crime convention an important instrument for this purpose.

—We endorse joint law enforcement action against organised crime and welcome the cooperation between competent agencies in tackling criminal networks. We agree to pursue further action, particularly in dealing with major smuggling routes and targeting specific forms of financial fraud.

—We endorse the Lyon Group's principles and action plan to combat illegal manufacturing and trafficking of firearms. We welcome its agreement to work towards the elaboration of a binding international legal instrument in the context of the UN transnational organised crime convention.

5. We urge the Lyon Group to intensify its on-going work and ask our Ministers to report back to our next Summit on progress on the action plan on high tech crime, the steps taken against money laundering and the joint action on trafficking in human beings. We also welcome the steps agreed by our Environment Ministers on 5 April to combat environmental crime.

6. There is a strong link between drugs and wider international and domestic crime. We welcome the forthcoming UNGASS on drugs. This should signal the international community's determination in favour of a comprehensive strategy to tackle all aspects of the drugs problem. For its part, the G8 is committed to partnership and shared responsibility in the international community to combat illicit drugs. This should include reinforced cooperation to curb illicit trafficking in drugs and chemical precursors, action to reduce demand in our countries, including through policies to reduce drug dependency, and support for a global approach to eradicating illicit crops. We welcome the UNDCP's global approach to eliminating or significantly reducing illicit drug production, where appropriate through effective alternative development programmes.

16 May 1998

NOTE: This statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 16 but was not issued as a White House press release. An original was not available for verification of the content of this statement.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters in Birmingham, United Kingdom

May 17, 1998

Group of Eight Summit

The President. Let me just say a couple of things, and then I know you have some questions, and I'll try to answer a few of them.

First of all, I want to commend Prime Minister Blair and all of his team for putting on what I thought was one of our best G–8 meetings. This shows the benefit of these meetings not just for dealing with the issues that are in the news now—Indonesia, India, Pakistan, and other issues that are presently in the news—but also dealing with the long-term challenges we face. We did some serious work here on employment

issues, on environmental issues, on crime issues, on dealing with conversion of computers in all of our countries at the turn of the century and what kind of challenges will be presented by that, and how we can work together on them. It was a very stimulating, interesting meeting that will actually have an impact on the lives of the people that we all represent. So I thought it was quite good, and I felt good about that.

Secondly, I just had a very, very good meeting with President Yeltsin in which, once again, he assured me that he was doing his best to ratify the START II Treaty in the Duma. And we agreed that we wanted to immediately begin work on START III as soon as the ratification is secured there. I think all of us, because of the India nuclear tests, feel an even greater sense of urgency to change the debate again over nuclear issues toward less, not more; to change the whole direction here. And I think if we can get early Duma ratification we know pretty well where we are on a lot of these big START III issues, and we'd like to really get after it and turn this, the nuclear tide, back in the right direction, away from more weapons toward fewer ones. So I was quite encouraged by that.

We still have some areas where we're working with them hard to get greater results and cooperation, especially in the whole area of technology transfer to Iran, and all of you know about that. And we went over that in some significant detail and I think reached some understandings which will bear fruit in the days ahead; so I'm hopeful of that.

Anyway, it was a good meeting. He was in very, very good form, excited about his new government, proud of them, and seemed to be in as good a health and good a spirits as I've seen him in quite a long time.

So, questions?

Nuclear Proliferation in South Asia

Q. Mr. President, Pakistan's Foreign Minister told Reuters that he was very close to certain his country would conduct a nuclear test. He told the Associated Press it's not a matter of if but when. Sir, what does this do to regional stability? And could this have been avoided had, for example, Russia and France joined the U.S. in sanctions against India?

The President. Well, first of all, based on our best information, it hasn't happened yet. I also saw the Foreign Minister on television last night making substantially the same statement, but I understand it's still being debated in the Cabinet.

I understand also that they're under a lot of pressure. You can only imagine what the pressures might be. But I will say this: I still have hopes that the Prime Minister and the Pakistani Government will not go through with a nuclear test. And I believe that we can, the rest of us who would support that, can work with them in a way that meets their security interests without the test.

Furthermore, I think that over the long run, and indeed before then, the political, the economic, and the security interests of Pakistan and in Pakistan's standing in the world would be dramatically increased if they walked away from a test. The whole rest of the world would think they were stronger and would be profoundly impressed, and I think it would help us to resolve these issues more if they did not. So I hope they will not. And if they do, we'll cross that bridge when we come to it.

Now, do I think that the result would be different if everyone had as hard a line on this as we do? I can't really say that. I think if you go back and look at the statement we've put out here, this is a—everybody condemned the Indian action, including countries that were very close to India. And every country said their relations would be affected by it. And when I came here, that's the most I thought we could get, because there are lots of countries in the world that basically are opposed to sanctions under almost all circumstances except under rare cases when the UN votes for them. So we just have a different view on that.

I'm glad that we've done what we've done, even though I have enormous admiration for India's democracy and for its progress in the last several years. But all I can tell you is I'm going to do what I can to get this back on track. I hope that Pakistan won't test. I think it will help us to get it back on track, and I think it will help Pakistan immeasurably in the world community, and it will have, I believe, specific political, economic,

and security benefits to the country if it does not test.

So I'll keep working on it.

Q. Mr. President, if sanctions aren't possible, are there any other specific actions you want these other countries to take when they go home?

The President. Well, for one thing, I think a lot of countries are taking economic action: Japan is; Canada is; a number of European countries are. The European Union is going to have to debate this. I think that's one of the reasons that Prime Minister Blair, who otherwise took quite a hard line here with us—he was quite good on the language of the resolution—but I think that he thinks, as head of the EU, he has to give all these other countries the chance to be heard. I think a number of European countries will take economic actions here.

And I think that we just have to—we're going to have to work this situation to turn it back around, because what you don't want is the—insofar as possible, the best of all worlds would be that this is an isolated event. And then India signs the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; then Pakistan says it will sign if India does, so they sign. That would be the best conceivable result.

The worst conceivable result would be for everybody that's ever worked on this to think they ought to conduct some sort of test and that this is now—it's sort of the new measure of either national security or national greatness. That's a terrible signal for the rest of us to send the world, especially when the Russians and we are doing our very best to put everything in the opposite direction and to reduce the number of nuclear weapons in the world.

So we just have to—I'm going to spend a lot of time thinking through this and coming up with an affirmative strategy to try to deal with all the elements of it and all the aspects of the problem. And in the meantime, I hope that Pakistan will find the strength necessary to walk away from a test.

1996 Campaign Financing

Q. Mr. President, there's new evidence that the Chinese Government funneled money into the American election campaign. Did you or anybody in your administration make decisions based on the influence of Chinese money?

The President. No.

Q. And what do you feel about that evidence?

The President. For one thing, first of all, I understand there's a new allegation about that. I have two things to say about it. First of all, all of the foreign policy decisions we made were based on what we believed—I and the rest of my administration—were in the interests of the American people. Now, if someone tried to influence them, that's a different issue, and there ought to be an investigation into whether that happened. And I would support that. I have always supported that. But I can tell you that the decisions we made, we made because we thought they were in the interests of the American people.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—the Chinese in your visit?

The President. Well, I want to see—when I get back home, I want to see, number one, what is the substance of this; how serious is it; what are the facts; what evidence is there? Is this just somebody saying, or is there some reason to believe there is objective evidence to support this? But in any case, I think the investigation ought to proceed, and then whatever the facts are, we'll take appropriate action at the time.

Russian Ratification of START II Treaty

Q. You mentioned President Yeltsin giving you assurances on START II ratification. He's done that in the past several times.

The President. He has, but one of the things he pointed out this time is he said this thing is now in the Duma; it's actively being considered; there are a lot of committees working on it; and that he will, obviously, not only push for its ratification but argue that it ought to be considered in an even more timely fashion now because of the Indian test.

Q. Will you go to Moscow only if it is ratified, or do you have assurances now——

The President. Well, I think it ought to be ratified because then we can get more business done. We can't really do anything on START III until START II is ratified. And I'm hoping that it will. And I'd like to leave it there. I'd like to leave it there.

Q. How long would it take to ratify START III?

The President. I don't know. But I think—but actually, I think START III could be done in fairly short order because we have been, Boris Yeltsin and I, have been talking about these issues for years now, and I think we know what the parameters of our two positions are, what our national security considerations are. And so I would expect that it could be done fairly quickly once we get START II out of the way.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:21 p.m. outside the Hyatt Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to President Boris Yeltsin of Russia; and Minister of Foreign Affairs Gohar Ayub Khan and Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif of Pakistan.

Birmingham Group of Eight Summit Statement

May 17, 1998

Northern Ireland

We warmly welcome the Belfast Agreement reached on 10 April. We commend all those involved in achieving an outcome which reflects the fundamental aspirations of both parts of the community in Northern Ireland and secures their rights. We recognise that the Agreement must win the support of the people in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. While acknowledging that it presents challenges to all parties, we hope it will achieve the widest possible support, not only as a basis for political stability and peace but also as an opportunity for economic development and prosperity for all Northern Ireland's people. We pledge our countries' support for this process.

Indonesia

We are deeply concerned at the situation in Indonesia, especially the recent upsurge of violence and the loss of life. We deplore the killings and urge the authorities to show maximum restraint, to refrain from the use of lethal force and to respect individual rights. We call on the public to express their views peacefully. It is essential to avoid an escalation of violence.

We recognise the hardship the economic crisis has caused. We believe the economic reform programme agreed with and supported by the international financial institutions is the only way to restore confidence and growth, and fully support the government in implementing it. But successful economic reform and international support for it will require sufficient political and social stability. We will continue to work, together with the international financial institutions, to support reform and alleviate hardship.

The current social unrest indicates that, to resolve the crisis, political as well as economic reform is necessary. The need for political reform is widely acknowledged in Indonesia. We encourage the authorities to respond rapidly, by opening a dialogue which addresses the aspirations of the Indonesian people and by introducing the necessary reforms.

FRY/Kosovo

The continuing violence in Kosovo has revived fears of a new Balkans war. The region has already seen too much bloodshed. A political solution to the problem of Kosovo is vital for the peace and well-being of all the people of the region. We consider the meeting on 15 May between President Milosevic and Dr Rugova to be a positive first step. It is particularly important that President Milosevic has assumed personal responsibility in the search for a resolution of the problems of Kosovo, including its future status. We urge both sides to ensure that the dialogue now begun leads rapidly to the adoption of concrete measures to lower tensions and stop violence. Resolving the issue of Kosovo's status will be difficult but is essential for the good of all those living in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Peace and stability in Europe rest on the principles that borders are inviolable and that political change must come about through peaceful means. We reject terrorism and violence from any side to achieve political goals or to stifle dissent. The states of the region should themselves contribute to a non-violent solution to the crisis. All states should cooperate in addressing the problem of refugees and displaced persons.

We underline the importance of cooperation with the Gonzalez mission. We stand ready to promote a clear and achievable path towards the FRY's full integration into the international community. But if Belgrade fails to build on recent progress and a genuine political process does not get underway, its isolation will deepen.

The elections in Montenegro on 31 May must be free, fair and in keeping with democratic standards and their results must be respected by all.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

We welcome the progress that has recently been made on peace implementation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and support the High Representative's active role in promoting the peace process. This is a critical year for consolidating peace in Bosnia, especially for refugee returns and democratic development, with nationwide elections scheduled for September. While the people of Bosnia have accomplished a great deal under very difficult circumstances, we look to Bosnia's leaders to work harder to create a stable and prosperous future for all the country's citizens.

Middle East Peace Process

We are deeply concerned at the continuing stalemate in the peace process, with concluded agreements not yet being implemented. We encourage all efforts to help revive the peace process. We strongly support the efforts to gain the agreement of the parties to a package of constructive and realistic ideas which have already been presented by the United States, including a second Israeli redeployment. We welcome Palestinian agreement in principle to these ideas which, if accepted by all sides, would lead to the resumption of final status talks. We call on Israeli and Palestinian leaders to refrain from unilateral acts which pre-determine the final status negotiations and undermine confidence. We remain determined to work with all the parties—Israel, the Palestinians, Syria, Lebanon—for a comprehensive peace. A resumption of Israeli-Palestinian negotiations would build confidence in the region and help to restore momentum to the peace process as a whole. A continuing blockage on the other hand could have grave consequences for security throughout the region.

Indian Nuclear Tests

We condemn the nuclear tests which were carried out by India on 11 and 13 May. Such action runs counter to the will expressed by 149 signatories to the CTBT to cease nuclear testing, to efforts to strengthen the global non-proliferation regime and to steps to enhance regional and international peace and security. It has been met by immediate international concern and opposition, from governments and more widely. We underline our full commitment to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty as the cornerstones of the global non-proliferation regime and the essential foundations for the pursuit of nuclear disarmament. We express our grave concern about the increased risk of nuclear and missile proliferation in South Asia and elsewhere. We urge India and other states in the region to refrain from further tests and the deployment of nuclear weapons or ballistic missiles. We call upon India to rejoin the mainstream of international opinion, to adhere unconditionally to the NPT and the CTBT and to enter into negotiations on a global treaty to stop the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons. India's relationship with each of us has been affected by these developments. We are making this clear in our own direct exchanges and dealings with the Indian Government and we call upon other states similarly to address their concerns to India. We call upon and encourage Pakistan to exercise maximum restraint in the face of these tests and to adhere to international non-proliferation norms.

NOTE: This statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 17 but was not issued as a White House press release. An original was not available for verification of the content of this statement.

Group of Eight Birmingham Summit Communique

May 17, 1998

Introduction

1. We, the Heads of State or Government of eight major industralised democracies and the President of the European Commission, met in Birmingham to discuss issues affecting people in our own and other countries. In a world of increasing globalisation we are ever more interdependent. Our challenge is to build on and sustain the process of globalisation and to ensure that its benefits are spread more widely to improve the quality of life of people everywhere. We must also ensure that our institutions and structures keep pace with the rapid technological and economic changes under way in the world.

2. Of the major challenges facing the world on the threshold of the 21st century, this Summit has focused on three:

—achieving sustainable economic growth and development throughout the world in a way which, while safeguarding the environment and promoting good governance, will enable developing countries to grow faster and reduce poverty, restore growth to emerging Asian economies, and sustain the liberalisation of trade in goods and services and of investment in a stable international economy;

—building lasting growth in our own economies in which all can participate, creating jobs and combating social exclusion;

—tackling drugs and transnational crime which threaten to sap this growth, undermine the rule of law and damage the lives of individuals in all countries of the world.

Our aim in each case has been to agree concrete actions to tackle these challenges.

Promoting sustainable growth in the global economy

3. In an interdependent world, we must work to build sustainable economic growth in all countries. Global integration is a process we have encouraged and shaped and which is producing clear benefits for people throughout the world. We welcomed the historic decisions taken on 2 May on the establishment of European Economic and Monetary Union. We look forward to a successful EMU which contributes to the health of the world economy. The commitment in European Union countries to sound fiscal policies and continuing structural reform is key to the long-term success of EMU, and to improving the prospects for growth and employment.

4. Overall global prospects remain good. However, since we last met, the prospects have been temporarily set back by the financial crisis in Asia. We confirm our strong support for the efforts to re-establish stability and growth in the region and for the key role of the International Financial Institutions. Successful recovery in Asia will bring important benefits for us all. Therefore:

—we strongly support reforms underway in the affected countries and welcome the progress so far achieved. With full implementation of programmes agreed with the IMF we are confident that stability can be restored. The underlying factors that helped Asia achieve impressive growth in the past remain in place. Implementation of agreed policies together with the action taken by ourselves and other countries to avoid spillover effects provide the basis for a firm recovery in the region and renewed global stability;

—we believe a key lesson from events in Asia is the importance of sound economic policy, transparency and good governance. These improve the functioning of financial markets, the quality of economic policy making and public understanding and support for sound policies, and thereby enhance confidence. It is also important to ensure that the private sector plays a timely and appropriate role in crisis resolution;

—we are conscious of the serious impact of the crisis in the region on the poor and most vulnerable. Economic and financial reform needs to be matched with actions and policies by the countries concerned to help protect these groups from the worst effects of the crisis. We welcome the support for this by

the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank and bilateral donors and the increased emphasis on social expenditure in programmes agreed by the IMF;

—we are concerned that the difficulties could trigger short-term protectionist forces both in the region and in our own countries. Such an approach would be highly damaging to the prospects for recovery. We resolve to keep our own markets open and call on other countries to do the same. We emphasize the importance for the affected countries of continued opening of their markets to investment and trade.

5. Looking ahead to the WTO's celebration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the GATT next week, we:

—reaffirm our strong commitment to continued trade and investment liberalisation within the multilateral framework of the WTO;

—call on all countries to open their markets further and resist protectionism;

—strongly support the widening of the WTO's membership in accordance with established WTO rules and practices;

—agree to promote public support for the multilateral system by encouraging greater transparency in the WTO, as in other international organisations;

—reaffirm our support for efforts to complete existing multilateral commitments, push forward the built-in agenda and tackle new areas in pursuing broad-based multilateral liberalisation;

—confirm our wish to see emerging and developing economies participate fully and effectively in the multilateral trade system; commit ourselves to deliver early, tangible benefits from this participation to help generate growth and alleviate poverty in these countries; and undertake to help least developed countries by:

—providing additional duty-free access for their goods, if necessary on an autonomous basis,

—ensuring that rules of origin are transparent,

—assisting efforts to promote regional integration,

—helping their markets become more attractive and accessible to investment and capital flows.

6. The last point highlights one of the most difficult challenges the world faces: to enable the poorer developing countries, especially in Africa, develop their capacities, integrate better into the global economy and thereby benefit from the opportunities offered by globalisation. We are encouraged by the new spirit of hope and progress in Africa. The challenges are acute, but confidence that they can be overcome is growing. We commit ourselves to a real and effective partnership in support of these countries' efforts to reform, to develop, and to reach the internationally agreed goals for economic and social development, as set out in the OECD's 21st Century Strategy. We shall therefore work with them to achieve at least primary education for children everywhere, and to reduce drastically child and maternal mortality and the proportion of the world's population living in extreme poverty.

7. To help achieve these goals, we intend to implement fully the vision we set out at Lyon and Denver. We therefore pledge ourselves to a shared international effort:

—to provide effective support for the efforts of these countries to build democracy and good governance, stronger civil society and greater transparency, and to take action against corruption, for example by making every effort to ratify the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention by the end of 1998;

—to recognise the importance of substantial levels of development assistance and to mobilise resources for development in support of reform programmes, fulfilling our responsibilities and in a spirit of burden-sharing, including negotiating a prompt and adequate replenishment of the soft loan arm of the World Bank (IDA 12) as well as providing adequate resources for the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility of the IMF and for the African Development Fund;

—to work to focus existing bilateral aid and investment agency assistance in support of sound reforms, including the

development of basic social infrastructure and measures to improve trade and investment;

—to work within the OECD on a recommendation on untying aid to the least developed countries with a view to proposing a text in 1999;

—to support the speedy and determined extension of debt relief to more countries, within the terms of the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative agreed by the International Financial Institutions (IFIs) and Paris Club. We welcome the progress achieved with six countries already declared eligible for HIPC debt relief and a further two countries likely to be declared shortly. We encourage all eligible countries to take the policy measures needed to embark on the process as soon as possible, so that all can be in the process by the year 2000. We will work with the international institutions and other creditors to ensure that when they qualify, countries get the relief they need, including interim relief measures whenever necessary, to secure a lasting exit from their debt problems. We expect the World Bank to join the future financial effort to help the African Development Bank finance its contribution to the HIPC initiative;

—to call on those countries who have not already done so to forgive aid-related bilateral debt or take comparable action for reforming least developed countries;

—to enhance mutual cooperation on infectious and parasitic diseases and support the World Health Organisation's efforts in those areas. We support the new initiative to "Roll Back Malaria" to relieve the suffering experienced by hundreds of millions of people, and significantly reduce the death rate from malaria by 2010. We will also continue our efforts to reduce the global scourge of AIDS through vaccine development, preventive programmes and appropriate therapy, and by our continued support for UNAIDS. We welcome the French proposal for a "Therapeutic Solidarity Initiative" and other proposals for the prevention and treatment of AIDS, and request our experts to examine speedily the feasibility of their implementation.

8. We see a particular need to strengthen Africa's ability to prevent and ease conflict, as highlighted in the UN Secretary General's recent report. We will look for ways to enhance the capacity of Africa-based institutions to provide training in conflict prevention and peacekeeping. We also need to consider further ways to respond to the exceptional needs of poor post-conflict countries as they rebuild their political, economic and social systems, in a manner consistent with democratic values and respect for basic human rights. In addition to immediate humanitarian assistance:

—we recognise the need for technical and financial assistance in creating strong democratic and economic institutions, supporting good governance alongside programmes of macroeconomic and structural reform supported by the IMF and World Bank. We call on the World Bank to play a strong role in coordinating bilateral and multilateral assistance in these areas;

—we also agree on the need to consider ways for debt relief mechanisms, including the HIPC initiative where appropriate, to be used to release more and earlier resources for essential rehabilitation, particularly for those countries with arrears to the IFIs.

9. A crucial factor in ensuring sustainable development and global growth is an efficient energy market. We therefore endorse the results of our Energy Ministers' Meeting in Moscow in April. We shall continue cooperation on energy matters in the G8 framework. We recognise the importance of soundly based political and economic stability in the regions of energy production and transit. With the objective of ensuring reliable, economic, safe and environmentally-sound energy supplies to meet the projected increase in demand, we commit ourselves to encourage the development of energy markets. Liberalisation and restructuring to encourage efficiency and a competitive environment should be supported by transparent and non-discriminatory national legislative

and regulatory frameworks with a view to establishing equitable treatment for both government and private sectors as well as domestic and foreign entities. These are essential to attract the new investment which our energy sectors need. We also recognise the importance of international co-operation to develop economically viable international energy transmission networks. We shall pursue this co-operation bilaterally and multilaterally, including within the framework and principles of the Energy Charter Treaty.

10. Considering the new competitive pressures on our electric power sectors, we reaffirm the commitment we made at the 1996 Moscow Summit to the safe operation of nuclear power plants and the achievement of high safety standards worldwide, and attach the greatest importance to the full implementation of the Nuclear Safety Account grant agreements. We reaffirm our commitment to the stated mission of the Nuclear Safety Working Group (NSWG). We agreed to deepen Russia's role in the activities of the NSWG, with a view to eventual full membership in the appropriate circumstances. We acknowledge successful cooperation on the pilot project of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) and consider it desirable to continue international cooperation for civil nuclear fusion development.

11. The greatest environmental threat to our future prosperity remains climate change. We confirm our determination to address it, and endorse the results of our Environment Ministers' meeting at Leeds Castle. The adoption at Kyoto of a Protocol with legally binding targets was a historic turning point in our efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We welcome the recent signature of the Protocol by some of us and confirm the intention of the rest of us to sign it within the next year, and resolve to make an urgent start on the further work that is necessary to ratify and make Kyoto a reality. To this end:

—we will each undertake domestically the steps necessary to reduce significantly greenhouse gas emissions;

—as the Kyoto protocol says, to supplement domestic actions, we will work further on flexible mechanisms such as international market-based emissions trading, joint implementation and the clean development mechanism, and on sinks. We aim to draw up rules and principles that will ensure an enforceable, accountable, verifiable, open and transparent trading system and an effective compliance regime;

—we will work together and with others to prepare for the Buenos Aires meeting of COP4 this autumn. We will also look at ways of working with all countries to increase global participation in establishing targets to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We will aim to reach agreement as soon as possible on how the clean development mechanism can work, including how it might best draw on the experience and expertise of existing institutions, including the Global Environment Facility. We look forward to increasing participation from developing countries, which are likely to be most affected by climate change and whose share of emissions is growing. We will work together with developing countries to achieve voluntary efforts and commitments, appropriate to their national circumstances and development needs. We shall also enhance our efforts with developing countries to promote technological development and diffusion.

12. The recent devastating forest fires in south-east Asia and the Amazon, threatening not only our environment but even economic growth and political stability, illustrate the crucial importance of global cooperation, and of better and more effective frameworks and practical efforts designed to sustainably manage and conserve forests. In the year 2000 we will assess our progress on implementation of the G8 Action Programme published last week. We strongly support the ongoing work on forests under the auspices of the United Nations, and we look forward to continuing these efforts.

Growth, employability, and inclusion

13. All our people, men and women, deserve the opportunity to contribute to and share in national prosperity through work

and a decent standard of living. The challenge is how to reap the benefits of rapid technological change and economic globalisation whilst ensuring that all our citizens share in these benefits by increasing growth and job creation, and building an inclusive society. To accomplish this, we recognise the importance of modernising domestic economic and social structures within a sound macro-economic framework. To these ends we strongly endorse the seven principles agreed by the G8 Finance, Economic, Labour and Employment Ministers at their London Conference in February on "Growth, Employability and Inclusion". We also welcome the conclusions of the Kobe Jobs Conference of November 1997, with their particular focus on active aging.

14. We discussed and welcomed the Action Plans we have each produced to show how the seven principles of the London Conference are being implemented. By sharing national experiences and best practices in this area, we can improve our policies and responses. We underlined the importance of the involvement of employers and unions in securing successful implementation of these Plans.

15. The Action Plans show that individually we are all making new commitments to improve employability and job creation in our countries. In particular, we have committed ourselves to:

—measures to help young, long-term unemployed and other groups hard hit by unemployment find work;

—measures to help entrepreneurs to set up companies;

—carrying out structural reforms, including making tax and benefit systems more employment friendly and liberalisation of product markets;

—measures to promote lifelong learning.

16. Each country confirmed its determination to introduce the measures set out in its Action Plans and to pursue the concept of active aging. Measures on active aging should explore what forms of work are appropriate to the needs of older workers and adapt work to suit them accordingly.

17. These measures will help generate soundly-based and equitable growth. We are also willing to share our principles and experiences, including in the relevant international institutions particularly the ILO, OECD and the IFIs, to help foster growth, jobs and inclusion not only in the G8 but throughout the world. We renew our support for global progress towards the implementation of internationally recognised core labour standards, including continued collaboration between the ILO and WTO secretariats in accordance with the conclusions of the Singapore conference and the proposal for an ILO declaration and implementation mechanism on these labour standards.

Combating drugs and international crime

18. Globalisation has been accompanied by a dramatic increase in transnational crime. This takes many forms, including trafficking in drugs and weapons; smuggling of human beings; the abuse of new technologies to steal, defraud and evade the law; and the laundering of the proceeds of crime.

19. Such crimes pose a threat not only to our citizens and their communities, through lives blighted by drugs and societies living in fear of organised crime; but also a global threat which can undermine the democratic and economic basis of societies through the investment of illegal money by international cartels, corruption, a weakening of institutions and a loss of confidence in the rule of law.

20. To fight this threat, international cooperation is indispensable. We ourselves, particularly since the Lyon summit in 1996, have sought ways to improve that cooperation. Much has already been achieved. We acknowledge the work being done in the UN, the EU and by other regional groupings. We welcome the steps undertaken by the G8 Lyon Group to implement its 40 Recommendations on transnational organised crime and the proposals G8 Justice and Interior Ministers announced at their meeting in Washington last December. By working together, our countries are helping each other catch criminals and break up cartels. But more needs to be done. There must be no safe havens either for criminals or for their money.

21. We have therefore agreed a number of further actions to tackle this threat more effectively:

—We fully support efforts to negotiate within the next two years an effective United Nations convention against transnational organised crime that will provide our law enforcement authorities with the additional tools they need.

—We agree to implement rapidly the ten principles and ten point action plan agreed by our Ministers on high tech crime. We call for close cooperation with industry to reach agreement on a legal framework for obtaining, presenting and preserving electronic data as evidence, while maintaining appropriate privacy protection, and agreements on sharing evidence of those crimes with international partners. This will help us combat a wide range of crime, including abuse of the internet and other new technologies.

—We welcome the FATF decision to continue and enlarge its work to combat money-laundering in partnership with regional groupings. We place special emphasis on the issues of money laundering and financial crime, including issues raised by offshore financial centres. We welcome the proposal to hold in Moscow in 1999 a Ministerial meeting on combating transnational crime. We agreed to establish Financial Intelligence Units (FIUs) where we do not already have them, in line with our national constitutions and legal systems, to collect and analyse information on those engaged in money laundering and liaise with the equivalent agencies in partner countries. We agreed on principles and the need for adequate legislation to facilitate asset confiscation from convicted criminals, including ways to help each other trace, freeze and confiscate those assets, and where possible, in accordance with national legislation, share seized assets with other nations.

—We agree on the need to explore ways of combating official corruption arising from the large flows of criminal money.

—We are deeply concerned by all forms of trafficking of human beings including the smuggling of migrants. We agreed to joint action to combat trafficking in women and children, including efforts to prevent such crimes, protect victims and prosecute the traffickers. We commit ourselves to develop a mutlidisciplinary and comprehensive strategy, including principles and an action plan for future cooperation amongst ourselves and with third countries, including countries of origin, transit and destination, to tackle this problem. We consider the future comprehensive UN organised crime convention an important instrument for this purpose.

—We endorse joint law enforcement action against organised crime and welcome the cooperation between competent agencies in tackling criminal networks. We agree to pursue further action, particularly in dealing with major smuggling routes and targeting specific forms of financial fraud.

—We endorse the Lyon Group's principles and action plan to combat illegal manufacturing and trafficking of firearms. We welcome its agreement to work towards the elaboration of a binding international legal instrument in the context of the UN transnational organised crime convention.

22. We urge the Lyon Group to intensify its on-going work and ask our Ministers to report back to our next Summit on progress on the action plan on high tech crime, the steps taken against money laundering and the joint action on trafficking in human beings. We also welcome the steps agreed by our Environment Ministers on 5 April to combat environmental crime.

23. There is a strong link between drugs and wider international and domestic crime. We welcome the forthcoming UNGASS on drugs. This should signal the international community's determination in favour of a comprehensive strategy to tackle all aspects of the drugs problem. For its part, the G8 is committed to partnership and shared responsibility in the international community to combat illicit drugs. This should include reinforced cooperation to curb illicit trafficking in drugs and chemical precursors, action to reduce demand in our countries, including through policies to reduce drug dependency, and support for a global approach to eradicating illicit crops. We welcome the UNDCP's

global approach to eliminating or significantly reducing illicit drug production, where appropriate through effective alternative development programmes.

Non-Proliferation and Export Controls

24. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems threatens the security of every nation. Our countries have been in the forefront of efforts to prevent proliferation, and we have worked closely together to support international non-proliferation regimes. We pledge to continue and strengthen this co-operation. As a key element of this co-operation, we reaffirm our commitment to ensure the effective implementation of export controls, in keeping with our undertakings within the non-proliferation regimes. We will deny any kind of assistance to programmes for weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. To this end, we will where appropriate undertake and encourage the strengthening of laws, regulations and enforcement mechanisms. We will likewise enhance amongst ourselves and with other countries our co-operation on export control, including for instance on the exchange of information. We will ask our experts to focus on strengthening export control implementation. And we will broaden awareness among our industrial and business communities of export control requirements.

Year 2000 Bug

25. The Year 2000 (or Millennium) Bug problem, deriving from the way computers deal with the change to the year 2000, presents major challenges to the international community, with vast implications, in particular in the defence, transport, telecommunications, financial services, energy and environmental sectors, and we noted the vital dependence of some sectors on others. We agreed to take further urgent action and to share information, among ourselves and with others, that will assist in preventing disruption in the near and longer term. We shall work closely with business and organisations working in those sectors, who will bear much of the responsibility to address the problem. We will work together in international organisations, such as the World Bank to assist developing countries, and the OECD, to help solve this critical technological problem and prepare for the year 2000.

Next Summit

26. We accepted the invitation of the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany to meet again next year in Köln on 18–20 June.

17 May 1998

NOTE: This communique was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 17 but was not issued as a White House press release. An original was not available for verification of the content of this communique.

The President's News Conference With European Union Leaders in London, United Kingdom

May 18, 1998

Prime Minister Tony Blair. Thanks very much, ladies and gentlemen. Do sit down. I'm sorry there isn't a text yet, but you'll be provided with one shortly.

Can I, first of all, set out what I believe that we have achieved at this summit, and then ask the President of the European Commission and, finally, the President of the United States to speak to you.

As you know, there have been for some years serious differences over the U.S.'s sanctions policy and the EU's extraterritoriality. And what we established today is at least a basis for a lasting solution to these problems. We've avoided a showdown over sanctions with which we don't agree, and we've done it in a way that at least provides the chance of a solution to the problem in the future. And the President of the United States will set out the U.S. position in a moment. So there's still more work to do, but it is a real step forward.

In addition, today we have launched a major new transatlantic trade initiative, the Transatlantic Economic Partnership, which will further add momentum to the process of developing what is already the most important bilateral trade relationship in the world. We've also agreed to work ever more closely together to promote multilateral trade liberalization.

Finally, we have welcomed the very substantial report presented to us by our senior officials on the progress achieved since our last summit towards further implementation of the 1995 new transatlantic trade agreement. Some examples of this are: cooperation to prevent drug smuggling through the Caribbean; a joint decision to give awards in central and Eastern Europe who have helped in recent years to entrench democracy and civil rights in those countries; and a joint EU-U.S. program in the Ukraine and Poland to warn women of the dangers of being lured into the sex trade in Western Europe.

So there are a series of measures that we have put together and agreed, and we have made very substantial progress on both the issues of sanctions and extraterritoriality, and of course, in taking forward our trade partnership through a major new trade initiative. And I'm delighted to be able to make those announcements to you today.

Jacques, do you want to add some words?

President Jacques Santer. Ladies and gentlemen, our summit today is the sixth between the European Union and the United States since the adoption of the new transatlantic agenda. These summits are becoming more and more important to the development of the transatlantic relationship. The breadth of issues we covered today and the substantial agreements we came to prove how worthwhile these meetings now are.

The 1995 new transatlantic agenda has led to much more intense cooperation across the Atlantic. It is not just a question of warm words but complete agreements. For example, today's signature of the mutual recognition agreement offers real benefits to business and consumers on both sides of the Atlantic.

Today's summit is particularly important because we and the United States have struck a deal on the U.S. sanctions laws. This agreement, after weeks of intense negotiations with the U.S. administration, finally brings peace in this longstanding dispute.

The European Union has opposed the United States sanctions laws on investments in Iran, Libya, and Cuba not only because we believe they are illegal but also because they are counterproductive. We in Europe have always taken very seriously the fight to curb terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction. But the U.S. sanctions laws make our cooperation on these issues more, rather than less difficult.

The deal today means that European companies and businessmen can conduct their business without the threat of U.S. sanctions hanging over their heads. It's a deal that is good for European companies who now have protection from the sanctions. It's a deal that is good for the European Union which has shown that it can act together, united in important foreign policy issues. And it is good for the transatlantic relationship which can now develop further, free of this longstanding dispute.

There are obviously still some further steps that need to be taken before the deal can be completely implemented, but I am hopeful that these will be concluded as soon as possible. By getting rid of the biggest problem in our relationship with the United States, the door is now open to further deepen and enhance our cooperation across the Atlantic.

Today at the summit we agreed to a substantial new initiative to deepen the trade relationship called the Transatlantic Economic Partnership. In this initiative, first we address the further removal of barriers in our bilateral trade. It also says that United States and the European Union will work together to achieve a substantial, further trade liberalization on a multilateral basis.

Today's agreement will add to the prosperity of both the United States and the European Union and, more generally, in the world. It will, thus, create better prospects for future jobs.

President Clinton, Prime Minister Tony Blair, and I will be in Geneva to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the GATT, an organization which has contributed so much to the stability and prosperity of the postwar world. Our agreements this morning sends a powerful message of transatlantic support to that meeting and to the further development of multilateral liberalization.

But of course, today's summit, as is usual on these occasions, was also an opportunity to discuss many key foreign policy issues including Turkey, Cyprus, Kosovo, and Ukraine. On Ukraine, we agreed to call on

the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development to play its part in the implementation of the memorandum of understanding on nuclear safety concluded between the G–7 and the Ukraine.

In conclusion, this summit has placed the transatlantic relationship on an even stronger footing. We can now look forward to an even deeper partnership in the future.

Thank you.

President Clinton. Thank you very much. I'd like to begin by thanking Prime Minister Blair for the creative and strong leadership that he has provided to the European Union and to the U.S.-EU partnership. And I thank President Santer for his years of work for European unity.

America welcomes a strong partnership with a strong and united Europe, to improve the lives, the security, the well-being of our own people and others around the world. The EU, as I'm sure all of you know, is America's largest trade and investment partner. Two-way trade supports more than 6 million jobs on both sides of the Atlantic.

Today I am very pleased that we have agreed to new steps to strengthen that economic partnership. First, we will work to dismantle trade barriers, both bilateral and multilateral trade barriers, in areas such as manufacturing, services and agriculture, about a dozen in all, while maintaining the highest standards of labor and environment.

Now, let me also say that we have agreed in this effort that we will make an effort to give all the stakeholders in our economic lives, environmental stakeholders, labor stakeholders, other elements of civil society, a chance to be heard in these negotiations, in these discussions. And I believe that is a new paradigm which ought to be mirrored in trade negotiations throughout the world.

Indeed, as President Santer said, when we conclude here, I am going to Geneva, where I will speak about how we can work together to strengthen the world trading system on the occasion of its 50th anniversary. And I will argue that the WTO ought to embrace the kinds of things that we and the EU have agreed to do here, to give all the stakeholders a role, and to do a better job of respecting the importance of preserving the environment and of making sure trade works for the benefit of all the people in all the countries involved.

I am also pleased that we have reached agreement today, as the Prime Minister and President Santer said, on an issue of vital importance to our own security and well-being. We share an interest in combating terrorism and limiting the spread of weapons of mass destruction. We understand, always, the problems with weapons of mass destruction, but we are, I hope, all more sensitive to them in light of the recent events in South Asia.

Here in London, the EU countries have committed to enhance their cooperation with us with regard to Iran. They will step up efforts to prevent the transfer of technology that could be used to develop weapons of mass destruction. They have agreed to work toward the ratification of all 11 counterterrorism conventions. We've agreed to cooperate in the development of Caspian energy resources.

I'd also like to emphasize that Russia, too, has taken important steps to strengthen controls over the export of sensitive technology, notably but not exclusively, to Iran, in effect, establishing Russia's first comprehensive catchall export control system. We'll be watching and working closely with the Russians to help make sure this system works.

The actions taken by the EU and Russian advance Congress' objective in enacting the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act. It is not primarily a sanctions act. It is an act that is designed to give the incentives for all of us to work together to retard the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to support more aggressive efforts to fight terrorism. Therefore, the waivers we have granted today are part of our overall strategy to deter Iran from acquiring weapons of mass destruction and promoting terrorism. And it is an important new stage in our partnership.

We have also forged a pathbreaking common approach to deter investment in illegally expropriated property around the world, including, but not limited to Cuba. Our governments will deny all forms of commercial assistance for these transactions, including loans, grants, subsidies, fiscal advantages, guarantees, political risk insurance. This understanding furthers the goals of protecting

property rights in Cuba and worldwide, advances the interests of U.S. claimants, and protects U.S. investors, and does so far more effectively than the United States could have done alone.

It also furthers, as the Prime Minister said and as President Santer did, the objectives of the European Union in getting away from the unilateral sanctions regime.

We have finally agreed to work together with Russia to strengthen nuclear safety. This is also very important, especially with regard to nuclear waste removal and storage in northwest Russia. We will act together to encourage Ukraine to embark on bold economic reform and to speed the closure of the Chernobyl reactors that threaten safety and health.

Let me finally add that today we will honor 50 exceptional individuals from Europe's new democracies for their work in helping freedom take strong root across the continent. I believe about half a dozen of them are here today. From protecting human rights in Belarus to preserving the environment in Slovakia, these dedicated men and women, like so many others, are helping to make Europe free, peaceful, prosperous, and united. I thank them, and again, I thank the Prime Minister for his truly outstanding leadership.

Thank you very much.

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Q. All three of you have spoken of the economic benefits which could flow to Northern Ireland and, in some cases, you've announced specific packages; in view of the polls which clearly show that the majority of the Unionist community has yet to be convinced. How conditional are those benefits on convincing the "yes" vote in the referendum on Friday?

Prime Minister Blair. Well, I don't think anyone is trying to say that investment is conditional on how people vote. But what people are saying is: It's a matter of common sense; if there's peace and stability in Northern Ireland, there is a far greater chance of attracting investment; that people from Europe, from the United States, from right around the world see Northern Ireland as an immensely exciting investment opportunity. But obviously, it's far easier from them to come and invest if they're investing in the context of peace and stability.

And I know that there are still people in Northern Ireland yet to make up their minds. And in the end the decision has got to be for people in Northern Ireland. But I have answered very clearly and specifically some of the questions that people have put to me. I have tried to tell people why it is so important that they recognize that the choice is not between the future that we've outlined in this agreement, which is the only chance I've seen of a peaceful, successful future for Northern Ireland, and the status quos that exist now.

The danger that we foresee is that the real choice is between the agreement and everything slipping back. And we want to do as much as we possibly can to avoid that, because we recognize, as your question implies, that if we can get real peace and stability there, well, the chances for people in Northern Ireland are just amazing. And we would like them to take advantage of that.

Mr. President.

President Clinton. Well, I agree with that. There's no sort of quid pro quo here. It's just a fact that, for example, the Irish community in America, both Protestant and Catholic, which desperately wants to see an end to the Troubles will be more interested in trying to make sure that a courageous effort on behalf of peace by the people of Northern Ireland has a better chance to succeed by greater investment. I don't think there's any question about that.

I also would just say that I think that if the majority community—in any vote to change, you might argue that the majority will always be willing to change because they're in the majority; they say, "Well, we have what we like now." But they don't have peace now. They don't have maximum prosperity now. And if you think about the next 10 to 20 years, if I were an Irish Protestant, which I am, living in Northern Ireland instead of the United States, I would be thinking about my daughter's future and her children's future. And I'd say, "If you look at the framework, this protects us, no matter what happens to population patterns, no matter what happens to immigration patterns, no

matter what happens. We're all going to be able to be protected and have a role in the democracy of our country, and I like that.''

So I'm hoping that everyone will be thinking that way, thinking about the future, thinking about their children. And I think the risk of doing this is so much smaller than the risk of letting it blow apart, that I believe in the end a lot of the undecided voters will go in and vote their hopes instead of their fears.

President Santer. I only would add that the European Commission launched several years ago, as you remember the peace program and also for the reconciliation for Northern Ireland and the surrounding counties. And I was very impressed on my last trip in Northern Ireland several weeks ago, how many people are working across community levels in these schools, these programs. There are more, at this moment, more than 11,000 applications of this program, more than 200,000 people across the community working in these programs, and they are supporting from grassroot levels these peace and reconciliation programs.

Therefore, I think we have to support also from an economic side this peace process. It is a longstanding process, but nevertheless, I think that through our structures and programs that people are coming closer together and the cross-border community complying also to a lasting peace. And I wanted also that it would happen on Friday and we ask that you would also have the possibility to support it for the next time.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, Secretary Albright and Dennis Ross are here in London after the talks in Washington with Prime Minister Netanyahu. Has the Prime Minister softened his resistance to the American proposal for Israeli troop withdrawals, pull-backs from the West Bank? What will Secretary Albright take to the meeting today when she sees Yasser Arafat? Could you give us some kind of update on these talks?

President Clinton. On a few occasions in the past I have given you an answer like this, and I hope you will abide my having to do so again.

The posture of the talks now is such that anything I saw publicly to characterize the position taken by Mr. Netanyahu, or anybody else in the back-and-forth, would almost certainly reduce the chances of our being able to get an agreement which would move the parties to final status and reduce dramatically tensions in the region.

So I think I should reaffirm what I said earlier today. The parties are working. They have been working hard. In my judgment, they have been working in honest, earnest good faith. And we have our hopes, but I think it is important not to raise false hopes or to characterize the talks at this time. They are just in a period when anything we say publicly will increase the chances that we will fail. And if we get something we can say, believe me, I'd be the first one to the microphone. I'd be very happy. But I think it's important not to do more than that now.

Chequers Golf Outing

Q. Mr. President, we gather it's not been all work today and that you are reported to have introduced our Prime Minister to the mysteries of golf. How did he do?

President Clinton. You know, there's a golf course across the street from Chequers, and the first nine holes were a part of the Chequers to stay until 1906. So it's at least 100 years old, the first nine holes. So this morning I got up early and the Prime Minister went with me and we walked about four and a half holes of the golf course. And he says, mind you, that he has never hit a golf ball before in his life. And he asked me to drive two balls off of every tee of these four holes we played, and that he would play the rest of the way in.

So I told him how to hold the club, how to stand, how to swing. And it was embarrassing how good he was. And the guy that was going around with us was a four handicap. For those of you who play, that's nearly scratch; it's very good. And he thought, he just couldn't believe the Prime Minister was telling the truth, that he never hit the ball before. It was amazing.

All I had to do was get him off the tee, and he did very well. He three-putted no greens; he two-putted every green, all four greens. And he only just missed two shots. The rest of it—it was unbelievable. Either

he is an unbelievable athlete, or I have a career as a golf instructor after I leave the White House. [*Laughter*] One of the two things must be true.

Prime Minister Blair. It's true. I'm ashamed to say I haven't played golf. But I had the best teacher I could possibly have. It's not everyone who says he's been given golfing lessons by the President of the United States of America. But we will put it down to beginner's luck, a bit like politics. [*Laughter*]

Nuclear Proliferation in South Asia

Q. Mr. President, have you or will you contact the Indian or Pakistani Prime Ministers concerning the nuclear programs they're developing? What factors are you weighing in deciding whether to go ahead with your trip planned for later this year to those two countries? And did the agreement that you announced today, or understanding on sanctions that you announced today, provide any way through to resolving the dispute that you had up at the G–8 on how to properly respond to India and Pakistan's programs?

President Clinton. The answer to the latter question is, no. The answer to the first two questions you asked is, I would like to talk to the Pakistani Prime Minister just to reassure him of my support for a decision not to test and my understanding of the difficulty of his position and what I think is the way out of this. I think Prime Minister Blair feels the same way.

I have made no decision about my travel plans. But keep in mind, what we need here is a way to break out of this box. What we need here is a way for both the national aspirations for security and for standing on the part of the Indians, and the national aspirations for security and for standing on the part of the Pakistanis to be resolved in a way that is positive.

I mean, this is, indeed, a very sad thing because it has the prospect of spreading not just to Pakistan, but to others in a way that could reverse decades of movement away from the nuclear precipice, in ways that clearly will not increase the security of countries, no matter how many times they say over and over and over again they only want these weapons for defensive purposes.

And so that's what we have to do. And it's too soon for quick, easy answers on that. But I can tell you that my view is, we need—instead of saying, ''We're not going to talk. We're not going to go here. We're not going to go there,'' what we really need to think of is—Pakistan has been a good ally of ours, India has been, arguably, the most successful democracy in history in the last 50 years because they preserved the democracy in the face of absolutely overwhelming diversity and difficulty, and pressures internal and external—and they can't get along over Kashmir, and they have some other tensions. And then their neighbors sometimes turn up the tensions a little bit.

We've got to find a way out of this. We can't have a situation where every country in the world that thinks it has a problem, either in terms of its standing or its security, believes that the way to resolve that is to put a couple of scientists in a laboratory and figure out how to conduct a nuclear explosion. We just—that is not the right thing to do. But we have to find the right way, offer it, and work it through with these folks. And I think maybe we can.

But the answer to your question is, I'd like to talk to the Pakistani Prime Minister, not because I think I can pressure him into doing that—I don't think for a moment I can do that—but just because I would like to express my personal conviction about this in a way that I hope would allow them to think about it.

Turkey, Greece, and Cyprus

Q. Mr. President, did you have a chance to talk about Turkey's European case, and related with that, the Cyprus question with Mr. Blair and other world leaders?

President Clinton. Yes, I did. And if I had any sense, I'd just stop there—that's the answer to your question.

You know what I think, what the United States believes. The United States believes that there ought to be a path for Turkey to keep moving toward closer union with Europe. The United States supports the fact that Turkey and Greece are in NATO. The United States believes that there should be an honorable settlement to the Cyprus impasse because it is keeping Turkey and

Greece, and the other Aegean issues—keeping Turkey and Greece from being genuine allies and being genuinely available to spend their time, their energy, and their resources promoting peace and development for their own people, and being enormous, stabilizing forces in their respective regions of Europe.

So, for me, this is a very important thing. To get there, I think we'll have to proceed on many fronts at once, and I think both the Turks and Greeks will have to make difficult decisions, which I believe the European Union, and I know the United States will strongly support. But I don't think we can solve one problem in isolation from the other. I think we have to move forward on all these problems—the Cyprus, the Aegean jurisdictional disputes, the role of Turkey in Europe's future—all of that we have to move forward on. But I think that both the Greeks and the Turks have a bigger interest in a comprehensive resolution of that, and I know the rest of us do, than it appears just from following daily events. We have got to resolve this.

Prime Minister Blair. Can I just add to that, on behalf of the European Union, that I agree entirely with what the President has just said. And I think it's important to emphasize yet again that Europe wants a good and close relationship with Turkey. We want Turkey to feel included in the family of European nations. We have a deep concern over what has happened, and is happening, in Cyprus. And we believe it is essential that we make progress in this area.

Now, we know the difficulties that Turkey felt that it had following the Luxembourg conclusions last year, but I think we should and will redouble our efforts to give a very clear signal to Turkey about our proper and true intentions and also to do what we can to bring hope in the conflict in Cyprus.

Nuclear Proliferation in South Asia

Q. Thank you very much, Mr. President. If I could ask the Prime Minister and President Santer, Pakistan is complaining about the lack of response to India's nuclear explosions. Specifically, at the G–8, there was no call for sanctions. Britain and the European Union are not following the lead of the United States, Canada, and Japan, and calling for sanctions. Will Britain and the European Union impose sanctions on India for its nuclear explosions?

And to you, Mr. President, beyond words to Pakistan, and beyond the possible delivery of those F–16's that Pakistan has already paid for, what specific concrete steps will you take to reassure the Pakistanis that might convince them not to go ahead with their own nuclear test?

Prime Minister Blair. Well, in respect to the first point, I mean, as the G–8 statement made clear, obviously, individual countries have their own individual positions vis-a-vis sanctions. But do not underestimate two very clear points of agreement that were established in our G–8 discussions. The first is our condemnation of the Indian nuclear tests. The second is our desire to see India integrate itself unconditionally, into the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty process.

And I believe if we need to look at the way forward from here, it is not merely a question of expressing our dismay and concern, which I did personally to the Indian Prime Minister last Friday; it is also finding the best way forward from now. And we expressed that very clearly at the G–8. I'm sure that is the position of all of the European Union countries, as well. And I think the most persuasive argument with Pakistan is to say very clearly to them that if India believes that it enhances its standing in the world by this action, it does not. And all of us are deeply conscious of the threat and danger to security of the world that nuclear testing poses. So that is why I think it is important to see where we go from here. And the statement of the G–8 particularly in relation to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty was most important and significant.

President Santer. I only want to add, first, that the European Union would, at the next European Ministerial Council on the 25th of May—so next Monday—discuss the relations about the European Union with India on the basis of the statements we made at the G–8 meeting last weekend.

Second, speaking from the European Commission, I must say that the main program we have—about 80 to 90 percent of our programs are humanitarian programs to India. We are focusing to the poorest people

of this country. So I don't think that sanctions for these programs, the humanitarian programs, would not produce any deeper concern. But we have to reflect on our attitude and the concerted attitude to India on the next occasion—on Monday.

President Clinton. First of all, let me say, I think that it's important to point out that in addition to Japan, Canada, and the United States, the Dutch, the Swedes have announced that they intend to have economic—take economic actions, and I believe there will be other European countries as well.

And everybody who was at the G–8 said that there would be some impact on their relations with India as a result of this. So I thought it was quite a strong statement. And given the well-known positions of all the countries involved, I thought it was stronger than could have been predicted when we went in.

Now, what I would hope we could work with the Pakistanis on are specific things that would allay their security concerns, and also make it clear that there will be political and economic benefits over the long run to showing restraint here. But the Prime Minister mentioned one of the things that I think could really help us out of this conundrum, which would be if India would say, ''Okay, now we're ready to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty,'' Pakistan has said in the past that if India signed, they would sign.

But again, I say somehow we've got to put this back on track. Remember, it wasn't very long ago that Argentina and Brazil had nuclear programs. And they just said, ''We're not going to do this. We are not going to run the slightest risk that some future rift between ourselves would lead to some kind of explosion. We're not going to sink vast amounts of our national treasury into this when we have so many poor people in our country and we need this money freed up to other things. We are going to find other ways, number one, to take care of our security and, number two, to consider ourselves and have others consider us great nations.''

And I think it would be fair to say that both of them have succeeded very well. I think it would be fair to say that at least all of us who live in the Americas believe they're enormously important countries and think more of them, not less of them, because they gave up their nuclear weapons. They have vigorous militaries, and they certainly feel themselves secure.

So we have to try to create that kind of condition under admittedly more difficult circumstances on the Indian subcontinent; that is, the previous tensions between India and China, the previous tensions between India and Pakistan. I understand they're different, but the fundamental fact is the same. So that's what I'm going to try to sell, and whatever happens, I'm going to work every day I'm President, until I leave office in 2001, I'm going to work for this because I do not want to see us slip back away. We're on the right track here as a world. We don't want to turn back.

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, why is it that if you feel it's so important to secure a yes vote in Northern Ireland, you decided it would be counterproductive to visit Northern Ireland before the vote?

And Prime Minister, are you concerned at opinion polls which suggest a slippage in the yes vote amongst the Unionist community? There is one in two Northern Ireland newspapers today which you may be aware of, which suggests that only 25 percent of young Protestants, who've never known anything but violence, are prepared to vote yes.

President Clinton. Let me answer your question first, because I think your question to the Prime Minister is the far more important one.

I decided that I shouldn't go, first of all, because I felt that I'd have just as good a chance to have my message heard if I did something like the interview the Prime Minister and I did with David Frost, that would be widely heard, under circumstances that would not allow me to become the issue in the election for those that are opposed to this measure.

I believe—you have to understand what I believe. I believe that the voters who actually weigh the merits and the substance and think rationally about what the alternatives are, if this fails and if it succeeds, will overwhelmingly vote yes. I believe the voters who

will vote no will be those who, frankly, don't trust the other side and don't feel that they can trust the other side and who, therefore, can get distracted. And I do not want to be a distraction.

The second reason I didn't want to do it is a lot of the leaders in Northern Ireland didn't think it would help. And my own experience is, I was the Governor of a State with not many more people than Northern Ireland had before I became President. And there were several times when the President of another party came into my State. At one time, I remember in 1984, President Reagan who was immensely popular in my State, campaigning for my opponent. President Reagan got 62 percent of the vote, and I got 63 percent of the vote. So it had no impact. I did not want to become the issue. But I did want my commitment to the welfare of the people of Northern Ireland in both communities to be heard. So I hope I made the right decision, and I hope I was heard.

Prime Minister Blair. To answer your question, I think there's obviously still a tremendous amount of debate going on. The fear that people have on specific issues—I've addressed those fears, each one of them—and those fears really revolve around this question: Is it clear that if people want to take their seats in the Government of Northern Ireland or to benefits of any of the programs or an accelerated prison release or any of the rest of it, is it clear that they will have to have given up violence for good? The answer to that question is unequivocally yes. It's what the agreement states. And I've made it clear, we will clarify that and make it clear in the legislation.

But beyond that, it is a decision that people are going to have to weigh in their own minds. And the easiest thing in politics is simply to say no. The easiest thing in politics is to sit there and say, "Change is something I'm afraid of, and I'm therefore just going to refuse it." But I ask everyone who takes that attitude to reflect upon what the future holds if there is a "no" vote for this agreement. And all the way through this campaign I've tried to ask people and to say to them, in order to understand their fears, say to them, "Well, what is the alternative to this agreement? Because, after all, what unionism has fought for for 60, 70 years has been the principle of consent, and that principle is enshrined in terms in the agreement; in return, fairness and equal treatment for people from whatever side of the community they come from." Now, those are principles everyone can accept.

That's the agreement. That's the alternative I take to the table. I still don't know what the alternative is on the other side. And I just hope people reflect on that and really think about it, because every generation gets its chances; this is the chance for this generation in Northern Ireland. And we've all done our best to provide it for people, but in the end it's their decision. I can't make that decision for people. I can only tell them honestly what I believe and feel.

Microsoft Antitrust Case

Q. Mr. President, Microsoft has said that preventing it from distributing its Windows '98 software would cripple the computer industry and slow U.S. growth. Given the breakdown of talks over the weekend, do you now see a collision between Microsoft and the Justice Department as inevitable, and do you concur with their assessment of the economic consequences?

President Clinton. Well, let me say, as you know, as a general principle, I have taken the view that I should not comment on matters within the jurisdiction of the Justice Department that could be the subject of legal action. At this time, I do not think I should depart from that policy on this case, even though it obviously will have a big impact on an important sector of our economy. But I would have to say, based on what I know to date, I have confidence in the way the antitrust division in the Justice Department has handled the matter.

I say this, what I said—I want to reserve the right at sometime in the future if I think it's appropriate to make a comment, because this is not just an open-and-shut case of one party sues somebody else. This is something that would have a significant impact on our economy. But I think that, based on what I know, I have confidence in the way the antitrust division has handled this, and while it's pending at this time, I think I should stick to my policy and not comment.

European Union-United States Trade

Q. It seems like every 2 or 3 years there's another statement by European and American leaders that there's been another major breakthrough in trade relations. Do you now, all three of you, think it's time to set a clear and firm objective of a full-scale free trade agreement in goods, services, and capital across the Atlantic?

And, secondly, for Mr. President—I think we're struck by your repeated use of the word, ''stakeholders'' in your comments upon the agreement that you have reached today. Does this have something to do with your discussions about the third way that you've been holding with Mr. Blair, and is this now a key word in the process?

President Clinton. Well, let me answer, first of all, the question of whether there should be a U.S.-EU comprehensive trade negotiation is one more properly directed to the EU because there is—the United States has supported European Union and any devices, including the EMU, chosen by the leaders to achieve that union. We have also supported the broadest possible trade relationship with Europe and, as you know and have commented on elsewhere, a similar relationship in Latin America and in the Asia-Pacific region.

Now, as you know, to make full disclosure, I would have to have fast-track authority from the Congress to do some, but not all, of the things that we have contemplated in this agreement. I would be for an even more sweeping one, but I think, to be fair, it's more difficult, with all the other tensions and debates of unification going on in Europe, to get much further than we've gotten today, and what we have agreed to do is very considerable, indeed.

Now, the question you asked about the stakeholders, I have always believed that our country—that the United States could not succeed in the end, economically and socially at home, in providing opportunity for everyone who is responsible enough to work for it, and in having a community that's coming together instead of being torn apart, unless we maintained our level of engagement and involvement in the rest of the world. I have always believed we could not sustain our involvement in the rest of the world in trade and other areas unless the American people thought we were doing it in a way that was consistent with their values when it comes to basic working standards, basic living standards, and preserving the global environment.

So what we have tried to do, without prescribing the end, is to set up a process here for our negotiation which will let all those folks into the trade debate. And what I am going to argue for at the WTO is an even more sweeping example of that. But Sir Leon Brittan—I think he's here today—commented earlier this year that in the preamble to the WTO, it says that sustainable development should be the goal of increasing global trade, and that part of the trade agenda should be providing the means to preserve the environment and increasing the number of tools to do so.

That's just one example. Is it part of the so-called third way? I think you could say that, but it's not something that came out of our dinner conservation last night. This is something Prime Minister Blair and I have long believed ought to be done. But you can't—we don't exist as economic animals alone, and in fact, if we don't find a way to prove that increasing trade will lead to prosperity more broadly shared in all the countries in which we deal and will give us the tools to improve the environment, in the end, our trade policies will prove self-defeating.

President Santer. For our trade relations, I can only say that since we adopted the new transatlantic agenda in December 1995, we made a huge progress, a long way together. And Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, this morning, made a list of all we have delivered since '95. It is a very impressive list.

Now, it's coming the way how we can deepen these transatlantic partnership relations further. And that we did this morning. And I think that this is really a major result for the future. We are the biggest world partner, the United States and Europe, and we have a balanced trade relations. And we have also a balanced foreign direct investments on both sides of the Atlantic, and, therefore, it seems to me that's very important that we strengthen and that we deepen these relations step-by-step for the future and that we make it in a very comprehensive way.

That's not to say that we would not have sometime some difficulties; the partners always have some difficulties. I remember that also with the member states in the European Union—that's my daily life—I have to deal with difficulties. And even with our friends here, in the Presidency, we are discussing the same problems—[inaudible]—cultural fields as we are discussing sometimes also with the United States. So, the thing is only in what spirit we are dealing with these problems. And therefore, I think we have to be in a partnership-like spirit, and that's the real sense and the deepness, the depths of our partnership relation. And therefore, I think this summit, the sixth summit since 1995, is a very important one, and gives a new signal for a new direction.

Situation in Indonesia

Q. With regard to Indonesia, sir, do you anticipate using U.S. forces to safeguard the lives of Americans in that country, and would the United States be prepared to give Soeharto asylum if it would help ease him from power?

President Clinton. Well, with regard to the first question, I have been given no indication that it is necessary at this time. And with regard to the second, the prospect has not been presented. As you probably know, just as we were fixing to come in here, there are all kinds of new stories which may or may not be accurate about very rapidly unfolding developments in Indonesia. And I expect that all of you may want to come back to me in 2 or 3 hours or 4 hours for comments on things that may be clearer then than they are now.

Let me just say again what I think the real issue is here. We want this country to come back together, not come apart. We want the military to continue to exercise maximum restraint so there will be minimum loss of life and injury. We want civil society to flourish there. We believe that Indonesia was headed for some tough times because there has to be some tough economic decisions taken no matter what government has been in. But the absence of a sense of political dialog and ownership and involvement obviously has contributed to the difficulties there. And then there has been a heartbreaking loss of life of all the people who burned to death, for example.

So what we're looking for now and what we're going to be working for is the restoration of order without violence and the genuine opening of a political dialog that gives all parties in this country a feeling that they are a part of it. They should decide, the Indonesian people, who the leader of Indonesia is. And then we're going to do our best, when things settle down and human needs are taken care of and there's order, to try to get them back on the road to economic recovery. Because all of us have a big interest in the future success of a country that has done some fabulous things in the last 30 years, but it had a very bad few moments here.

Thank you.

Prime Minister Blair. Thank you very much, indeed.

President Santer. Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 159th news conference began at 1:20 p.m. at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. The President met with Prime Minister Blair in his capacity as President of the European Council and President Jacques Santer of the European Commission. In the news conference the following people were referred to: Ambassador Dennis B. Ross, Special Middle East Coordinator; Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel; Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority; Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif of Pakistan; and European Trade Commissioner Sir Leon Brittan, vice president, European Commission.

Statement of European Union/ United States Shared Objectives and Close Cooperation on Counter-Terrorism

May 18, 1998

1. The United States, the European Union and its member states are strategic allies in the global fight against terrorism—a grave threat to democracy, and to economic and social development. They oppose terrorism in all its forms, whatever the motivation of its perpetrators, oppose concessions to terrorists, and agree on the need to resist extortion threats. They condemn absolutely not only those who plan or commit terrorist acts, but also any who support, finance or harbour

terrorists. They recognize that terrorism operates on a transnational scale, and cannot effectively be dealt with solely by isolated action using each individual state's own resources. They work together to promote greater international cooperation and coordinated effort to combat terrorism by all legal means and in all relevant bilateral and multilateral fora—from the Transatlantic Dialogue to the United Nations.

The International Legal Framework

2. Extradition and mutual legal assistance arrangements are in operation or will be developed between EU partners and the United States. The EU and US cooperate in the United Nations framework to elaborate the necessary international legal instruments for the fight against terrorism. They work in tandem to promote universal adherence to the eleven international counter-terrorism conventions. EU partners contributed to the rapid and successful negotiation of the most recent UN Convention (for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings) based on a draft proposed by the US. Now they are cooperating to consider the terms of a draft UN Convention on the Suppression of Nuclear Terrorism.

Areas of current EU/US mutual interest

3. (i) Terrorist Fund-raising: EU partners are pooling their knowledge and experience to work to cut off terrorists' sources of funding. They have agreed a set of action points, and their operational agencies are working on joint initiatives against terrorist funding. The US participated in an EU seminar in 1997 which shaped this work, is briefed regularly on current developments in this key area, and will take part in a follow-up EU seminar in Vienna in October 1998.

(ii) Chemical/Biological Terrorism and other threats: During the UK Presidency the EU and US have shared their thinking and compared best practice in the areas of CB terrorism, Terrorist arms trafficking and Bomb scene management.

(iii) The Middle East Peace Process: The EU briefs the US regularly on its current 3-year programme of counter-terrorism cooperation to enhance the effectiveness of the Palestinian Authority in this key area, including an extensive programme of human rights training. To strengthen EU/Palestinian links still further in the fight against terrorism, a declaration creating a joint Security Committee was agreed in April 1998. The Committee now meets regularly to discuss security issues.

EU/US Consultation and Information Exchange

4. Policy cooperation is developed bilaterally and at EU/US level. Operational cooperation, including intelligence-sharing, is handled bilaterally by national law enforcement agencies, and is given high priority. To identify and assess the scale of the terrorist threat, the EU member states and the US exchange information and assessments on terrorist trends and latest developments. The regular meetings on counter-terrorism between the US and the EU Troika of the Second and Third Pillars are used to exchange views on all aspects of terrorism policy, including trends in countries of particular current concern in the Middle East and elsewhere. Information is also shared on significant developments on either side of the Atlantic, eg the creation of Europol, which will include terrorism within its remit soon after its launch. The US has updated EU partners on the impact of its decision last October to designate 30 foreign terrorist organisations.

Further Cooperation

5. While recognising the wide range of work successfully accomplished hitherto, both sides see scope to strengthen further their close ties in the field of counter-terrorism, and are working to do so—by additional information-sharing at their regular Troika meetings, enhanced bilateral intelligence exchanges, and sustained cooperation at the United Nations and in other fora to advance their common objectives.

NOTE: This statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 18 but was not issued as a White House press release. An original was not available for verification of the content of this statement.

United States/European Union Declaration on Common Orientation of Non-Proliferation Policy

May 18, 1998

The International Non-Proliferation Regime

The United States and the Member States of the European Union share a strong common interest in non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems.

The United States and the European Union support universal adherence to international treaties covering weapons of mass destruction, including the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. They are cooperating to ensure full and effective implementation of these treaties. This includes the effective implementation of the recently-strengthened safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency and verification procedures being implemented pursuant to the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. They are also working toward agreement on an effective Protocol on verification for the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention.

They are active participants in international export control regimes and arrangements:

—The Nuclear Suppliers Group.

—The Zangger Committee of countries committed to cooperation in interpretation and implementation of the export clause (Article III.2) of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

—The Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR).

—The Australia Group of suppliers of goods and dual-use equipment potentially relevant to chemical or biological weapons.

Among their other responsibilities, the regimes provide mechanisms for the exchange of information about programs and activities of concern in the area of weapons proliferation which they address.

Export Control Policy

While promoting international trade and opportunities, and consistent with other relevant international obligations, the United States and the European Union take as a particularly important objective the denial of assistance to programs of weapons of mass destruction and means of delivery. This includes dual-use goods and technology subject to export control. The United States and European Union Member States have adopted policies and given guidance to licensing officials to prevent any export of controlled goods when they believe they might be used in programs of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems. In this context, they should take into account, inter alia, evidence of an importer's prior association with such programs.

The European Union has adopted a comprehensive legally-binding Dual-Use Regime of export controls which contains stringent catch-all provisions covering equipment that might be used in or in connection with programs of weapons of mass destruction.

Regions of Proliferation Concern

The United States and the European Union have discussed regions of proliferation concern, including the Middle East and South Asia.

In this context, the United States and the European Union have recently noted their continuing serious concern about efforts by some countries in the Middle East and South Asia to acquire missile technology and their capability to produce weapons of mass destruction. The European Union noted that such concerns should figure into its political contacts with these countries, notably Iran.

The United States and the European Union reaffirmed their support of the work of UNSCOM in ensuring Iraq's implementation of UN Security Council Resolutions on the elimination of its weapons of mass destruction.

United States-European Union Consultations and Information Exchange

The United States and the European Union hold regular consultations on non-proliferation and will strengthen their close ties in this field.

The two sides also recognize that effective implementation of export controls will be greatly enhanced by the timely exchange of any relevant information about programs and activities of concern. To strengthen existing cooperation in this area, the two sides have agreed to:

—Additional information sharing in their regular meetings;

—Give further consideration, including the appropriate involvement of experts, of proposals to establish improved communications and data transmissions relevant to non-proliferation export controls. Due consideration will be given to practical aspects of this concept.

—Enhanced bilateral information exchanges.

Political Action With Suppliers

The United States and European Union countries have engaged key suppliers. Several European leaders and Foreign Ministers have raised their concern directly with their Russian counterparts about Russian technological assistance to Iran's ballistic missile program. These concerns have been reinforced in contacts between the European Union troika and Russian counterparts. The United States and European Union welcome actions taken by Russia to strengthen its export control regime.

The United States is open to a trilateral meeting with European Union and Russia on non-proliferation issues, but believes that careful preparation will be needed for such a meeting to be useful.

Agenda for Further Cooperation

The United States and European Union intend to continue working closely together to advance their common non-proliferation objectives. Some items on the agenda of work in the coming year are:

—Coordination of export control assistance programs to third countries. Exchanges of information about ongoing programs have already occurred.

—Cooperation to improve export control implementation.

—Consultation to ensure that intangible technology transfers do not contribute to proliferation. Ideas in this area have been advanced by both sides.

—Best practice in export control implementation, including discussion of means to strengthen verification of end-use and to prevent diversion through third countries. Controls of non-linked items (catch-all), software and technology.

NOTE: This declaration was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 18 but was not issued as a White House press release. An original was not available for verification of the content of this declaration.

United States/European Union Statement on Caspian Energy

May 18, 1998

The United States and the European Union recognize the importance of Caspian Basin oil and gas resources in contributing to the economic prosperity, energy security, and stability of the region.

These resources will be an important addition to world oil and gas supplies and require secure access routes to world markets.

Essential to this development will be the early availability of multiple pipelines. Major export pipelines from the Caspian will accordingly contribute to the secure delivery of an important new source of world energy supplies.

The European Union's INOGATE program is designed to promote the security of energy supplies. It includes work on: revitalization of the existing transmission network and on new oil and gas pipelines across the Caspian, Black Sea region and westwards to Europe; urgent renovation of hazardous infrastructure; strengthening regional cooperation; compliance with international standards; reform of the region's energy sectors; and protection of foreign investments. The European Union's TRACECA project supports the development of an east-west transport and trade corridor from Central Asia, across the Caspian Sea, the Caucasus, and the Black Sea, to Europe.

The United States strongly endorses commercially and environmentally sound projects to develop Caspian energy resources

and their transport to international markets. U.S. technical assistance and training programs are helping many of the Caspian states improve their legal regimes to encourage private investment in energy development and transport. The United States underscores that the Caspian Pipeline Consortium project is a critical component of a commercially driven multiple pipeline system for the entire region. The United States has provided a grant to Turkmenistan to complete a feasibility study for a trans-Caspian gas pipeline.

Commercial considerations will first and foremost determine decisions on the development of energy projects and export routes. It is the private sector that will make the investments and take the risks. Projects therefore need to be economically viable and competitive. They must also meet the highest environmental standards.

The United States and the European Union welcome the progress made by the littoral states towards formulating a legal regime for the Caspian that will enhance rapid development of the region's energy resources. They express the hope that the littoral states will reach early agreement.

NOTE: This statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 18 but was not issued as a White House press release. An original was not available for verification of the content of this statement.

Transatlantic Partnership on Political Cooperation

May 18, 1998

1. Under the New Transatlantic Agenda, launched in December 1995, the United States and the European Union made a commitment to further strengthen and adapt our partnership to face new challenges at home and abroad. We recognized that our political and economic cooperation is a powerful force for peace, democracy and prosperity. We agreed to move to common action to achieve these ends. We agreed to move to common action to achieve those ends. We have since taken specific steps to strengthen respect for human rights, to promote non-proliferation, to fight terrorism, to address crises in troubled regions and much more. Our experience has shown that, working together, the United States and the European Union are more effective in pursuing shared goals. When differences have emerged between us, however, this has reduced the effectiveness of our response.

2. In order to enhance our partnership, we undertake to intensify our consultations with a view to more effective cooperation in responding to behavior that is inimical to the goals agreed in the New Transatlantic Agenda or which threatens international stability and security, in which we have a shared interest. We have instructed senior officials to undertake early consultations when there is an evident risk of such behavior. To this end, we have agreed to principles that will guide us:

(a) We will seek through exchanging information and analysis and through early consultations to pre-empt, prevent and, as needed, respond to such behavior. Our objective is to achieve compatible and mutually reinforcing policy responses, which are practical, timely and effective.

(b) These responses should be carefully formulated as part of a coherent overall policy approach designed to change unacceptable behavior. They should also be in line with international commitments and responsibilities.

(c) We will make full use of diplomatic and political action to achieve our objectives.

(d) Economic sanctions are another possible response. Their use requires careful consideration. In general, they would be used only when diplomatic and political options have failed or when a problem is so serious as to require more far-reaching action.

(e) In such circumstances, the United States and the European Union will make a maximum effort to ensure that they economic sanctions are multilateral. They are likely to have the strongest political and economic impact when applied as widely as possible throughout the international community. Multilateral actions also distribute the costs of sanctions on the imposing parties more evenly. Whenever possible, effective measures taken by the UN Security Council are the optimal approach.

(f) When multilateral economic sanctions are imposed, our objective will be to exert

the greatest possible pressure on those responsible for the problem, while avoiding unnecessary hardship and minimizing the impact on other countries.

(g) Where wider agreement on economic sanctions cannot be achieved, or in cases of great urgency, the United States and the European Union will consult on appropriate responses. In such circumstances either partner could decide to impose economic sanctions.

(h) To ensure the resilience of our partnership in such circumstances:

—a partner will not seek or propose, and will resist, the passage of new economic sanctions legislation based on foreign policy grounds which is designed to make economic operators of the other behave in manner similar to that required of its own economic operators;

—that partner will target such sanctions directly and specifically against those responsible for the problem; and

—the partner not imposing sanctions will take into account the interest of the other in formulating its own policy and continue to pursue, in its own way, those goals which are shared.

(i) It is in the interest of both partners that policies of governmental bodies at other levels should be consonant with these principles and avoid sending conflicting messages to countries engaged in unacceptable behavior. Both partners will work to achieve this goal.

3. The United States and the European Union will consult closely, including at senior levels, in applying these principles and resolving differences. Each side will also develop the necessary internal procedures to ensure effective implementation of the principles.

Understanding on Conflicting Requirements

The United States and the European Union, recalling the Understanding of April 11, 1997, which stated, inter alia, that they would "work together to address and resolve through agreed principles, the issue of conflicting jurisdictions, including issues affecting investors of another party because of their investments in third countries," wish to confirm in this Understanding their intention to propose jointly in negotiation of the Multilateral Agreement on Investment the following article regarding conflicting requirements:

"1. In contemplating new legislation, action under existing legislation or other exercise of jurisdiction which may conflict with the legal requirements or established policies of another Contracting Party and lead to conflicting requirements being imposed on investors or their investments, the Contracting Parties concerned should:

(a) have regard to relevant principles of international law;

(b) endeavor to avoid or minimize such conflicts and the problems to which they give rise by following an approach of moderation and restraint, respecting and accommodating the interests of other Contracting Parties;

(c) take fully into account the sovereignty and legitimate economic, law enforcement and other interests of other Contracting Parties;

(d) bear in mind the importance of permitting the observance of contractual obligations and the possible adverse impact of measures having a retroactive effect.

2. Contracting Parties should endeavor to promote co-operation as an alternative to unilateral action to avoid or minimize conflicting requirements and problems arising therefrom.

3. Contracting Parties should on request consult one another in accordance with paragraph____of Article____ (Consultations section of Dispute Settlement provision) and endeavor to arrive at mutually acceptable solutions to such problems, it being understood that such consultations would be facilitated by notification at the earliest stage practicable.

4. If consultations under paragraph 3 do not result in a mutually satisfactory resolution of the claim, either of the Contracting Parties may bring the matter to the attention of the Parties Group. Pursuant to Article____(The Parties Group), the Parties Group will consider the matter in light of the agreed principles in paragraph 1, with a view toward resolving the matter.

5. The Parties Group may review, in accordance with Article____(Review), the implementation and assess the effectiveness of this Article."

N.B.: It is understood that nothing in the MAI excludes this provision from MAI dispute settlement.

NOTE: This statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 18 but was not issued as a White House press release. An original was not available for verification of the content of this statement.

Statement on Indictment of Mexican Bankers Involved in Laundering Drug Money

May 18, 1998

I am pleased that the Treasury Department and the United States Customs Service have joined today with the Justice Department to take a significant step to protect our Nation and its children from drugs. The indictments today send a clear message that those who help finance drug operations, who launder drug money, who make it possible for drug dealers to earn their illegal profits, will not escape the long arm of our Nation's law enforcement. We still have much to do, but let no one doubt that we will press this fight relentlessly against the drug cartels and all their partners in crime.

Notice—Continuation of Emergency With Respect to Burma

May 18, 1998

On May 20, 1997, I issued Executive Order 13047, effective at 12:01 a.m. eastern daylight time on May 21, 1997, certifying to the Congress under section 570(b) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104–208), that the Government of Burma has committed large-scale repression of the democratic opposition in Burma after September 30, 1996, thereby invoking the prohibition on new investment in Burma by United States persons, contained in that section. I also declared a national emergency to deal with the threat posed to the national security and foreign policy of the United States by the actions and policies of the Government of Burma, invoking the authority, *inter alia*, of the International emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701–1706).

The national emergency declared on May 20, 1997, must continue beyond May 20, 1998, as long as the Government of Burma continues its policies of committing large-scale repression of the democratic opposition in Burma. Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), I am continuing the national emergency with respect to Burma. This notice shall be published in the *Federal Register* and transmitted to the Congress.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 18, 1998.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 12:05 p.m., May 18, 1998]

NOTE: This notice was published in the *Federal Register* on May 19.

Message to the Congress on Burma

May 18, 1998

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the emergency declared with respect to Burma is to continue in effect beyond May 20, 1998.

As long as the Government of Burma continues its policies of committing large-scale repression of the democratic opposition in Burma, this situation continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force

these emergency authorities beyond May 20, 1998.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 18, 1998.

Message to the Senate Transmitting a Convention Adopted by the International Labor Conference and Documentation

May 18, 1998

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the Convention (No. 111) Concerning Discrimination (Employment and Occupation), adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 42nd Session in Geneva on June 25, 1958. Also transmitted is the report of the Department of State, with a letter dated January 6, 1997, from then Secretary of Labor Robert Reich, concerning the Convention.

This Convention obligates ratifying countries to declare and pursue a national policy aimed at eliminating discrimination with respect to employment and occupation. As explained more fully in the letter from Secretary Reich, U.S. law and practice fully comport with its provisions.

In the interest of clarifying the domestic application of the Convention, my Administration proposes that two understandings accompany U.S. ratification.

The proposed understandings are as follows:

> "The United States understands the meaning and scope of Convention No. 111 in light of the relevant conclusions and practice of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations which have been adopted prior to the date of U.S. ratification. The Committee's conclusions and practice are, in any event, not legally binding on the United States and have no force and effect on courts in the United States.
>
> "The United States understands that the federal nondiscrimination policy of equal pay for substantially equal work meets the requirements of Convention 111. The United States further understands that Convention 111 does not require or establish the doctrine of comparable worth with respect to compensation as that term is understood under United States law and practice."

These understandings would have no effect on our international obligations under Convention No. 111.

Ratification of this Convention would be consistent with our policy of seeking to adhere to additional international labor instruments as a means both of ensuring that our domestic labor standards meet international requirements, and of enhancing our ability to call other governments to account for failing to fulfill their obligations under International Labor Organization (ILO) conventions. I recommend that the Senate give its advice and consent to the ratification of ILO Convention No. 111.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 18, 1998.

Remarks at the World Trade Organization in Geneva, Switzerland

May 18, 1998

Thank you very much, Director General Ruggiero, Federal Councillor Couchepin, your Excellencies, thank you for the opportunity to address you on this most important occasion.

Near the end of World War II, as leaders and ordinary citizens began to dream of a system that would prevent a return to war, President Franklin Roosevelt asked the people of the United States and the world to look ahead to peace with these words: He said, "A basic essential to permanent peace is a decent standard of living for all individual men and women and children in all nations. Freedom from fear is eternally linked with freedom from want."

It was that understanding that led a farsighted generation of postwar leaders, determined to avoid past errors of protectionism and isolationism, to embrace what was then still a revolutionary idea, that freedom—freely elected governments, free markets, the

free flow of ideas, the free movement of people—would be the surest route to the greatest prosperity for the largest number of people.

They were also confident that growing economic interdependence would lead to greater peace among nations. The economic alliances and institutions they created—the IMF, the World Bank, the GATT—built a platform for prosperity and peace that has lasted down to the present day.

In the fullness of time, events have confirmed the convictions of the founders of the international system. World trade has increased fifteenfold; average tariffs have declined by 90 percent; the trading community has grown from 23 nations to 132, with 31 more working to join. Russia and China, where the shackles of state socialism once choked off enterprise, are moving to join the thriving community of free democracies. Trade is creating prosperity among the nations of the Americas and offers hope to the emerging economies of Africa and Asia.

On the edge of a new millennium, our people are creating a new economy, a very different one from that our founders faced 50 years ago. The new one is driven by technology, powered by ingenuity, rewards knowledge and teamwork, flexibility and creativity, and draws us closer across the lines that have divided us for too long.

On any given day, over 3 million people take to the air on commercial flights. Three decades ago phone lines could only accommodate 80 calls at one time between Europe and the United States. Today, they can handle one million calls at one time. In the United States alone, economic output has tripled while the physical weight of goods produced has barely changed. The world's new wealth largely comes from the power of ideas.

This new global economy of ideas offers the possibility but not the guarantee of lifting billions of people into a worldwide middle class and a decent standard of living, the opportunity to give their children a better life. Yet it also contains within it, as we all know, the seeds of new disruptions, new instabilities, new inequalities, new challenges to the balance of work and family, of freedom and security, of equal opportunity and social justice, of economic growth and a sustainable environment.

The challenge of the millennial generation here gathered is, therefore, to create a world trading system, attuned both to the pace and scope of a new global economy and to the enduring values which give direction and meaning to our lives. We took the first vital step when we created the World Trade Organization in 1995, a goal that had alluded our predecessors for nearly half-century. The Uruguay round that founded the WTO amounted to the biggest tax cut in history, $76 billion a year when fully implemented. Since that event, world trade has increased by 25 percent. Since 1995, we also have begun to build an infrastructure for this new economy, with historic agreements on information technology, telecommunications, and financial services, which together affect trillions of dollars in global commerce every year.

At the G–8 summit just concluded in Birmingham, the leaders worked on ideas to strengthen the international financial architecture so that private capital markets can spur rapid growth while minimizing the risk of worldwide economic instability. Now, we must build on these achievements with a new vision of trade to construct a modern WTO for the 21st century. I would like to offer you my suggestions.

First, we must pursue an ever more open global trading system. Today let me state unequivocally that America is committed to open trade among all nations. Economic freedom and open trade have brought unprecedented prosperity in the 20th century; they will widen the circle of opportunity dramatically in the 21st. One-third of the strong economic growth we have enjoyed in America these past 5 years was generated by trade. For every country engaged in trade, open markets dramatically widen the base of possible customers for our goods and services. We must press forward.

Redoubling our efforts to tear down barriers to trade will spur growth in all our countries, creating new businesses, better jobs, higher incomes, and advancing the free flow of ideas, information, and people that are the lifeblood of democracy and prosperity. At the

U.S.-EU summit in London today, we embraced this goal and committed ourselves to reducing barriers and increasing trade in a dozen important areas.

No matter how much some people might wish otherwise, globalization and the technology revolution are not policy choices; they are facts. The choice is whether we shape these forces of a new economy to benefit our people and advance our values or retreat behind walls of protection to be left behind in the race for the future.

At a moment when, for the first time in all human history, a majority of the world's people live under governments of their own choosing; when the argument over which is better, free enterprise or state socialism, has been won; when people on every continent seek to join the free market system, those of us who have benefited most from this system and led it must not turn our backs. For my part, I am determined to pursue an aggressive market open strategy in every region of the world. And I will continue to work with Members of our Congress, in both parties, to secure fast-track negotiation authority.

Second, we must recognize that in this new economy, the way we make trade rules and conduct trade affects the lives, daily—and the livelihoods, and the health, and the safety of ordinary families all over the world. Therefore, our efforts to make the trading system more open must themselves be made more open.

In order to build a trading system for the 21st century that honors our values and expands opportunity, we must do more to ensure that spirited economic competition among nations never becomes a race to the bottom in environmental protections, consumer protections, or labor standards. We should be leveling up, not leveling down. Without such a strategy, we cannot build the necessary public support for continued expansion of trade. Working people will only assume the risks of a free international market if they have the confidence that the system will work for them.

The WTO was created to lift the lives of ordinary citizens. It should listen to them. I propose the WTO for the first time, provide a consultative forum where business, and labor, and environmental, and consumer groups can provide regular and continuous input to help guide further evolution of the WTO. The U.S. and the EU agreed today to provide such a forum as part of our new trade agenda. It is far more important for the WTO to follow suit. When this body convenes again, the world's trade ministers should sit down with representatives of the broader public to begin to do this.

Third, we must actually do more to harmonize our goals of increasing trade and improving the environment and working conditions. Expanded trade can and should enhance the environment. Indeed, the WTO agreement, in its preamble, explicitly adopts sustainable development as an objective of open trade, including a commitment to preserve the environment and to increase the capacity of nations to do so. Therefore, international trade rules must permit sovereign nations to exercise their rights to set protective standards for health and safety, the environment, and biodiversity. Nations have a right to pursue those protections, even when they are stronger than international norms.

I am asking that a high-level meeting be convened to bring together trade and environmental ministers to provide strong direction and new energy to the WTO's environmental efforts in the years to come, a suggestion that has already been made by Sir Leon Brittan of the European Commission.

Likewise, the WTO and the International Labor Organization should commit to work together to make certain that open trade does lift living standards and respects the core labor standards that are essential not only to worker rights but to human rights. I ask the two organizations' Secretariats to convene at a high level to discuss these issues.

This weekend, the G–8 leaders voiced support for the ILO's adoption of a new declaration and a meaningful followup mechanism on core labor standards when the ILO ministers meet next month here in Geneva. I hope you will add your support. We must work hard to ensure that the ILO is a vibrant institution. Today, I transmitted to our Senate for ratification the ILO convention aimed at eliminating discrimination in the workplace.

Because this new economy is based on ideas, information, and technology, the return on investment in education has never been higher. And the adverse consequences of being without skills has never been greater. These trends cannot be reversed. Our goal, therefore, must be to help more people benefit from the possibilities of the new economy, even as we ensure that the forces of technology and new trade patterns do not aggravate inequality or reinforce poor labor conditions.

Here I must add—even as we do more to harmonize our goals of more trade and higher incomes for ordinary people, each nation must do more to provide universal access to quality education and training. Without that, no trade rules, however wisely conceived or effected, can guarantee individual success to the people we are really trying to reach.

Fourth, we must modernize the WTO by opening its doors to the scrutiny and participation of the public. Through long trial and error, we have learned that governments work best when their operations are open to those affected by their actions. As American Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis said a long time ago, ''Sunshine is the best of disinfectants.''

The WTO should take every feasible step to bring openness and accountability to its operations. Today, when one nation challenges the practices of another, the proceeding takes place behind closed doors. I propose that all hearings by the WTO be open to the public and all briefs by the parties be made publicly available. To achieve this, of course, would require a change in the rules of this organization. But each of us could do our part now. The United States today formally offers to open up every panel we are a party to, and I challenge every other nation to join us in making this happen.

Today, there is no mechanism for private citizens to provide input in these trade disputes. I propose further that the WTO provide the opportunity for stakeholders to convey their views, such as the ability to file amicus briefs to help inform the panels in their deliberations. Today, the public must wait weeks to read the reports of these panels. I propose that the decisions of the trade panels be made available to the public as soon as they are issued.

Fifth, we must have a trading system that taps the full potential of the information age. This revolution in information technology is the greatest force for prosperity in our lifetimes. The Internet is the fastest growing social and economic community in history, a phenomenon with unimagined revolutionary potential to empower billions around the world. It has been called the ''death of distance,'' making it possible for people to work together across oceans as if they were working together across the hall.

When I became President, there were only 50 sites on the World Wide Web. Four years ago there were still less than 3 million people with access to the Internet. Today there are over 100 million people, with the number doubling every year.

Today, there are no customs duties on telephone calls, fax messages, E-mail, or computer data links when they cross borders. We have spent 50 years tearing down barriers to trade in goods and services. Let us agree that when it comes to electronic commerce, we will not erect these barriers in the first place. I ask the nations of the world to join the United States in a standstill on any tariffs on electronic transmissions sent across national borders. We cannot allow discriminatory barriers to stunt the development of the most promising new economic opportunity in decades.

Earlier today at the summit of the EU, we agreed to deepen our collaboration in this area. And last week, the Japanese Prime Minister, Mr. Hashimoto, and I, agreed to move forward together with a market-oriented, private-sector-led approach to enhance privacy, protect intellectual property, and encourage the free flow of information and commerce on the Internet. I hope we can build a consensus that this is the best way to harness the remarkable potential of this new means of communication and commerce.

Sixth, a trading system for the 21st century must be comprised of governments that are open, honest, and fair in their practices. In an era of global financial markets, prosperity depends upon government practices that are based upon the rule of law rather than bureaucratic caprice, cronyism, or corruption.

Investors demand it. And their loss of confidence can have sudden, swift, and severe consequences, with ripples throughout entire regional economies.

With its insistence on rules that are fair and open, the WTO plays a powerful role toward open and accountable government. But the WTO must do more. When we meet next year, all members of the WTO should agree that government purchases should be made through open and fair bidding. This single reform can open up $3 trillion worth of business to open competition around the world. And I ask every nation to adopt the antibribery convention developed by the OECD. Both these steps would promote both investor confidence and stability.

Finally, we must develop an open global trading system that moves as fast as the global marketplace. In an era in which new products' lifecycles are measured in months and information and money move around the globe in seconds, we simply can no longer afford to take 7 years to finish a trade round, as happened during the Uruguay Round, or to let decades pass between identifying and acting on a trade barrier we all know ought to fall.

In the meantime, new industries arise, new trading blocs take shape, and governments invent new trade barriers every day. We should explore what new type of trade negotiating round or process is best suited to the new economy. There must be a way to tear down barriers without waiting for every issue in every sector to be resolved before any issue in any sector is resolved. There must be a way to do this that is fair and balanced to nations large and small, rich and poor. Surely we can negotiate trade agreements in a way that is faster and better than the way we have followed to date.

For example, agriculture, which I understand has been discussed quite a bit here, is at the heart of our economy and many of yours. Tearing down barriers to global trade is, I believe, critical to meeting the food needs of a growing world population. Starting next year, we should aggressively begin negotiations to reduce tariffs and subsidies and other distortions that restrict productivity and the best allocation of food. We must develop rules rooted in science to encourage the full fruits of biotechnology. And I propose that even before negotiations near conclusions, WTO members should pledge to continue making annual tariff and subsidy reductions so that there is no pause in reform.

We have to recognize that the fastest growing area of economic activity in the world is services, the one least disciplined by WTO rules. So when services negotiations are launched, I think it is essential to engage in wide-ranging discussions to ensure openness for dynamic service sectors, such as express delivery, environmental, energy, audiovisual, and professional services.

We have to continue our strong momentum to dismantle industrial tariffs. A good place to start would be an agreement on the sectors from chemicals to environmental technology proposed by APEC. And we must move forward in strengthening intellectual property protection.

These are my proposals for a 21st century trading system: one that is more open and accountable; one that listens to the voices of citizens; that works to protect the environment and lift the lives and incomes of ordinary people; one that is in sync with the information age; that promotes honest, effective government; and that makes better, faster decisions. In short, a trading system based on the new economy and old, enduring values. To move forward, I am inviting the trade ministers of the world to hold their next meeting in 1999 in the United States.

I ask you to think about the opportunity that has been presented to all of us: the chance to create a new international economy in which open markets and open economies spark undreamed of innovation and prosperity; in which the skills of ordinary citizens power the prosperity of entire nations; in which the global economy honors those same values that guide families in raising their children and nations in developing good citizens; in which poor people, at last, find opportunity, dignity, and a decent life; in which increasing interdependence among nations enhances peace and security for all.

This will be the world of the 21st century if we have the wisdom and determination, the courage, and the clarity of our forebears 50 years ago.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:48 p.m. at les Palais des Nations in a ceremony commemorating the 50th anniversary of the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade. In his remarks, he referred to Renato Ruggiero, director general, World Trade Organization; Pascal Couchepin, Federal Councillor and Head of the Federal Department of Public Economy of Switzerland; and Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto of Japan.

Remarks Urging Congressional Action on Tobacco Legislation

May 20, 1998

Thank you very much. Thank you very much. First of all, I'd like to thank Tara and Emily. There's really nothing much more to say after their presentations. They weren't so muted and shy; I think we all got the point. Didn't you think they were terrific? Give them another hand. I thought they were great. [*Applause*] Thank you.

I'd like to thank all the Members of Congress who are here. I think they were all mentioned except we missed Congressman Borski who is in the first seat. No minister would do that in a congregation. [*Laughter*] Thank you for being here, all of you. Thank you, Reverend Jackson. I thank the public health advocates who are here. I thank the young people who are here, both behind me and a few out there in the audience. I thank the parents of our speakers who came and other parents who are here for what they have done.

I can't thank the Vice President enough for his longstanding and absolutely passionate, indeed all-consuming, interest in this issue. I think it would be fair to say—he talked about how we looked at the issue and all the obstacles to it, and I went ahead. The people that had the most influence on me were the Vice President, the First Lady, and our daughter. And that was three—if there were 300 million on the other side, the three would have a majority. So I thank them all, and especially the Vice President for years and years and years of dedicated work on this issue.

This morning I was thinking that when I was the age of—even younger than most of the people here in the audience, most of the children here, the biggest public health threat to us was polio. America went to work and conquered the disease, and I was actually part of the first group of children to be immunized against polio.

Today, we all know our greatest public health threat to our children, and indeed to all Americans, are all the related things that can happen to people who are addicted to tobacco. I was a little older than most of the children here when the Surgeon General sounded an alarm that has grown louder, clearer, and more difficult to ignore every year, the warning that smoking kills.

For a generation, Americans of all ages and walks of life, including young people just like those whom we honor here today, have answered that alarm by fighting tirelessly to conquer this deadly threat to protect the health of our people. In the face of very powerful opposition, our Nation has actually won some victories, both large and small, requiring all cigarette packages to carry warning labels, prohibiting cigarette advertising on the airwaves, banning smoking on domestic airline flights. But today, we stand on the verge of passing legislation that will do far more than anything we have ever done to stop the scourge of youth smoking.

This week, as all of you know, the Senate is considering historic, comprehensive, bipartisan legislation, proposed by Senator McCain and Senator Hollings. Over the last few weeks, we have worked very hard with Senators in both parties to strengthen this bill, protecting Americans from the dangers of secondhand smoke in public buildings, dramatically increasing health research, and funding a nationwide advertising campaign to tell young people not to smoke, toughening look-back surcharges to make reducing youth smoking the tobacco companies' bottom line.

This bill includes a significant price increase to discourage youth smoking and affirms the FDA's authority to regulate tobacco products. I hope that in the next few days, the Senate will make sure we do everything we possibly can, also, to protect tobacco farmers in their communities.

This bill is our best chance to protect the health of our children, to keep them from getting hooked on cigarettes ever. It is a good, a strong bill. Congress should pass it

and pass it now. Let me also say that I believe the presence of the young people here and their active support of the Tobacco-Free Kids movement is absolutely critical. There are still cynics who say, ''Well, this is not the kind of problem that requires this sort of solution. After all, nobody forces these people to start smoking.'' The young people here wearing their T-shirts, willing to look into the eyes of the lawmakers, are a stunning rebuke to that kind of cynicism. I thank them for saying no to tobacco and yes to their own bright futures.

And I want to tell you that you may well be able to have a bigger impact on Capitol Hill than all the things that we say here in the White House on the remaining undecided voters. Our lawmakers must not let this historic opportunity slip away under pressure from big tobacco lobbying. I want you to go and see them. I know you're going to Capitol Hill. When you're up there, I want you to ask every Member of Congress to go home tonight and think about how they can look you in the eye and say no to your future.

We now know from the release of previously classified documents that for years the tobacco companies looked on you as, and I quote, ''the replacement smokers'' of the 21st century. But here we have more than 1,000 unique children who cannot be replaced, the scientists, the artists, the teachers, the Olympic champions, the engineers, the leaders, perhaps a future President in the 21st century. The rest of us have an obligation to see that these children and all their counterparts in every community in our country have a chance to grow and live to the fullest of their God-given abilities.

That is what this bill is all about. This is more than just another bill in the legislature. This is more than a culmination of a historic fight between powerful political forces. We have no higher obligation than to give the young people we see here today the brightest, best future we possible can. That's what this bill is about, and we must pass it.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:25 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Tara Lipinski, Olympic figure skating gold medalist; Emily Broxterman, 1997 midwest regional winner, Youth Advocate of the Year Award; and civil rights leader Rev. Jesse Jackson.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Proposed Tobacco Legislation

May 20, 1998

Dear Mr. Leader:

I applaud the Senate for taking up comprehensive, bipartisan legislation to dramatically reduce teen smoking. Every day, 3000 teenagers start smoking regularly, and 1000 will die prematurely of smoking-related diseases as a result. I urge the Senate to move swiftly to pass comprehensive legislation that could save those children's lives.

Last September, and in my budget plan, I set forth five principles for comprehensive tobacco legislation:

- Raising the price of cigarettes by $1.10 a pack over 5 years with additional surcharges on companies that continue to sell to kids;
- Affirming the FDA's full authority to regulate tobacco products;
- Getting companies out of the business of marketing and selling tobacco to minors;
- Promoting public health research and public health goals; and
- Protecting our tobacco farmers and their communities.

I have made protecting tobacco farmers and farming communities a top priority for this legislation, and I believe Senator Ford's LEAF Act fully meets this standard. I am deeply troubled by the Senate Leadership's recent attempt to undermine protection for tobacco farmers and their communities. I urge the Senate to work through this impasse and ensure that small, family farmers are protected.

If that issue can be resolved to my satisfaction, the bill before the Senate, as amended by Senator McCain's Manager's Amendment, is a good, strong bill that will make a real dent in teen smoking. Congress should pass it without delay.

I applaud Senator McCain and others in both parties who have worked hard to strengthen this legislation. I am particularly

pleased that the bill contains significant improvements which will help reduce youth smoking and protect the public health:

- Tough industry-wide and company-specific lookback surcharges that will finally make reducing youth smoking the tobacco companies' bottom line;
- Protection for all Americans from the health hazards of secondhand smoke;
- No antitrust exemption for the tobacco industry;
- Strong licensing and anti-smuggling provisions to prevent the emergence of contraband markets and to prosecute violators;
- A dedicated fund to provide for a substantial increase in health research funding, a demonstration to test promising new cancer treatments, a nationwide counteradvertising campaign to reduce youth smoking, effective state and local programs in tobacco education, prevention, and cessation, law enforcement efforts to prevent smuggling and crackdown on retailers who sell tobacco products to children, assistance for tobacco farmers and their communities, and funds for the states to make additional efforts to promote public health and protect children; and
- The elimination of immunity for parent companies of tobacco manufacturers, an increase in the cap on legal damages to $8 billion per year, and changes to ensure that the cap will be available only to tobacco companies that change the way they do business, by agreeing to accept sweeping restrictions on advertising, continue making annual payments and lookback surcharges even if those provisions are struck down, make substantial progress toward meeting the youth smoking reduction targets, prevent their top management from taking part in any scheme to promote smuggling, and abide by the terms of the legislation rather than challenging it in court. Because the First Amendment limits what we can do to stop the tobacco companies' harmful advertising practices—which lure so many young people to start smoking—we can do far more to achieve our goal of reducing youth smoking if the companies cooperate instead of tying us up in court for decades. If a cap that doesn't prevent anybody from suing the companies and getting whatever damages a jury awards will get tobacco companies to stop marketing cigarettes to kids, it is well worth it for the American people. I, therefore, oppose the Gregg Amendment to strike the liability cap.

I strongly support these improvements, and I urge the Senate to pass this legislation without delay.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Trent Lott, Senate majority leader, and Thomas A. Daschle, Senate minority leader. An original was not available for verification of the content of this letter.

Radio Remarks on Cuban Independence Day

May 20, 1998

I want to say hello to all listeners of Radio Marti. On behalf of the people of the United States, I offer you warmest wishes on this Cuban Independence Day.

The United States is determined to help Cuba achieve a peaceful transition to democracy. And as part of our effort, I announced in March that the U.S. would permit direct humanitarian flights, transfers of money from families in the United States to relatives in Cuba, and streamline procedures for the sale of medicines to your country.

These steps are aimed at building on Pope John Paul's historic visit to Cuba, increasing humanitarian relief and supporting the role of the church and other elements of civil society. We're committed to helping Cuba's courageous democracy and human rights advocates as they work for a brighter future. We continue to be concerned about those who languish in Cuban jails. We urge the Cuban Government to release all political prisoners and reintegrate them into Cuban society.

Cubans will never be free until Cubans are free to speak out and organize for fundamental change. We send you a message of hope; we must work together to promote freedom

in the only country in our hemisphere which does not yet enjoy it. I believe the Cuban people want democracy and that they will relish it and prosper in every realm—political, economic, and cultural—once they are free.

Before I sign off, let me congratulate the Office of Cuba Broadcasting, home to Radio and TV Marti, as it begins broadcasting from its new headquarters in Miami today. Here, closer to their listeners, Radio and TV Marti will continue to bring information, hope, and encouragement to the people of Cuba.

My best wishes to all of you, and thank you for listening.

NOTE: The President's remarks were taped at approximately 11:30 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House for later broadcast and were embargoed by the Office of the Press Secretary until 1:30 p.m. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on the Washington Conference on Humanitarian Demining

May 20, 1998

It gives me great pleasure to welcome you to the Washington Conference on Global Humanitarian Demining.

This Conference fulfills a commitment I made last October when Secretary Albright and Secretary Cohen announced the "Demining 2010 Initiative." We set as our goal the elimination, by the end of the next decade, of the threat posed by landmines to civilians. Landmine contamination is not only a pressing humanitarian problem, but it affects virtually every aspect of life in countries recovering from civil war or armed conflict.

We long ago realized that reaching this goal would require a concerted effort by the international community, and we have been heartened by the response—your response—so far. Each of the countries and organizations represented at this conference plays a critical role in this effort, and your presence here is testimony to the importance the international community attaches to this enormous task.

Almost 4 years ago I called for the global elimination of landmines. Since then, the U.S. has been at the forefront of the efforts to rid the world of these hidden killers. Not only have we destroyed millions of landmines in our own arsenal and banned their export, but we have also provided a substantial share of the global resources for humanitarian demining.

The Washington conference is an opportunity for us to set a course for the future together and move toward a goal we all share: to eliminate as quickly as possible the scourge of antipersonnel landmines that kill and main civilians. This conference builds on the efforts of many other countries and individuals, including, of course, the remarkable accomplishment of the Ottawa process, making this a truly global endeavor.

We have come a long way, but much remains to be done. It is my hope that the Washington conference will inspire a new commitment on the part of all present to ensure an increase in the level and effectiveness of effort and resources the world dedicates to the challenge of humanitarian demining.

Statement on the Resignation of President Soeharto of Indonesia

May 20, 1998

We welcome President Soeharto's decision, which provides an opportunity to begin a process leading to a real democratic transition in Indonesia—an opportunity for the Indonesian people to come together and build a stable democracy for the future. We urge Indonesia's leaders to move forward promptly with a peaceful process that enjoys broad public support. The United States stands ready to support Indonesia as it engages in democratic reform.

Statement on the Conclusion of the World Trade Organization Meeting

May 20, 1998

I am pleased and proud that the members of the World Trade Organization ("WTO") have accepted my invitation to hold the 1999 WTO Ministerial meeting in the United States. This meeting will enable us to advance the ambitious agenda I laid out earlier this week to shape the world trading system to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Next year's meeting will bring home for Americans the important stake that we all have in the global economy. And I welcome the decision by the WTO to ask United States Trade Representative Charlene Barshefsky to chair that meeting.

In Geneva, we made important advances on our proposal to free the potential of electronic commerce. I am particularly pleased that the WTO members joined the United States in a standstill on any tariffs on electronic transmissions sent across national borders. We cannot allow discriminatory barriers to stunt the development of the most promising new economic opportunity in decades. This worldwide proposal builds on far-reaching agreements we reached within the last week with the European Union and Japan.

As we build a trading system for the 21st century that honors our values and expands opportunity, we must do more to ensure that spirited economic competition among nations never becomes a race to the bottom—in environmental protections, consumer protections, or labor standards. Without such a strategy, we cannot build the necessary public support for continued expansion of trade. I will work to ensure that the WTO and other international institutions are more responsive to labor, the environment, consumers, and other interests so that we can build the public confidence we need in our trade expansion initiatives.

I want to thank Ambassador Barshefsky, Secretary Glickman, Ambassador Rita Hayes, our Ambassador to the WTO, and all the representatives of the U.S. business community and other participants in the Ministerial who worked to make this meeting a success.

Message to the Senate Returning Without Approval the "District of Columbia Student Opportunity Scholarship Act of 1998"

May 20, 1998

To the Senate of the United States:

I am returning herewith without my approval S. 1502, the "District of Columbia Student Opportunity Scholarship Act of 1998."

If we are to prepare our children for the 21st Century by providing them with the best education in the world, we must strengthen our public schools, not abandon them. My agenda for accomplishing this includes raising academic standards; strengthening accountability; providing more public school choice, including public charter schools; and providing additional help to students who need it through tutors, mentors, and after-school programs. My education agenda also calls for reducing class size, modernizing our schools and linking them to the Internet, making our schools safe by removing guns and drugs, and instilling greater discipline.

This bill would create a program of federally funded vouchers that would divert critical Federal resources to private schools instead of investing in fundamental improvements in public schools. The voucher program established by S. 1502 would pay for a few selected students to attend private schools, with little or no public accountability for how those funds are used, and would draw resources and attention away from the essential work of reforming the public schools that serve the overwhelming majority of the District's students. In short, S. 1502 would do nothing to improve public education in the District of Columbia. The bill won't hire one new teacher, purchase one more computer, or open one after-school program.

Although I appreciate the interest of the Congress in the educational needs of the children in our Nation's Capital, this bill is fundamentally misguided and a disservice to those children.

The way to improve education for all our children is to increase standards, accountability, and choice within the public schools. I urge the Congress to send me legislation I have proposed to reduce class size, modernize our schools, end social promotions, raise academic standards for all students, and hold school systems, schools, and staff accountable for results.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 20, 1998.

Radio Remarks on the Northern Ireland Peace Accord Referendum

May 20, 1998

Tomorrow the people of Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland have an opportunity to join hope to history. I know that as you go to the polls and consider the merits of the April 10 accord, you will reflect on the past three decades, so marred by hatred and bloodshed, fighting and fear. I hope you will also reflect on the decades to come and the opportunity you now have in your hands to build a lasting peace for yourselves and your children. This Friday, you can turn the common tragedy of Northern Ireland's past into a shared triumph for the future.

As you face the future, you can count on America. We were blessed with the arrival of your ancestors and relatives who helped to build our Nation. We want to return the favor with trade and investment, with friendship and partnership. But to those of any party or persuasion who would revert to violence, you must know that you will find no friends in America.

To everyone voting tomorrow let me say, you can do nothing to erase the past, but you can do everything to build the future. The world is with you, but the choice is yours. May you make the right choice—for peace, for your children, for your future. And may God bless you all.

NOTE: The President's remarks were taped at approximately 11:35 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House on May 20 for later broadcast. These remarks were released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 21. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on Senate Ratification of the Protocols for Enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

May 21, 1998

Thank you very much. I suppose I should begin with an apology for having to dash off and pick up the paper, but I would hate to lose this document after all the effort we put into getting to this point. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Vice President, thank you for your leadership on this issue. Senator Roth, Senator Biden, Secretary Albright, Secretary Cohen, General Ralston, Mr. Berger, to the ambassadors of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and the other members of the diplomatic corps who are here, to Senators Levin and Lieberman and Lugar, Mikulski, and Smith, I thank all of you so much.

Ladies and gentlemen, before we begin I would like to make a couple of brief comments. First of all, let me say I know that all Americans are heartbroken by the terrible shooting at the school in Springfield, Oregon, today. And I would just like to say on behalf of the American people that our thoughts and prayers are with the families of the people who were killed and wounded and with that entire fine community.

Next let me say that I welcome the wise decision made less than 24 hours ago by President Soeharto in Indonesia. It now gives the Indonesian people a chance to come together to build a stable democracy for the 21st century. I hope that the leaders will now move forward promptly, with an open and peaceful transition that enjoys broad public support. Indonesia is a very great nation, populous, wide ranging, diverse, with remarkable accomplishments to its credit in the last few decades. It has a great future. The United States stands ready to work, as we have with other nations in the past, to support Indonesia's leaders and people as they pursue democratic reform.

Finally, by way of introduction, let me say, since we're here to talk about Europe today, I'd like to put in one last plug for the vote in Ireland and Northern Ireland tomorrow. And I suspect all of you agree with me. And I hope that those fine people will lift the burden of the last 30 years from their shoulders and embrace a common future in peace.

Let me say notwithstanding my good friend Senator Biden's overly generous remarks, we are here today because of the efforts of a lot of people who supported this effort: Members of Congress and former Members of Congress, present and former national security officials, present and former military leaders, representatives of our veterans, business unions, religious groups, ethnic communities. I especially thank Senators Lott and Daschle, Senators Helms and

Biden, and you, Senator Roth, the chairman of our NATO observer group.

You behaved in the great tradition of Truman and Marshall and Vandenberg, uniting our country across party for common values, common interests, and a common future.

It's really amazing, isn't it, that Bill Roth and Joe Biden come from Delaware. I want you to know there is no truth to the rumor that I agreed to move the NATO headquarters to Wilmington in return for this vote. [*Laughter*] However, it does say a lot for those small States that these two remarkable men have made such an indispensable contribution to this effort. I thank the other Senators who are here for their passionate commitments.

I'd also like to mention one other person, my adviser on NATO enlargement who managed the ratification process for the White House, Jeremy Rosner. Thank you, Jeremy. You did a great job, too, and we thank you.

I see so many people here that—and I don't want to get into calling names, but I thank Mr. Brzezinski, Ambassador Kirkpatrick, General Joulwan and so many others who are here who have been a part of America's effort over the last 50 years to make sure that after World War II freedom triumphs.

We learned at great cost in this century that if we wanted America to be secure at home we had to stand up for our interests, our ideals, and our friends around the world. Because of the alliances we've built and the work that our people have been able to do here, we near the end of this great century at a remarkable pinnacle of peace, with prosperity and declining social problems at home, and for the very first time ever a majority of the world's people living under governments of their own choosing.

Since World War II, no alliance for freedom has been more important or enduring than NATO. And as we look ahead to the next 50 years, we have to imagine what the world will be like and what it is we expect to do and, in particular, in this case, what about NATO. Today we welcome Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic, finally erasing the boundary line the cold war artificially imposed on the continent of Europe, strengthening an alliance that now, clearly, is better preserved to keep the peace and preserve our security into the 21st century.

For the 16 of us already in NATO, enlarging our alliance will create three new allies ready to contribute troops and technology and ingenuity to protecting our territory, defending our security, and pursuing our vital interest. The 60 million people who live in Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic, they now know that what they build in peace they will be able to keep in security. And America now knows that we have new allies to help us meet the new security challenges of the 21st century, something that our partnership in Bosnia so clearly demonstrates.

I would say also to the nations who have joined with us in the Partnership For Peace, and others who have considered doing so, and those who hope still someday to become NATO members, we are in the process of adapting this organization to the security challenges of the 21st century, and those who are with us in the Partnership For Peace, those who have been part of our endeavor in Bosnia, we appreciate you as well. We respect your aspirations for security; we share your devotion to your freedom; and we hope this is a day which you can celebrate as well.

We come to this day, thanks to many acts of courage: courage that toppled the Berlin Wall, ended the cold war; sacrifice by those who raised freedom's banner in Budapest in 1956, in Prague in 1968, in Gdansk in 1980; people like Lech Walesa, Vaclav Havel, Arpad Goncz, so many others. The selfless investment of blood and treasure the American people made in European freedom in the 20th century is also something we ought to stop and remember here today. There are so many people whose families gave so much in two World Wars and the cold war who should feel a personal sense of satisfaction and triumph because of this day. And I hope they do.

As we look ahead to the 21st century, again I say, we have to see what we're doing in NATO in the larger context of preparing for a different era. Our goal is to help to build a Europe that is undivided, free, democratic, at peace, and secure, a Europe in which Russia, Ukraine, and other States of the Former Soviet Union join with us to make common

cause; a dynamic new Europe with partnership for commerce and cooperation. Therefore, we have supported the expansion of NATO and the Partnership For Peace. We have also supported all efforts at European integration and the expansion of European institutions to welcome new democracies. And we will continue to do so.

We want to imagine a future in which our children will be much less likely to cross the Atlantic to fight and die in a war, but much more likely to find partners in security, in cultural and commercial and educational endeavors. The expansion of NATO and the Partnership For Peace make the positive outcome much more probable.

This is a day for celebration but also a day for looking ahead. Our work to adapt all our institutions to the challenges of the new century is far from done. On Monday I had the opportunity to go to Geneva to lay out a seven-point plan for the changes I believe the world trading system must embrace in order to fully and faithfully serve free people in the 21st century.

And just very briefly before I close, let me mention the things that I believe we still have to do with NATO. We have to build closer ties with the Partnership For Peace members. We have to reinforce the practical cooperation between NATO and Russia, and NATO and Ukraine. We have to see through our efforts to secure a lasting peace in the Balkans, and we cannot walk away until the job is done. We must achieve deeper reductions in our nuclear forces and lower the limits on conventional arms across the European continent.

Yes, we have more work to do, but for today, we remind the people of Europe that in the efforts that lie ahead, they can continue to count on the United States. And we remind the world that tomorrow, as yesterday, America will defend its values, protect its interests, and stand by its friends. So that years from now another generation may gather in this place and bask in the warm glow of liberty's light, because in our time we fulfilled America's eternal mission: to deepen the meaning of freedom, to widen the circle of opportunity, to strengthen the bonds of our union among ourselves and with others who believe in the primary importance of liberty and human dignity.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:35 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski; former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, and Gen. George A. Joulwan, USA (Ret.), former Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

Message to the Senate on Ratification of the Protocols for Enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

May 21, 1998

To the Senate of the United States:

I am gratified that the United States Senate has given its advice and consent to the ratification of the Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic.

The Senate's decisive vote was a milestone on the road to an undivided, democratic and peaceful Europe. The message this vote sends is clear: American support for NATO is firm, our leadership on both sides of the Atlantic is strong, and there is a solid bipartisan foundation for an active U.S. role in transatlantic security.

I thank Majority Leader Lott, Minority Leader Daschle, Senators Helms and Biden, Senator Roth and the members of the NATO Observer Group, and the many others who have devoted so much time and energy to this historic effort. The continuous dialogue and consultation between the Administration and the Congress on this issue was a model of bipartisan partnership. I am committed to ensuring that this partnership continues and deepens as we proceed toward NATO's 50th anniversary summit next year in Washington.

The resolution of ratification that the Senate has adopted contains provisions addressing a broad range of issues of interest and concern, and I will implement the conditions it contains. As I have indicated following approval of earlier treaties, I will of course do so without prejudice to my authorities as President under the Constitution, including my authorities with respect to the conduct of foreign policy. I note in this connection

that conditions in a resolution of advice and consent cannot alter the allocations of authority and responsibility under the Constitution.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 21, 1998.

Proclamation 7098—National Maritime Day, 1998

May 21, 1998

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

The United States is and has always been a maritime Nation. Our history is tied to the sea—from the *Santa Maria* to the *Mayflower*, from clipper ships to ocean liners, from the Liberty Ships of World War II to the huge, efficient containerships of the 1990s—and our development as a Nation has paralleled the growth of our waterborne commerce.

As we look forward to the challenges of the 21st century, we continue to rely on our Nation's maritime industry and the U.S. Merchant Marine to keep America competitive in an increasingly global economy. Ships and barges carry more than one billion tons of commercial cargo annually between ports within our Nation. Internationally, more than 95 percent of our imports and exports by weight are transported on water—a total of more than one billion metric tons of cargo each year.

We also depend on America's maritime industry and Merchant Marine to fill a crucial role in protecting our national interests and the security of our allies. Throughout our history, in times of conflict or crisis, the owners, operators, and crews of U.S.-flag commercial vessels have provided vital sealift capability in support of our Armed Forces, advancing defense, peacekeeping, and humanitarian missions across the globe.

Our maritime industry has made many important contributions to the economic strength and defense capability of our Nation, and my Administration has worked with the Congress to implement new approaches to ensure the industry's continued viability. Our National Shipbuilding Initiatives are helping to improve the competitiveness of America's maritime industry by seeking to eliminate foreign subsidies, assisting the industry's international marketing efforts, eliminating unnecessary government regulations, and enhancing private sector financing of shipbuilding through Federal loan guarantees. Under the Maritime Security Program, the Federal Government contracts with owners and operators of U.S.-flag vessels to supplement our military sealift capability and gains access to a fleet of modern commercial ships and the sophisticated intermodal transportation system that supports it. Together, these programs protect our Nation's economic interests and our national security by ensuring that U.S.-flag vessels will always sail in the sea lanes of the world.

In recognition of the importance of the U.S. Merchant Marine, the Congress, by a joint resolution approved May 20, 1933, has designated May 22 as "National Maritime Day" and has authorized and requested the President to issue annually a proclamation calling for its appropriate observance.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim May 22, 1998, as National Maritime Day. I urge all Americans to observe this day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities and by displaying the flag of the United States at their homes and in their communities. I also request that all ships sailing under the American flag dress ship on that day.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-first day of May, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-eight, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-second.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:37 a.m., May 22, 1998]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on May 26.

Message to the Congress Certifying Cooperation of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to Conditions of Membership to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

May 21, 1998

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the resolution of advice and consent to the ratification of the Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, adopted by the Senate of the United States on April 30, 1998, I hereby certify to the Congress that, in connection with Condition (5), each of the governments of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic are fully cooperating with United States efforts to obtain the fullest possible accounting of captured and missing U.S. personnel from past military conflicts or Cold War incidents, to include (A) facilitating full access to relevant archival material, and (B) identifying individuals who may possess knowledge relative to captured and missing U.S. personnel, and encouraging such individuals to speak with United States Government officials.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 21, 1998.

Message to the Congress Certifying Cooperation of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to Conditions of Membership to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

May 21, 1998

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the resolution of advice and consent to the ratification of the Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, adopted by the Senate of the United States on April 30, 1998, I hereby certify to the Senate that:

> In connection with Condition (2), (i) the inclusion of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic in NATO will not have the effect of increasing the overall percentage share of the United States in the common budgets of NATO; (ii) the United States is under no commitment to subsidize the national expenses necessary for Poland, Hungary, or the Czech Republic to meet its NATO commitments; and (iii) the inclusion of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic in NATO does not detract from the ability of the United States to meet or to fund its military requirements outside the North Atlantic area; and
>
> In connection with Condition (3), (A) the NATO-Russia Founding Act and the Permanent Joint Council do not provide the Russian Federation with a veto over NATO policy; (B) the NATO-Russia Founding Act and the Permanent Joint Council do not provide the Russian Federation any role in the North Atlantic Council or NATO decision-making including (i) any decision NATO makes on an internal matter; or (ii) the manner in which NATO organizes itself, conducts its business, or plans, prepares for, or conducts any mission that affects one or more of its members, such as collective defense, as stated under Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty; and (C) in discussions in the Permanent Joint Council (i) the Permanent Joint Council will not be a forum in which NATO's basic strategy, doctrine, or readiness is negotiated with the Russian Federation, and NATO will not use the Permanent Joint Council as a substitute for formal arms control negotiations such as the adaptation of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, done at Paris on November 19, 1990; (ii) any discussion with the Russian Federation of NATO doctrine will be for explanatory, not decision-making purposes; (iii) any explanation described in the preceding clause will not extend to a level of detail that could in any way compromise the effectiveness of NATO's military forces, and any such explanation will be offered only after NATO has first set its policies on issues affecting internal matters; (iv) NATO will not discuss any agenda item with the Russian Federation prior to agreeing to a NATO position within the North Atlantic Council on that agenda

item; and (v) the Permanent Joint Council will not be used to make any decision on NATO doctrine, strategy, or readiness.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 21, 1998.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Protocol to the Mexico-United States Extradition Treaty With Documentation

May 21, 1998

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Protocol to the Extradition Treaty Between the United States of America and the United Mexican States of May 4, 1978, signed at Washington on November 13, 1997.

In addition, I transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Protocol. As the report explains, the Protocol will not require implementing legislation.

This Protocol will, upon entry into force, enhance cooperation between the law enforcement communities of both countries. The Protocol incorporates into the 1978 Extradition Treaty with Mexico a provision on temporary surrender of persons that is a standard provision in more recent U.S. bilateral extradition treaties.

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

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 21, 1998.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities

May 21, 1998

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to present to you the 32nd annual report of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), the Federal agency charged with advancing scholarship and knowledge in the humanities. The NEH supports an impressive range of humanities projects advancing American scholarship and reaching millions of Americans each year.

The public has been enriched by many innovative NEH projects. These included a traveling exhibit, companion book, and public programming examining the history and legacy of the California Gold Rush on the occasion of its Sesquicentennial. Other initiatives promoted humanities radio programming and major funding for the critically acclaimed PBS series, ''Liberty! The American Revolution.''

The NEH is also utilizing computer technologies in new and exciting ways. Answering the call for quality humanities content on the Internet, NEH partnered with MCI to provide EDSITEment, a website that offers scholars, teachers, students, and parents a link to the Internet's most promising humanities sites. The NEH's ''Teaching with Technology'' grants have made possible such innovations as a CD–ROM on art and life in Africa and a digital archive of community life during the Civil War. In its special report to the Congress, ''NEH and the Digital Age,'' the agency examined its past, present, and future use of technology as a tool to further the humanities and make them more accessible to the American public.

This past year saw a change in leadership at the Endowment. Dr. Sheldon Hackney completed his term as Chairman and I appointed Dr. William R. Ferris to succeed him. Dr. Ferris will continue the NEH's tradition of quality research and public programming.

The important projects funded by the NEH provide for us the knowledge and wisdom imparted by history, philosophy, literature, and other humanities disciplines,

and cannot be underestimated as we meet the challenges of the new millennium.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 21, 1998.

Remarks on Presentation of the Commander-in-Chief Trophy to the United States Air Force Academy Falcons

May 21, 1998

The President. General Shelton, General Ryan, Senator Thurmond, Lieutenant General Oelstrom, Coach Fisher DeBerry; to the entire Air Force Academy team, at least the First Classmen who are here today, and all of our other guests, friends and members of the Air Force football staff and others. I am very pleased to present the Commander-in-Chief's Trophy to the United States Air Force Academy again. [*Laughter*]

This is the 11th time the Air Force has won the trophy. Since I have been President I have presented it to the Falcons every year except 1996. That's 5 our of 6 years. I'm good luck for you folks. [*Laughter*] You might ought to think about repealing the 22d amendment. [*Laughter*]

The record of the Air Force Academy is so remarkable that I have asked Secretary Cohen to include a special analysis of your success in the next quadrennial defense review. We may try to apply it to other areas of our endeavor. [*Laughter*]

This team showed real character, winning its first 7 games, ending up 10 and 2. Charles Gilliam rushed for 741 yards. Lane Morgan rushed for six touchdowns and threw for 975 yards. Chris Gizzi, whom I just met, had 179 tackles, the second highest number in school history. And he proved over and over again, I understand, that he has a real nose for football. [*Laughter*] For the members of the press that are here, I understand he had his nose stitched up after every game.

Coach DeBerry, as always, you deserve a lot of credit for this team's outstanding performance. You're the winningest coach in Academy history. Your knowledge of the game, your calm leadership are always indispensable to the team's success.

I understand—and I have seen on occasion—that you tend to excite your team with unexpected displays of emotion on the sideline. And I was told before I came out here that part of the reason that these Falcons flew so high is that they were supremely pumped up by the chicken dance you did after beating Navy and Army [*Laughter*]

One of my predecessors, and one of my favorite predecessors, Teddy Roosevelt, would admire this team. In 1900, he wrote a book called "The Strenuous Life," in which he said, "In life, as in a football game, the principle to follow is hit the line hard." Your competitive drive, teamwork, and hard work brought you here. And I hope you will continue to hit the line hard in your careers and in your service to our Nation.

All of us here are very, very proud of the Academy football programs at all three of our service academies and the fine example you set as scholar athletes. But the 1997 Falcons have proven beyond question that they deserve the Commander-in-Chief Trophy. Your timing couldn't have been better; last fall we celebrated in the 50th anniversary of the Air Force, and you gave something extra to cheer for.

Again, let me repeat my congratulations to the team, the coach, to the entire Air Force Academy. You not only aim high, you find what you aim for. Congratulations.

Now I'd like to ask Lieutenant General Oelstrom to come up and continue the program.

Thank you very much.

[*At this point, team members presented gifts to the President.*]

The President. You know, I sometimes don't have the best of timing. Tomorrow is the day in my annual rotation that I have to give the commencement address at the Naval Academy. [*Laughter*] So, if you'll forgive me, I think I'll start wearing this day after tomorrow on the golf course. [*Laughter*]

You're great representatives of the United States. We're all proud of you. Thank you very much. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:10 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks,

he referred to Lt. Gen. Tad Oelstrom, USAF, Superintendent, and Fisher DeBerry, Football Coach, U.S. Air Force Academy.

Remarks at a Reception for the Sons of Italy Foundation

May 21, 1998

Thank you very much. I thought they were all talking, so I made them come up here. [*Laughter*] But I thank Secretary Cuomo and Paul Polo and Phil Piccigallo for making me feel so welcome. I got here in time to hear Steve Forbes talking, and I appreciate his warming the crowd up. [*Laughter*] That's the most high-class warm-up act I've had this year. [*Laughter*]

Ambassador Foglietta, Ambassador Salleo; Regis Philbin, thank you for welcoming me; and to my good friend, Tony Bennett, welcome. I'd like to also congratulate tonight's honoree, Philip Guarascio, and thank all of you for giving me a chance to come by and share a few moments of your 10th anniversary.

For over 90 years, the Sons of Italy has been a community organization in the truest sense. For 10 years, you've given out this National Education and Leadership Award, finding what I think is one of the very finest ways you could ever express your pride and your ethnic heritage and your devotion to the next generation.

I asked before I came on the stage if I could have an opportunity to personally congratulate the scholarship recipients here tonight, and I hope that I can do this because they, after all, represent not only your commitment but all our futures.

The Italian-American tradition of work and family, faith and community, is just as alive today as it was when the Sons of Italy first began to meet. As President, I have tried to pursue policies that embody those values, values that led so many Italian-American families to such great success in America.

We've got a lot to be thankful for tonight: the lowest unemployment in 28 years; the lowest welfare rolls in 27 years; the lowest inflation in 32 years. But we all know that we've got a lot to do and that we can't stop until we can see the values that embody the Sons of Italy alive and well in every neighborhood in America. I'd like to say a special word of thanks to Secretary Cuomo for his extraordinary work in trying to make sure that we get that done.

I'm told that tonight everybody who is here can claim to be Italian. I see my favorite Italian with an Irish name, Senator Leahy, out here. [*Laughter*] It's shameless. He's the only man I know who can show up at every Irish and every Italian event, claim to be one of you and always be telling the truth. It seems an unfair advantage even in America. [*Laughter*]

Tonight I know you're also celebrating the life of Frank Sinatra. I had, as one of the many perks of becoming President, the chance to get to know Frank Sinatra a little and to appreciate on a personal level what people all over the world appreciated in his music and his movies. I think it's important tonight, because of what you stand for, to note that while we have lost his remarkable voice, we have also lost a generous spirit of a man who raised more than $1 billion for charity and left a lot as well, and really did, as I said a couple of days ago, always manage to do it his way.

I want to thank you for everything you do, but especially, in closing, I want to say that, if you look ahead to the 21st century, we will be living in an economy that is increasingly based on ideas, but our ability to take advantage of it will rest more and more on the strength, the depth, and the character of our soul, on whether we can learn to live together across all the lines that divide us to find a home among people who aren't exactly like us, but down deep inside, have more in common with us than what divides us.

Tomorrow, in the land of my ancestors, Ireland and Northern Ireland, the people will be voting on whether to discard decades of war and hundreds of years of conflict to chart a new path for peace for their children. We are working hard to preserve a peace in Bosnia among people of different religious traditions. We see on the Indian subcontinent new tensions among people of different religious and ethnic groups. We struggle still to make peace in the Middle East at a time when computers have made instantaneous the transfer of money and information and ideas across the globe.

If we are to make the most of the education that you have worked so hard to give to the children of Italian immigrants, then we truly must work just as hard to embody the values by which you have lived and through which you have found a true home in the United States.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:42 p.m. in the National Building Museum. In his remarks, he referred to Paul S. Polo, president, and Philip R. Piccigallo, national executive director, Sons of Italy Foundation; Malcolm S. (Steve) Forbes, Jr., publisher, Forbes magazine; Thomas M. Foglietta, U.S. Ambassador to Italy; Ferdinando Salleo, Italian Ambassador to the United States; entertainer Regis Philbin, who introduced the President; singer Tony Bennett; and Philip Guarascio, vice president and general manager, advertising and marketing, North American Division of General Motors Corp.

Commencement Address at the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland

May 22, 1998

Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you very much. Secretary Dalton, thank you for your generous introduction and your dedicated service. Admiral Larson, thank you. Admiral Johnson, General Krulak, Admiral Ryan, Board of Visitors Chair Byron; to the faculty and staff of the Academy; distinguished guests; to proud parents and family members, and especially to the Brigade of Midshipmen: I am honored to be here today. And pursuant to longstanding tradition, I bring with me a small gift. I hereby free all midshipmen who are on restriction for minor conduct offenses. [*Applause*] There was so much enthusiasm, I wonder if you heard the word, ''minor'' offenses. [*Laughter*]

You know, the President has the signal honor of addressing all of our service academies serially, one after the other in appropriate order. This is the second time I have had the great honor of being here at the Naval Academy. But I began to worry about my sense of timing. I mean, what can you say to graduating midshipmen in a year when the most famous ship on Earth is again the *Titanic?* [*Laughter*] But then I learned this is a totally, almost blindly, confident bunch. After all, over in King Hall you eat cannonballs. [*Laughter*] Now, for those of you who don't know what they are, they're not the ones Francis Scott Key saw flying over Fort McHenry; they're just huge apple dumplings. Nonetheless, they require a lot of confidence. [*Laughter*]

I will try to be relatively brief today. I was given only one instruction: I should not take as long as your class took to scale Herndon Monument. Now, at 4 hours and 5 minutes, the slowest time in recorded history, I have a lot of leeway. [*Laughter*]

But you have more than made up for it. You have done great things, succeeding in a rigorous academic environment, trained to be superb officers. You have done extraordinary volunteer work, for which I am personally very grateful. In basketball, you made it to the NCAA's for the second time in a row. You defeated Army in football last year. In fact, you were 26–6 against teams from Army this year. And while I must remain neutral in these things—[*laughter*]—I salute your accomplishments. [*Laughter*]

Let me also join the remarks that Secretary Dalton made in congratulating your Superintendent. Admiral Larson has performed remarkable service as an aviator, submarine commander, Commander-in-Chief in the Pacific, twice at the helm of the Academy. I got to know him well when he was our Commander-in-Chief in the Pacific. I came to appreciate more than I otherwise ever could have his unique blend of intelligence and insight and character and passionate devotion to duty.

In view of the incident on the Indian subcontinent in the last few days, I think it's important for the historical record to note that the first senior official of the United States who told me that there was a serious potential problem there and we had better get ready for it was Admiral Chuck Larson, several years ago.

When I asked him to return to the Academy, I thought it was almost too much, and then I realized it might have been too little, for he loves this Academy so much this is hardly tough duty. He met all its challenges.

He taught you midshipmen to strive for excellence without arrogance, to maintain the highest ethical standards. Admiral, on behalf of the American people, I thank you for your service here, your 40 years in the Navy, your devotion to the United States. We are all very grateful to you.

I also have every confidence that Admiral Ryan is a worthy successor, and I wish him well.

As I speak to you and other graduates this spring, I want to ask you to think about the challenges we face as a nation in the century that is just upon us and how our mission must be to adapt to the changes of changing times while holding fast to our enduring ideals. In the coming weeks, I will talk about how the information revolution can widen the circle of opportunity or deepen inequality, about how immigration and our Nation's growing diversity can strengthen and unite America or weaken and divide it.

But nothing I will have the chance to talk about this spring is more important than the mission I charge you with today, the timeless mission of our men and women in uniform: protecting our Nation and upholding our values in the face of the changing threats that are as new as the new century.

Members of the Class of 1998, you leave the Yard at the dawn of a new millennium, in a time of great hope. Around the world people are embracing peace, freedom, free markets. More and more nations are committed to educating all their children and stopping the destruction of our environment. The information revolution is sparking economic growth and spreading the ideas of freedom around the world. Technology is moving so fast today that the top-of-the line, high-speed computers you received as plebes today are virtually museum pieces. [*Laughter*]

In this world, our country is blessed with peace, prosperity, declining social ills. But today's possibilities are not tomorrow's guarantees.

Just last week, India conducted a series of nuclear explosive tests, reminding us that technology is not always a force for good. India's action threatens the stability of Asia and challenges the firm international consensus to stop all nuclear testing. So again I ask India to halt its nuclear weapons program and join the 149 other nations that have already signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. And I ask Pakistan to exercise restraint, to avoid a perilous nuclear arms race.

This specter of a dangerous rivalry in South Asia is but one of the many signs that we must remain strong and vigilant against the kinds of threats we have seen already throughout the 20th century, regional aggression and competition, bloody civil wars, efforts to overthrow democracies.

But also, our security is challenged increasingly by nontraditional threats, from adversaries both old and new, not only hostile regimes but also terrorists and international criminals, who cannot defeat us in traditional theaters of battle but search instead for new ways to attack, by exploiting new technologies and the world's increasing openness.

As we approach the 21st century, our foes have extended the fields of battle, from physical space to cyberspace; from the world's vast bodies of water to the complex workings of our own human bodies. Rather than invading our beaches or launching bombers, these adversaries may attempt cyberattacks against our critical military systems and our economic base. Or they may deploy compact and relatively cheap weapons of mass destruction, not just nuclear but also chemical or biological, to use disease as a weapon of war. Sometimes the terrorists and criminals act alone. But increasingly, they are interconnected, and sometimes supported by hostile countries.

If our children are to grow up safe and free, we must approach these new 21st century threats with the same rigor and determination we applied to the toughest security challenges of this century. We are taking strong steps against these threats today. We've improved antiterrorism cooperation with other countries; tightened security for our troops, our diplomats, our air travelers; strengthened sanctions on nations that support terrorists; given our law enforcement agencies new tools. We broke up terrorist rings before they could attack New York's Holland Tunnel, the United Nations, and our airlines. We have captured and brought to justice many of the offenders.

But we must do more. Last week, I announced America's first comprehensive strategy to control international crime and bring criminals, terrorists, and money launderers to justice. Today, I come before you to announce three new initiatives: the first broadly directed at combating terrorism; the other two addressing two potential threats from terrorists and hostile nations, attacks on our computer networks and other critical systems upon which our society depends, and attacks using biological weapons. On all of these efforts, we will need the help of the Navy and the Marines. Your service will be critical in combating these new challenges.

To make these three initiatives work we must have the concerted efforts of a whole range of Federal agencies, from the Armed Forces to law enforcement to intelligence to public health. I am appointing a National Coordinator for Security, Infrastructure Protection, and Counterterrorism, to bring the full force of all our resources to bear swiftly and effectively.

First, we will use our new integrated approach to intensify the fight against all forms of terrorism: to capture terrorists, no matter where they hide; to work with other nations to eliminate terrorist sanctuaries overseas; to respond rapidly and effectively to protect Americans from terrorism at home and abroad.

Second, we will launch a comprehensive plan to detect, deter, and defend against attacks on our critical infrastructures, our power systems, water supplies, police, fire, and medical services, air traffic control, financial services, telephone systems, and computer networks.

Just 15 years ago, these infrastructures—some within government, some in the private sector—were separate and distinct. Now, they are linked together over vast computer-electronic networks, greatly increasing our productivity but also making us much more vulnerable to disruption. Three days ago, we saw the enormous impact of a single failed electronic link when a satellite malfunction disabled pagers, ATM's, credit card systems, and TV and radio networks all around the world. Beyond such accidents, intentional attacks against our critical systems already are underway. Hackers break into government and business computers. They can raid banks, run up credit card charges, extort money by threats to unleash computer viruses.

If we fail to take strong action, then terrorists, criminals, and hostile regimes could invade and paralyze these vital systems, disrupting commerce, threatening health, weakening our capacity to function in a crisis. In response to these concerns, I established a commission chaired by retired General Tom Marsh, to assess the vulnerability of our critical infrastructures. They returned with a pointed conclusion: Our vulnerability, particularly to cyberattacks, is real and growing. And they made important recommendations that we will now implement to put us ahead of the danger curve.

We have the best trained, best equipped, best prepared Armed Forces in history. But as ever, we must be ready to fight the next war, not the last one. And our military, as strong as it is, cannot meet these challenges alone. Because so many key components of our society are operated by the private sector, we must create a genuine public-private partnership to protect America in the 21st century. Together, we can find and reduce the vulnerabilities to attack in all critical sectors, develop warning systems including a national center to alert us to attacks, increase our cooperation with friendly nations, and create the means to minimize damage and rapidly recover in the event attacks occur. We can and we must make these critical systems more secure, so that we can be more secure.

Third, we will undertake a concerted effort to prevent the spread and use of biological weapons and to protect our people in the event these terrible weapons are ever unleashed by a rogue state, a terrorist group, or an international criminal organization. Conventional military force will continue to be crucial to curbing weapons of mass destruction. In the confrontation against Iraq, deployment of our Navy and Marine forces has played a key role in helping to convince Saddam Hussein to accept United Nations inspections of his weapons facilities.

But we must pursue the fight against biological weapons on many fronts. We must strengthen the international Biological

Weapons Convention with a strong system of inspections to detect and prevent cheating. This is a major priority. It was part of my State of the Union Address earlier this year, and we are working with other nations and our industries to make it happen.

Because our troops serve on the front line of freedom, we must take special care to protect them. So we have been working on vaccinating them against biological threats, and now we will inoculate all our Armed Forces, active duty and reserves, against deadly anthrax bacteria.

Finally, we must do more to protect our civilian population from biological weapons. The Defense Department has been teaching State and local officials to respond if the weapons are brandished or used. Today it is announcing plans to train National Guard and reserve elements in every region to address this challenge. But again, we must do more to protect our people. We must be able to recognize a biological attack quickly in order to stop its spread.

We will work to upgrade our public health systems for detection and warning, to aid our preparedness against terrorism, and to help us cope with infectious diseases that arise in nature. We will train and equip local authorities throughout the Nation to deal with an emergency involving weapons of mass destruction, creating stockpiles of medicines and vaccines to protect our civilian population against the kind of biological agents our adversaries are most likely to obtain or develop. And we will pursue research and development to create the next generation of vaccines, medicines, and diagnostic tools. The human genome project will be very, very important in this regard. And again, it will aid us also in fighting infectious diseases.

We must not cede the cutting edge of biotechnology to those who would do us harm. Working with the Congress, America must maintain its leadership in research and development. It is critical to our national security.

In our efforts to battle terrorism and cyberattacks and biological weapons, all of us must be extremely aggressive. But we must also be careful to uphold privacy rights and other constitutional protections. We do not ever undermine freedom in the name of freedom.

To the men and women of this Class of 1998, over 4 years you have become part of an institution, the Navy, that has repeatedly risen to the challenges of battle and of changing technology. In the Spanish-American War, 100 years ago, our Navy won the key confrontations at Manila Bay and off Cuba. In the years between the World Wars, the Navy made tremendous innovations with respect to aircraft carriers and amphibious operations. In the decisive battle in the Pacific in World War II at Midway, our communications experts and code breakers obtained and Admiral Nimitz seized on crucial information about the enemy fleet that secured victory against overwhelming odds.

In the cold war, nuclear propulsion revolutionized our carrier and submarine operations. And today, our Navy and Marine Corps are fundamental to our strategy of global engagement, aiding our friends and warning foes that they cannot undermine our efforts to build a just, peaceful, free future.

President Theodore Roosevelt put it succinctly a long time ago. "A good Navy," he said, "is the surest guaranty of peace." We will have that good Navy, because of you. Your readiness, strength, your knowledge of science and technology, your ability to promptly find and use essential information, and above all, your strength of spirit and your core values, honor, courage, and commitment. I ask you to remember, though, that with these new challenges especially, we must all, as Americans, be united in purpose and spirit.

Our defense has always drawn on the best of our entire Nation. The Armed Forces have defended our freedom, and in turn, freedom has allowed our people to thrive. Our security innovations have often been sparked and supported over and over by the brilliance and drive of people in non-military sectors, our businesses and universities, our scientists and technologists. Now, more than ever, we need the broad support and participation of our citizens as your partners in meeting the security challenges of the 21st century.

Members of the Class of 1998, you are just moments away from becoming ensigns and second lieutenants, and I have not taken as much time as you did to climb the Monument. [*Laughter*] I thank you for giving me

a few moments of your attention to talk to you and our Nation about the work you will be doing for them for the rest of your careers. You will be our guardians and champions of freedom.

Let me say just one thing in closing on a more personal note. We must protect our people from danger and keep America safe and free. But I hope you will never lose sight of why we are doing it. We are doing it so that all of your country men and women can live meaningful lives, according to their own lights. So work hard, but don't forget to pursue also what fulfills you as people, the beauty of the natural world, literature, the arts, sports, volunteer service. Most of all, don't forget to take time for your personal lives, to show your love to your friends and, most of all, to your families, the parents and grandparents who made the sacrifices to get you here, in the future, your wives, your husbands, and your children.

In a free society, the purpose of public service, in or out of uniform, is to provide all citizens with the freedom and opportunity to live their own dreams. So when you return from an exhausting deployment or just a terrible day, never forget to cherish your loved ones, and always be grateful that you have been given the opportunity to serve, to protect for yourselves and for your loved ones and for your fellow Americans the precious things that make life worth living, and freedom worth defending.

I know your families are very proud of you today. Now go and make America proud.

Good luck, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:22 a.m. in the Navy/Marine Corps Memorial Stadium. In his remarks, he referred to Adm. Charles Larson, USN, Superintendent, U.S. Naval Academy; Adm. Jay Johnson, USN, Chief of Naval Operations; Gen. Charles Krulak, USMC, Commandant of the Marine Corps; Vice Adm. John R. Ryan, USN, incoming Superintendent, U.S. Naval Academy; Beverly Byron, Chair, U.S. Naval Academy Board of Visitors; and President Saddam Hussein of Iraq.

Remarks on the Proposed "Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act" and an Exchange With Reporters

May 22, 1998

The President. Today Congress will take an important step toward preserving and expanding our prosperity in the new century. I am pleased that Congress likely will answer my call to pass a historic bill to strengthen our transportation system and maintain our commitment to fiscal discipline and investing in our people. It is a bill that will help our communities to modernize and build the roads and bridges, the railways and buses that link people of our great and vast country together, that keep our economy strong and vibrant.

I have said I would strongly support legislation that meets my core principles: First, it must keep our budget balanced, must preserve the budget surplus until we have save Social Security first; and then it must not undermine other national priorities, including education, health care, child care, and the environment.

The bill being considered by the Congress this afternoon meets those principles. The measure does spend more than we wanted, but I am pleased that we have persuaded Congress to cut $17 billion of excess spending from this bill. Therefore, we have reached, what I consider to be, a principled compromise. At the same time, the bill fulfills the transportation priorities I set forth in my balanced budget. It strengthens our commitments to encouraging mass transit, to protecting the environment, to expanding opportunities to disadvantaged businesses, to moving more Americans from welfare to work with transportation assistance.

But I am deeply disappointed by one thing that is missing from the bill. Congress has refused to lower the national drunk driving standard to .08 percent blood alcohol content. We must have zero tolerance for irresponsible and reckless acts that endanger our children and loved ones traveling on our

roads. We must make .08 the law in every State, and I will continue to work until that happens.

Finally, let me say, this bill does show that fiscal responsibility and investing in our future go hand in hand toward preparing our people and our country for the next century. I want to thank Secretary Slater and Larry Stein, especially, and the members of my economic team for the hard work they did starting from a very difficult bargaining position to reduce the spending in this bill. If Congress does, in fact, pass the bill as expected, I will be pleased to sign it into law.

Nuclear Proliferation in South Asia

Q. Mr. President, did the Pakistani Prime Minister give you any assurances that he will resist any nuclear test at this point, and did you offer him anything, including a request of Congress to release the F–16's?

The President. Well, as you know, I talked to him on Monday, and I told him I would call him back at the end of the week, and I did so. And we had a good long conversation about where we go from here to deal with some of their security concerns and other concerns. And I continue to urge him to refrain from testing, and I told him that I had done everything I could do to get other world leaders involved in both supporting him, if he would refrain from testing, and encouraging the Indians not to further aggravate the situation with precipitous comments or action in Kashmir or elsewhere. And we talked about some other things, but until we have resolved our conversations I don't think I should get into any more detail.

I am impressed with the depth of understanding that the Prime Minister showed and with his genuine concern that he both protect the security of his country and do nothing to upset the decades-long effort now the world has been making toward nonproliferation. And we'll keep working on it and hoping for a good result.

Q. Mr. President, do you feel more optimistic in this situation now? Is there any reason to believe that the Pakistanis will not test?

The President. I think that anything I say to characterize the Prime Minister's present position would only make it more difficult for him and for others. I think they're having an honest debate within their government. I believe they want to do the right thing by their people. But they want to do the right thing by this great issue that affects even more than India and Pakistan.

All I can tell you is I'm working hard on this. I have spent an enormous amount of time on it in the last several days and will continue to do so. And if there are definitive developments about—in this area, I will be happy to tell you. But today we had a very long conversation and it was a good one, and I'll continue to work on it and expect to have more for you over the next few days.

School Shootings

Q. Mr. President, what will you do about these school shootings? Will you demand, perhaps, a Federal age limit? This child actually owned the rifle he used.

The President. Well, let me say I'm going to address that in my radio address tomorrow. And then after that I'll be available to answer more questions about it.

China's Satellite Launch Capability

Q. Mr. President, you've been criticized by Congress for giving the approval for a U.S. satellite to go up on a Chinese rocket. Documents released today, apparently by the Justice Department, indicate that you may have been told that giving that approval could harm a criminal investigation of Loral and Hughes Corporation. Given that knowledge, is that correct, and given that knowledge, was that the right thing to do?

The President. Well, first of all, I think the decision was the correct one. And I am glad that the documents, which have been turned over to the committee and apparently some have been released—I hope that at the appropriate time everybody will have access to the decision document. Let me back up and say that that decision, like every decision I make, was made based on what I though was in the national interest and supportive of our national security.

About 10 years ago, it became obvious that our country had an interest in developing a globally competitive, commercial satellite system, and that we had more satellites that needed to get up in space than we had

launchers to provide. So we needed to supplant satellite launches in America with satellite launch capacity in other countries, that included China but also Russia and Europe.

President Reagan adopted a policy then. President Bush continued the policy, and I continued the policy. There were about nine satellites launched in the 4 years of the Bush administration. I believe there have been about 11 launched under my administration under this policy .

This particular launch, the one in question, had to be recommended by the State Department. Then after the State Department recommended it, it was concurred in that decision by the Defense Department and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The National Security Council here sought the views of the Justice Department because of the matter to which you alluded; they raised a question about it; the NSC evaluated their concerns along with the decision of the State Department that it ought to go forward with the concurrence of the Defense Department, which was fully aware of the matters, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and concluded that, on balance, we should go forward.

I got a decisionmaking memo to that effect, and I approved it. It was handled in the routine course of business. I believe that facts will show that. There was absolutely nothing done to transfer any technology inappropriately to the Chinese as a result of this decision. I believe it was in the national interest, and I can assure you it was handled in the routine course of business, consistent with the 10-year-old policy.

Secret Service Testimony

Q. Mr. Clinton, there's been a decision made that the Secret Service will not be allowed to use privilege in the case of the grand jury. Do you feel that by allowing Secret Service agents to testify that it would, in fact, harm future Presidents?

The President. Well, that's the Secret Service position. And President Bush agreed with them.

Q. Do you agree with them?

The President. And I think there's a serious possibility that that could occur, probably in a different sort of context. At least it will have a chilling effect on—perhaps on the conversations Presidents have and the work that they do and the way they do it. But it is true that there is no legal—there's no statute there.

But all these investigations have been carried out over the last 25 years in a climate of intense pro-investigation, and yet I don't think anyone ever thought about it because no one ever thought that anyone would ever abuse the responsibility the Secret Service has to the President, to the President's family. So there are certain things that you ought not to have to make a law about, and I think that's basically where we are—that it never occurred to anybody that anyone would ever be so insensitive to the responsibilities of the Secret Service that this kind of legal question would arise.

What the law would be on appeal or whether the Secret Service will appeal, I don't know because I haven't been involved in it. I don't think it's appropriate for me to be involved in it. But I think—yes, I think it will raise some serious questions and present a whole new array of problems for managing the Presidency and for the Secret Service managing their responsibility. And because previous people have understood that and cared enough about it, I don't think that anybody has ever even considered doing this before. But we're living in a time which is without precedent, where actions are being taken without precedent, and we just have to live with consequences.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Larry Stein, Assistant to the President and Director of Legislative Affairs; and Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif of Pakistan.

Proclamation 7099—Prayer for Peace, Memorial Day, 1998

May 22, 1998

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Today Americans live in a time of great hope. Our Nation is free, prosperous, and

at peace. While very real dangers and problems still exist in the world, the Cold War is over, democracy is sweeping the globe, and old adversaries are forming new partnerships.

But the blessings we enjoy today are not the happy accidents of history; they are the culmination of promises kept by generations of young Americans and paid for by their courage and sacrifice. The promise of freedom articulated in our Declaration of Independence was made real by a ragtag army of brave Americans who were prepared to die for their convictions. The promise of unity was kept during the Civil War by thousands of Americans, black and white, who were willing to fight to preserve our Union. The promise of democracy was kept by the hundreds of thousands of Americans who fought and died in World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, and the Persian Gulf. On home soil and in foreign lands, lost at sea or brought down from the skies, our young men and women in uniform have given their lives to keep their promise to America: to defend our freedom, to preserve our values, and to advance the ideals of democracy.

On Memorial Day, we have our own promises to keep. We remember and honor all those gallant Americans who, in the eloquent words of President Lincoln, ''gave the last full measure of devotion'' for the well-being of our Nation and their fellow citizens. We express our profound sympathy and gratitude to the families who have so freely given their sons and daughters in service to America. We promise to keep faith with all those who have died for our country by remaining vigilant in our defense of freedom and democracy. And we promise always to work for permanent peace in the world so that a new generation of Americans will never have to know the horrors of war.

In respect and recognition of the courageous men and women to whom we pay tribute, the Congress, by joint resolution approved on May 11, 1950 (64 Stat. 158), has requested the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe each Memorial Day as a day of prayer for permanent peace and designating a period on that day when the American people might unite in prayer.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Memorial Day, May 25, 1998, as a day of prayer for permanent peace, and I designate the hour beginning at 3:00 p.m. EDT of that day as a time to join in prayer. I urge the press, radio, television, and all other information media to take part in this observance.

I also request the Governors of the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the appropriate officials of all units of government, to direct that the flag be flown at half-staff during this Memorial Day on all buildings, grounds, and naval vessels throughout the United States and in all areas under its jurisdiction and control, and I request people of the United states to display the flag at half-staff from their homes for the customary forenoon period.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., May 26, 1998]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on May 27.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on United States Citizens Missing in Cyprus

May 22, 1998

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Public Law 103–372, I hereby submit the enclosed ''Report to Congress on the Investigation of the Whereabouts of the U.S. Citizens Who Have Been Missing from Cyprus Since 1974.'' The report was prepared by retired Ambassador Robert S. Dillon, with significant contribution by former State Department Associate

Director of Security Edward L. Lee, II. Their intensive investigation centered on Cyprus, but it followed up leads in the United States, Turkey, Greece, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

The investigation led to the recovery of partial remains that were identified through DNA testing (done at the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology DNA Identification Laboratory) and other evidence as being those of one of the missing Americans, Andreas Kassapis. The report concludes that Mr. Kassapis was killed shortly after his capture in August 1974. The report also concludes that, although their remains could not be recovered, the other four missing U.S. citizens in all likelihood did not survive the events in Cyprus in July and August 1974.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 22, 1998.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Czech-United States Treaty on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters and Documentation

May 22, 1998

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Czech Republic on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Washington on February 4, 1998. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

The Treaty is one of a series of modern mutual legal assistance treaties being negotiated by the United States in order to counter criminal activities more effectively. The Treaty should be an effective tool to assist in the prosecution of a wide variety of crimes, including terrorism, other violent crimes, drug trafficking, money laundering, and other ''white-collar'' crime. The Treaty is self-executing.

The Treaty provides for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance available under the Treaty includes: locating or identifying persons or items; serving documents; taking testimony or statements of persons; transferring persons in custody for testimony or other purposes; providing documents, records, and articles of evidence; executing requests for searches and seizures; immobilizing assets; assisting in proceedings related to forfeiture of assets, restitution, and criminal fines; and providing any other assistance consistent with the laws of the Requested State.

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

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 22, 1998.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Inter-American Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles, With Annexes and Documentation

May 22, 1998

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Inter-American Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles, with Annexes, done at Caracas December 1, 1996, (the ''Convention''), which was signed by the United States, subject to ratification, on December 13, 1996. I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the Convention.

All species of sea turtles found in the Western Hemisphere are threatened or endangered, some critically so. Because sea turtles migrate extensively, effective protection and conservation of these species requires cooperation among States within the sea turtles' migratory range. Although the international community has banned trade in sea turtles and sea turtle products pursuant to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, the Convention I am transmitting is the first multilateral agreement that actually sets standards to protect and conserve sea turtles and their habitats.

In section 609 of Public Law 101–162, the Congress called for the negotiation of multilateral agreements for the protection and conservation of sea turtles. In close cooperation with Mexico, the United States led a 3-year effort to negotiate the Convention with other Latin American and Caribbean nations. Once ratified and implemented, the Convention will enhance the conservation of this hemisphere's sea turtles and harmonize standards for their protection.

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

William J. Clinton

The White House,
May 22, 1998.

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.

May 16

In the morning, the President traveled to Weston-under-Lizard, a village north of Birmingham, United Kingdom, where he participated in Group of Eight Summit meetings in the Weston Park estate home throughout the morning. In the afternoon, the President presented Prime Minister Jean Chretien of Canada with a NHL Washington Capitals jersey to wear during a photo-op as a result of the Capitals' victory over the Ottawa Senators in the second round of the NHL playoffs. Later, the President returned to Birmingham.

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton attended a dinner with summit leaders in the Pavilion Restaurant at the Birmingham Botanical Gardens. Later, they attended a concert in the Symphony Hall at the International Convention Center.

May 17

In the morning, the President attended the closing session of the G–8 Summit in Hall 4 of the International Convention Center.

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Chequers, country residence of Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom, in Buckinghamshire.

May 18

In morning, the President traveled to London, United Kingdom, where he attended several European Union-United States Summit meetings at 10 Downing Street throughout the morning and into the afternoon.

In the afternoon, the President and Prime Minister Blair had a telephone conversation with Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif of Pakistan concerning nuclear proliferation in South Asia. Later, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Geneva, Switzerland.

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton returned to Washington, DC.

May 20

The President announced his intention to appoint Anne-Lee Verville as a member of the National Skill Standards Board.

The White House announced that President Clinton invited President Kim Dae-jung of South Korea for a state visit June 8–11.

May 21

In the morning, the President had a telephone conversation with President Boris Yeltsin of Russia concerning the situation in India and Pakistan.

The President also had a telephone conversation with Larry Bentz, principal of Thurston High School in Springfield, OR, to express condolences on the shooting incident at the school.

The President announced his intention to appoint Secretary of Transportation Rodney E. Slater and his intention to nominate Sylvia de Leon, Linwood Holton, Amy M. Rosen, John Robert Smith, Michael Dukakis, and Gov. Tommy G. Thompson of Wisconsin as members of the Amtrak Reform Board.

The President announced his intention to appoint John O. Norquist to serve as a member of the Amtrak Reform Council.

May 22

In the morning, the President traveled to Annapolis, MD, and in the afternoon, he returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced his intention to nominate Louis Caldera to be Secretary of the Army.

The President announced his intention to nominate Robert C. Randolph to be Assistant Administrator for Asia and Near East Affairs at the U.S. Agency for International Development.

The President announced his intention to nominate Awilda R. Marquez to be Assistant Secretary and Director General of the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service at the Department of Commerce.

The President announced his intention to nominate Hugh Q. Parmer to be Assistant Administrator for Humanitarian Response at the U.S. Agency for International Development.

The President announced his intention to nominate Greta Joy Dicus as a member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

The President announced his intention to nominate Joan Specter as a member of the National Council on the Arts.

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton went to Camp David, MD.

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 May 18

Jose de Jesus Rivera,
of Arizona, to be U.S. Attorney for the District of Arizona for a term of 4 years, vice Janet Napolitano, resigned.

Submitted May 21

Richard M. Berman,
of New York, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of New York, vice Kevin Thomas Duffy, retired.

Sylvia de Leon,
of Texas, to be a member of the Reform Board (Amtrak) for a term of 5 years (new position).

Michael S. Dukakis,
of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Reform Board (Amtrak) for a term of 5 years (new position).

Donovan W. Frank,
of Minnesota, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Minnesota, vice David S. Doty, retired.

Linwood Holton,
of Virginia, to be a member of the Reform Board (Amtrak) for a term of 5 years (new position).

Colleen McMahon,
of New York, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of New York, vice John F. Keenan, retired.

William H. Pauley III,
of New York, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of New York, vice Peter K. Leisure, retired.

Amy M. Rosen,
of New Jersey, to be a member of the Reform Board (Amtrak) for a term of 5 years (new position).

John Robert Smith,
of Mississippi, to be a member of the Reform Board (Amtrak) for a term of 5 years (new position).

Tommy G. Thompson,
of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Reform Board (Amtrak) for a term of 5 years (new position).

Submitted May 22

Louis Caldera,
of California, to be Secretary of the Army, vice Togo Dennis West, Jr.

Greta Joy Dicus,
of Arkansas, to be a member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 30, 2003 (reappointment).

Awilda R. Marquez,
of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service, vice Lauri Fitz-Pegado.

Hugh Q. Parmer,
of Texas, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, vice M. Douglas Stafford, resigned.

Joan Specter,
of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2002, vice Patricia Ann Brown, term expired.

Gerald Bruce Lee,
of Virginia, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, vice James C. Cacheris, retired.

Patricia A. Seitz,
of Florida, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, vice Stanley Markus, elevated.

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 May 13 [1]

Statement by the Press Secretary announcing the President's upcoming visit to Houston and Dallas, TX, and Cleveland, OH

[1] This release was not received in time for inclusion in the appropriate issue.

Released May 16

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by National Security Adviser Samuel Berger and Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Crime, Narcotics, and Law Enforcement Jonathan Winer on the G–8 Summit

Fact sheet: Reducing the Nuclear Threat

Released May 17

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry, Deputy National Security Adviser Jim Steinberg, and Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott on the G–8 Summit and the President's meeting with President Boris Yeltsin of Russia

Fact sheet: The G–8 Birmingham Summit: "Securing the Benefits of Integration"

Released May 18

Transcript of remarks by Press Secretary Mike McCurry to the press pool

Statement by the Press Secretary: U.S.–EU Summit

Fact sheet: Building a Stronger World Community: The Transatlantic Economic Partnership

Fact sheet: U.S.–EU Summit: Disciplines for Strengthening Investment Protection

Fact sheet: Cooperation on Nonproliferation and Counterterrorism

Released May 19

Announcement of nomination of U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana

Released May 20

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by the Press Secretary: State Visit by Korean President Kim Dae-jung

Released May 21

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Fact sheet: NATO Enlargement

Announcement of nominations for U.S. District Judges for the Southern District of New York and the District of Minnesota

Released May 22

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Transportation Secretary Rodney Slater, Office of Management and Budget Acting Director Jack Lew, and National Economic Council Director Gene Sperling on the proposed "Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act"

Transcript of a press briefing by National Coordinator for Security, Infrastructure Protection, and Counterterrorism Richard Clarke and Critical Infrastructure Assurance Office Director Jeffrey Hunker on the President's commencement address at the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, MD

Announcement of nominations for U.S. District Judges for the Southern District of Florida and the Eastern District of Virginia

Fact sheet: Preparedness for a Biological Weapons Attack

Fact sheet: Summary of Presidential Decision Directives 62 and 63

Fact sheet: Combating Terrorism: Presidential Decision Directive 62

Fact sheet: Protecting America's Critical Infrastructure: PDD 63

Acts Approved by the President

NOTE: No acts approved by the President were received by the Office of the Federal Register during the period covered by this issue.