Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, October 11, 1999
Volume 35—Number 40
Pages 1887–1990

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Bill Signings
California
Access Now for Gay and Lesbian Equality dinner in Beverly Hills—1901
Democratic National Committee
Beverly Hills—1912
Brentwood Park—1905
Palo Alto—1891, 1896
Representative Brad Sherman, luncheon in Beverly Hills—1910
Canada, U.S. Embassy dedication ceremony in Ottawa—1975
Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty—1920, 1933, 1953
Former Commerce Secretary Mickey Kantor, portrait unveiling—1938
Legislative agenda—1932
Nevada, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee luncheon in Las Vegas—1887
New Democrat Network dinner—1942
New York City
Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee reception—1961
Departure for—1953
Empire State Pride gala—1969
National Labor Research Association dinner—1964

Addresses and Remarks—Continued

Patients' Bill of Rights—1922, 1958
Radio address—1899
Representative Bart Stupak, reception—1940

Bill Signings

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000
Remarks—1925
Statement—1927

Communications to Congress

Iraq, letter transmitting report on compliance with U.N. Security Council resolutions—1919
Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization, letter transmitting report—1931
Partnership For Peace, letter transmitting report—1930

Executive Orders

1999 Amendments to the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States—1948

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Cabinet Room—1920
New York City—1958
South Lawn—1953
South Portico—1922

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

Editor's Note: The President was in Mont-Tremblant, Canada, on October 8, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

Contents—Continued

Interviews With the News Media—Continued

Interview with John Roberts of the Columbia Broadcasting System—1957
New conference with Prime Minister Chretien of Canada in Ottawa, October 8 (No. 181)—1978

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Canada, Prime Minister Chretien—1978

Proclamations

Child Health Day—1919
Fire Prevention Week—1890
General Pulaski Memorial Day—1937
German-American Day—1931
Leif Erikson Day—1985
National Children's Day—1986
National School Lunch Week—1986
To Delegate Authority for the Administration of the Tariff-Rate Quotas on Sugar-Containing Products and Other Agricultural Products to the United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of Agriculture—1974

Statements by the President

See also Bill Signings
Commerce Department, fire—1890
Executive order amending the manual for courts-martial—1953
House action on Patients' Bill of Rights legislation—1958
Irish peace process, inappropriate metaphor—1985
London commuter train crash—1937
"Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1999," proposed—1890
"Pension Reduction Disclosure Act of 1999," proposed—1960
Senate action on education appropriations—1960
Senate action on the nomination of Ronnie L. White to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri—1930

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1990
Checklist of White House press releases—1989
Digest of other White House announcements—1988
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1988

Week Ending Friday, October 8, 1999

Remarks at a Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee Luncheon in Las Vegas, Nevada

October 1, 1999

Thank you very much. Senator Bryan, Senator Reid, Senator Baucus; Mr. Mayor, Mayor Jones, and Senator Bernstein—that sounds pretty good, doesn't it? [*Laughter*] Sounds pretty good—[*laughter*]—and my good friend Arthur Goldberg, I had a wonderful day with him in his home in New Jersey, and now he's brought me to Paris.

I went to Paris for the first time 30 years ago this year as a young man. And not very long ago, on my way to Bosnia to talk about our humanitarian efforts there to save the people of Kosovo from ethnic cleansing, I stopped in Paris for a day to see the President of France and the Prime Minister, and I had a chance to walk again as I did a young man, along the Tuileries and look again at the Eiffel Tower. I've already had more dreams fulfilled than I could have asked for in 10 lifetimes, but I never dreamed I'd actually get to give a speech in the Eiffel Tower. [*Laughter*] So I thank you, Arthur, for one more milestone in my life, and I congratulate you on this magnificent creation and the success it's enjoying.

I was thinking about all of you here today, and I was thinking, one of the things that I like about Arthur Goldberg and a lot of the others of you who have been my longtime friends here, is that you have a sense of enlightened self-interest. You're intelligent enough to support Democrats so you can continue to live like Republicans. [*Laughter*]

And I told someone the other day, I saw how much money Governor Bush had raised—you know, I'm thinking of putting that down as one of the economic achievements of my tenure in office—[*laughter*]—that we didn't discriminate; we allowed the Republicans to make money, too, in this economy. And it's not our fault if they decide to spend it in a way different than we would like.

Let me say, just seriously—I'll be rather brief, but I want to first thank you for coming here; and second, to try to give you some sense of what is at issue in this coming election year in all of the elections, and certainly in these elections for United States Senate, every one of which is of genuine national significance.

First, when Al Gore and I moved to Washington in 1993, into the White House, and we started our administration, we had a few very definite ideas about how we ought to change our policy—how we ought to change our economic policy, our crime policy, our welfare policy, our education policy, what our priorities in foreign policy ought to be. And we generally were trying to prepare America for the global economy and the global society in which we're living for the post-cold-war world, with a view to give every person in this country a chance to live up to his or her God-given abilities; trying to bring an increasingly diverse country closer together, instead of allowing it to become more and more torn apart and fractionalized, as so many countries in the world are today, over differences of race, religion, and other things. And we wanted to try to maintain America's role for peace and freedom and prosperity in the world.

And after 6½ years, the results, I think, speak for themselves. We do have the lowest unemployment rate in 29 years and the lowest welfare rolls in 32 years and the lowest crime rates in 26 years. We just had back-to-back surpluses in our budget for the first time in 42 years. And yesterday we learned that we have the lowest poverty rate in 20 years, the longest peacetime expansion, and the highest homeownership in history. These are things we can be proud of. And I am grateful that I had the chance to serve and to be a part of these historic developments.

And for all of you that had anything to do with that, I thank you.

But every country must always have its eyes pointed toward tomorrow. And it may seem strange to you, since I can't run again, but I almost wish that the theme song of this year's election—the millennial election next year, I mean—were the one that we used in 1992, that great old Fleetwood Mac song, "Don't Stop Thinking About Tomorrow."

The question is not whether America will change; it is how America will change and whether we will build on what we have done that is working to meet the large, long-term challenges the country faces in this new millennium, or whether we will basically veer off and go back to an approach that got us in an awful lot of trouble before. The economy has been good so long, most people have forgotten what it was like in 1992. Most people forgot what it was like to have year in after year out of crime rates rising, welfare rolls rising, and intensifying social divisions.

So I say to you, the question—and I hope you'll keep this in mind between now and November of 2000—the issue for every citizen, without regard to party, is not whether we will vote for change. The issue is what kind of change we will embrace. That is, America is always changing. That's why we're still around here after over 220 years, because we've always been in the business of recreating ourselves based on our bedrock principles. And what difference does it make who's in the Senate? It will determine whether we use this moment of prosperity to save Social Security so that the baby boomers don't, in effect, bankrupt our children with our retirement. It will determine whether we lengthen the life of Medicare and add a prescription drug coverage, which is of pivotal importance to millions of Americans. Three-quarters of the retired people in this country today do not have access to affordable prescription drugs, and a lot of the hospital bills that they run up are because they did not have the preventive medications that they need.

It will determine whether we make a commitment to what is now the largest, most ethnically and religiously diverse group of people we've ever had in our schools, and whether we really believe that they can all learn and we're determined to give them a world-class education.

Yesterday I went to New York, to the IBM Center, to meet with Governors and business leaders of both parties to talk about the absolute imperative of having world-class standards and genuine accountability for all of our school children; the need to end social promotion but to give our children the schools they need; to turn around failing schools or shut them down; to give kids the after-school and summer school and mentoring support they need; but to keep pushing for higher standards in education. These are just three big questions.

I have asked the Congress to adopt a plan that would take Social Security out to 2050, beyond the life expectancy of all but the most fortunate baby boomers. I'd like to be around then, but it seems sort of unlikely. I have asked them to add more than a decade to the life of Medicare and to deal with the prescription drug issue. I have asked to adopt some truly groundbreaking educational reforms, and I have asked them to do it in a budget that would allow America over the next 15 years to pay down the debt, so that by 2015 we'd be debt-free, for the first time since Andrew Jackson was President in 1835. Now, those are changes worth fighting for.

Now, in every case, there are differences among the parties on this. I also have to tell you that there are differences in other areas. I'm fighting now to get the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty ratified in the Senate. Virtually all the opposition we have is coming from the other side of the aisle. A dream that was first embraced by Dwight Eisenhower, a Republican President, and proposed by John Kennedy, a Democrat, who gave us the first temporary test ban treaty.

It is profoundly important because we are trying to stop countries that do not have nuclear power now, and terrorist groups who do not have nuclear power now, from getting it. And it will help us not only to restrain people who have nuclear weapons from using them ever in the future but from seeing the proliferation of these things. Every Senator's vote makes a difference. The treaty has to be ratified by two-thirds of the Senate.

I'm trying to get the funds from the Congress to implement the agreement I made with former Prime Minister Netanyahu and Mr. Arafat, with the help of the late King Hussein, at the Wye peace accords. It's absolutely imperative that America do its part if we want the Israelis and their partners in the Middle East to keep making peace. It could have a huge impact on the life our children lead in the 21st century. And the congressional majority so far has been unwilling to fund it. Every Senator's vote makes a difference.

And I can go on and on and on. You know this; you've seen it. But it's easy to forget. This State has been profoundly well served by Dick Bryan and Harry Reid. And Arthur said he wished I could run again—I wish Dick would have run again. [*Laughter*] I told him, I said, "He's too young to quit. He doesn't even have gray hair, unlike some people."

So when you pick someone to succeed him, you have to think about this. The person you pick to succeed him is going to lengthen the life of Social Security or try to let it wither on the vine, hoping that it will be privatized, not really thinking about what's going to happen—not to the baby boomers; most of us will be fine—what happens to our children and their ability to raise our grandchildren, if we leave a significant percentage of our people who are my age and younger, in the baby boom generation, unable to sustain themselves in retirement?

What if we don't continue to push to raise standards in education? You know, our children have picked up nearly a full grade in reading levels in the last 2 years. It didn't happen by accident. Four years ago only 16 States had enforceable standards; today, 50 do. Four years ago only 11 States had real accountability—that is, for schools, teachers, and students; today, only 16 do.

Now, I can tell you, the Democrats are more likely than the Republicans, by a factor of five or six, to continue to push to raise standards in education. It could change the whole future of America. We are more likely to push for things like the hate crimes legislation and other things that are designed to bring us together, across all the lines that divide us, and certainly more likely to think about our responsibilities in the world.

You know, people come here, Las Vegas, from all over the world. And I know that for many Americans, maybe people living in small towns in this State, they'd just as soon, just thinking about it for 30 seconds, that we not invest any money anywhere else in the world. But with the end of the cold war, a modest investment in our diplomacy can keep American men and women in uniform out of wars for decades to come. It will save lives; it will give us a more peaceful world. It will also protect the international economy, on which our own prosperity depends.

All this will be determined not only by the Presidential race but by the races for the Senate and the races for the House. And it seems to me, when you think about the things everybody used—not everybody, at least our friends in the opposition—the Republicans used to say about the Democrats that they were weak on crime, weak on welfare, weak on the budget, weak on foreign policy—all those things they used to say about us—"you can't trust them to run the country"—our crime policy has helped communities have the lowest crime rate in a generation. Our welfare policies have given us the lowest welfare rolls in 32 years, without doing what they wanted to do, which was to cut the kids out of Federally-guaranteed food and medical care and to give more child care so people can succeed at home and at work. Our economic policies have benefitted not just those of us in this room who can afford to be here, but we've also got the lowest poverty rates in 20 years.

And our continued commitment to fulfilling our responsibilities in the world have given us a safer world and will give us a safer world in the 21st century, which means a more prosperous world, which is critical to a more prosperous America.

I'd just leave you with this thought: We are 4 percent of the world's population; we have 22 percent of the world's income. We cannot sustain 22 percent of the income with 4 percent of the people unless we have a constructive relationship with the other 96 percent of the people in the world. It is of pivotal importance.

So it is not only for humanitarian reasons that I have sought to end the slaughter in Kosovo and Bosnia, to try to bring peace from the Middle East to Northern Ireland, to try to deal with the test ban treaty. It's also very much in the immediate daily interest of the people of this city, this State, and this Nation. This is a different and a better country than it was in 1992, and I'm grateful that I had a role to play in it. But don't be deceived here. It wasn't because of me; it was because what we did was the right thing to do. It is the ideas, the policies, the direction, the conviction of where we're going—that's what counts.

And you can keep America changing in the right way with the right decisions in all these elections in 2000. After those elections, I'll just be a citizen again, but I took forward to bearing this message for the rest of my life. And I thank you for being here to help make America work.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:10 p.m. in the Eiffel Tower Restaurant at the Paris Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Oscar B. Goodman and former Mayor Jan Laverty Jones of Las Vegas; Senatorial candidate Ed Bernstein; Arthur M. Goldberg, president and chief executive officer, Park Place Entertainment; President Jacques Chirac and Prime Minister Lionel Jospin of France; Gov. George W. Bush of Texas; former Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel; and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Statement on the Fire at the Department of Commerce

October 1, 1999

I am relieved that today's fire at the Department of Commerce was extinguished quickly and apparently without any serious injuries. The DC Fire Department and all those who worked to put out the fire deserve credit for ensuring the safety of the Department of Commerce employees who work at the Herbert Hoover Building. I hope that the damage can be repaired quickly and that Secretary Daley and his entire team can be back to full speed as soon as possible.

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

Statement on the Proposed "Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1999"

October 1, 1999

Yesterday's nuclear accident in Japan is a tragic reminder that we must do everything in our power to ensure safe, responsible handling of radioactive materials. Upon reviewing Senate bill 1287, regarding potential nuclear waste disposal at Yucca Mountain, I have determined that it would not adequately ensure the protection of public health and safety. If this bill is presented to me in its current form, I will veto it.

I am encouraged that this latest Senate bill, the "Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1999," does not seek to authorize interim storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain before a thorough scientific analysis of the site has been completed. That would be an unconscionable mistake, and I have consistently opposed such proposals in the past. However, the bill would take away the existing authority of the Environmental Protection Agency to protect public health and safety. It is vital that this authority be preserved.

I urge the Congress to join with me in opposing this legislation and ensuring that we fulfill our responsibility to protect this and future generations.

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

Proclamation 7231—Fire Prevention Week, 1999

October 1, 1999

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Of the many disasters that affect our communities in a given year, fire is one that Americans can actually prevent; and, through early warning and appropriate response, we can minimize the havoc fire wreaks when it

does occur. In 1998, U.S. fire departments responded to nearly 1.8 million fires, with three-quarters of them occurring in residences. Fire cost our Nation some $8.6 billion in property loss last year, and it took a staggering human toll: more than 4,000 civilians died, and 91 firefighters lost their lives in the line of duty.

The place where Americans feel safest—at home—is the very place where we are at greatest risk from fire. Eighty percent of all U.S. fire deaths occur at home. If Americans knew more about fire prevention and better understood how to react quickly and sensibly when fire breaks out, we could greatly reduce such deaths.

Because knowledge of simple fire safety precautions is so vital to saving lives, the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) launched a 3-year initiative to teach the importance of planning and practicing how to escape from fire. In partnership with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, through its United States Fire Administration, and our Nation's fire services, NFPA has again selected, "Fire Drills: The Great Escape!" as the theme of this year's Fire Prevention Week.

Fire spreads quickly, making a fast response essential to survival. I urge every family to develop a home fire escape plan and to practice it at least twice a year. The elements of a good plan include installing working smoke alarms on every level of the home, establishing two ways out of each room, and establishing a meeting place outside the home.

Each of us can take these simple steps to plan and practice our own "great escape" from fire and significantly improve our chance of survival if fire occurs. By doing so, we can pay fitting tribute to the selfless service of our Nation's firefighters. The extraordinary personal sacrifice made by firefighters throughout America, and the dedication of all men and women who serve in our Nation's fire services, will be honored on Sunday, October 10, 1999, at the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial Service in Emmitsburg, Maryland.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim October 3 through October 9, 1999, as Fire Prevention Week. I encourage the people of the United States to take an active role in fire prevention not only during this week, but also throughout the year. I also call upon every citizen to pay tribute to the members of our fire and emergency services who have lost their lives or been injured in service to their communities, and to those men and women who carry on their noble tradition.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 6, 1999]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 7. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Reception in Palo Alto, California

October 1, 1999

Thank you. You know, Tom cracked that joke about the White House—[*laughter*]—I'm a Southerner. What I thought sitting here watching him is, we have reversed all the roles in "Gone With the Wind." [*Laughter*] We're about to remake the whole movie, and it's going to be better this time. [*Laughter*]

Let me say, first of all, I am delighted to be here. I thank Tom and Jeanne for opening their beautiful home and bringing their beautiful family together, and their larger family, for this event. I thank my dear friend Senator Boxer for being here and for her leadership. I want to thank Governor and Mrs. Romer for being here; and Beth and Ron Dozoretz, and Joe Andrew, for all their work; and Art Torres, the chairman of the California Democratic Party. And I thank Steve Westly and Chris Larsen and everybody else who had anything to do with this event.

There are people here tonight who started with me in 1991 and 1992. And there are people here tonight I've never met before. And that's sort of a metaphor for what's happening to the economy and the society of Silicon Valley and the whole, what I hope is happening to our Democratic Party.

I want to take a few minutes to sort of put all these specific issues that are flying back and forth across the airwaves and over the Internet into some larger context, if I might. Our economy has been strong for so long now a lot of people have forgotten what it was like in 1992, when we had high unemployment, high interest rates; we quadrupled the debt in 12 years of this country. We had had stagnant wages, and the society was beginning to fray rather badly. We had escalating crime rates, escalating welfare rolls, increasing racial tensions. We had a lot of problems.

And we had people who believed that they could get elected by driving deeper wedges into our American society instead of by bringing us together. And when I first came out here—and Larry was one of the first people I met with when I came out—when I first came out here, I knew that a big part of making America work and preparing America for the 21st century would be to model and learn from what was happening here.

You know, this whole technology-based economy here is about 8 or 9 percent of the American economy now directly, but it has accounted for 30 percent of our growth since I've been President. That's a stunning statistic that all of you should know, if you don't. And if you think about how it works, it's the way America ought to work. You know, ideas matter. If you've got good ideas, there are supplies of capital. Teamwork is terribly important. And where you come from and what you did before and who your father was and what your race is or what your gender is or what your sexual orientation is, they don't matter; ideas matter—can you do something that makes the world a better place, that provides something that other people want that they can hook into? That's very important.

I think—let me just give you one example that I had no earthly idea about until Steve told me tonight. It's a big joke in the White House that when I picked Al Gore to be my Vice President, I was trying to balance the ticket because he was technologically adept and I was technologically challenged. [*Laughter*]

I'll never forget the first time I heard about eBay. I thought it was such a neat deal. I thought, now, that's something I'd like to do; that's my kind of deal. I like to buy and sell and swap and give things and do things. I'd love that. Steve told me tonight there are now 20,000 Americans who do not work for eBay who make a living doing transactions through eBay—20,000 Americans, including all kinds of people who can now work at home, people who used to be on welfare, people—and he said that one of the people said this is capitalism for the rest of us.

So with that background, let me say, when I started in 1992, it seemed to me that the problem with national politics was that it was frozen in time, but everything else was terrifically dynamic; that it was designed to take a bunch of people and politics in Washington, which is a long way from Palo Alto and a long way from everywhere else—a long way from Beltsville, Maryland, on some days—[*laughter*]—where there were lots of layers between the people there and real voters, and to structure voters' choices in such a way that they hoped would help the politicians, but had almost nothing to do with solving the problems of America. So you had to be a liberal or a conservative, or you had to be left or right, or you had to be for this position or that one or you weren't politically correct.

We basically had a whole string of paralysis, and we found ourselves after 12 years of so-called supply-side economics having quadrupled the debt. We were economically paralyzed, and nobody wanted to raise taxes, and nobody wanted to cut spending. And as a consequence, we were slowly sort of squeezing the lifeblood out of our public life. No one could set priorities; nobody could make decisions; nobody would take chances. And it seemed to me that if you look at the things that worked in America, where we were leading the world in private sector endeavors, or if you looked at classrooms that worked that I had visited in the poorest places in America, with high crime rates, and

they still—there were classrooms in the early nineties that still had no dropouts, no violence, 100 percent of the kids going on to college, everybody performing well. They were different from most places like it, but they were working. They all rejected all those false choices.

It seemed to me that's what America had to do. We had to say, "Look, we believe that we can reduce the deficit and balance the budget and still continue to invest in education and technology and the environment. We believe that we can help business and lift up working people at the same time. It's not an either/or thing. We believe we can grow the economy while we improve the environment. We don't think it's an either/or thing. We believe we can punish criminals who ought to be punished and prevent more crime and reduce the crime rate. We believe we can require able-bodied people on welfare to work, but to it in a way that helps them to become better parents, not worse parents, through medical care and nutrition and child care." And on and on and on.

You can take any issue, but basically, what I wanted to do was to make America work the way the best of America was already working. And I wanted to hook America up to the future that so many of you are doing so much to make. And I wanted to clean out a lot of the sort of dead wood, accumulated dead wood of ideas and procedures and practices that were weighing Washington down.

I remember—I think Bill Gates said once what I thought was kind of funny. He said, "You know, our world works three times faster than normal business, and Washington works three times slower." [*Laughter*] "That puts them behind by a factor of nine." There's a lot of truth in that. And so we set about to try to change the whole way Government works.

And after 6½ years, you know the economic statistics. We have the lowest unemployment rate in 29 years; the lowest welfare rates in 32 years; the lowest crime rates in 26 years; the lowest poverty rates, we learned yesterday, in 20 years; the lowest African-American poverty ever recorded. The first time we've had 2 years of budget surpluses in 42 years. We also have—but some other things you ought to know. With the HOPE scholarships and the other additions to student aid and the changes in the student loan program, virtually anybody in America who is willing to work for it can get a college education. We have, thanks to Senator Barbara Boxer, begun to offer large numbers of young people the opportunity to go to after-school programs to stay off the streets and out of trouble and learn more. And that's very important.

And during this time, we've raised the standards for clean air, for clean water, for safe food. We've cleaned up more toxic waste dumps, and the economy has gotten better, not worse, under what the sort of politically predictable right says is an unconscionable burden on the business community of cleaning up the environment.

We have, as all of you know, a more activist Government, but the size of the Federal establishment, thanks largely to technological innovations spearheaded by the Vice President, is the smallest it has been since John Kennedy was President in 1962. The Federal Government is the smallest it's been since 1962.

So what I would like to say is, I feel that in the last 6½ years, we have at least prepared America for the 21st century. We've gotten things going again in the right direction. But the atmosphere in Washington is still entirely too partisan and entirely too ideological, driven largely by the majority party in Congress. Now, I would never say that any of us are totally blameless, but that's where most of the pressure is. And so we have a lot of things that don't make any sense to me going on there now.

And let me say, what I think we should be doing is to build on what is happening now and ask ourselves, "Okay, what are the biggest challenges out there and how can we set in motion a framework that will allow the American people to meet those big challenges?" And I'll just give you four or five real quick that I think are important and compare that with what's going on, and that will illustrate why it's important that you're here tonight.

Number one, the number of people over 65 in this country is going to double in 30 years, as we baby boomers retire. I turn 65, if the Lord lets me live that long, in the year

2011, and I am the oldest of the baby boomers. So the baby boomers will all turn 65 between 2011 and 2029. Now, when they do, at present participation rates in the work force, there will be two people working for every one person drawing Social Security. For most of us, it's no sweat because we'll have other ways of supporting our retirement. But Social Security still is responsible for lifting about half of our seniors out of poverty, even if they have other sources of income as well. So we have to make sure that when we retire, the cost of the baby boomers' retirement, since we're such a big generation, does not burden our children. This is not about older people; it's about our children and our grandchildren. I'm telling you, everybody I know my age is worried about this.

So I asked the Congress to save the Social Security taxes, but as we pay down the debt to give the interest savings that we get from saving the Social Security taxes instead of spending them, to give the interest savings to the Social Security Trust Fund so we can run it out to 2050 and get it beyond the life expectancy of most of the baby boom generation—when things will right themselves again. This is a big deal. And if we can't do it now, when we're in such good shape financially, we'll never get a way around to doing it.

The second thing we've got to deal with is Medicare. We're all going to be living longer. Any person that lives to be 65 today has a life expectancy of 82. The younger people in this audience, it is literally conceivable that those of you who are 35 or younger will have children who will have a life expectancy of nearly 100. That is literally true. By the time we get all the mysteries of the human genome decoded and we know how to raise children from infancy with adjusted diets for them and their genetic structure and all those things, and we have all the medical care and all the pharmaceuticals and all the research we're making into cancer, these kinds of things will happen.

Now, in the meanwhile, we don't want Medicare to go broke. And interestingly enough, because Medicare was developed 30 years ago, when the world was a very different place, there is no prescription drug coverage for Medicare patients. Now, out here where biotech is a big deal, that must strike you as fundamentally absurd. You would never orchestrate, set up a program like that today without that. But three out of four seniors in this country don't have access to affordable prescription drugs. And the consequences are pretty catastrophic for some of them and enormously difficult in terms of burdens on the health care system. So I proposed a plan to fix that.

The third thing we have to recognize is, we have the most diverse student body in the history of our schools in terms of race and religion and culture, and it is a godsend in a global economy if, but only if, they can all get a world-class education. And so we have to do that. But we know how to do that. I am telling you, I have been to schools in this country that have solved every problem you can mention in American education. But we have not systematized it. And the trick is how to have a system that has the right rewards and sanctions—just like the marketplace does—with enough creativity, just like your companies do, to let people solve these problems at the grassroots level. That's what we're trying to do.

Now—and let me just say two other things. The next big problem that particularly those of you who are younger will face—and I predict to you that for the next 30 years, we will be obsessed with trying to find a way to deal with the challenge of climate change and to deal with—to get the world to give up another bad idea. We gave up supply-side economics now; nobody thinks that was a good idea anymore. We're all back to basic arithmetic. It's wonderful. It didn't have anything to do with the digital economy. We went back to arithmetic. [*Laughter*]

But there is still all over, in America, in the Congress, in the business community and all over the world in emerging societies, in China, India, other places, there are people that honestly believe you cannot have a modern economy without industrial age energy use patterns which are a prescription for environmental disaster in this country and around the world. And we have to abandon it. And a lot of the solutions will be found by people out here.

But we have offered a market-oriented response to the challenge of climate change that I think is very important. And there are two more issues that I think are big deals because—and keep in mind, every one of these issues that I'm mentioning, there is a profound difference between where we stand and where the other party stands—two more issues. We've got to find a way to bring the benefits of free enterprise to people and places that haven't been touched by this recovery. And then we have to find a way to show people in other countries how to do the same thing. We know a little about this, but not a lot.

But if 20,000 people can make a living trading on eBay, then we ought to be able to find a way to cure the 73-percent unemployment rate on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota, even though they're physically separate from other people. We ought to be able to find a way to get all those poor communities in the Mississippi Delta that never recovered from the collapse of the agricultural culture that followed the impact of the Great Depression, to find economic opportunities that will reach those people. We ought to be able to find a way to get into Appalachia. We ought to be able to find a way to get into the inner cities—not just for this or that or the other individual but a critical mass of people that can create a real economy, a real market economy in these places.

And finally, on the economic issues, I think we need a long-term commitment to setting an environment that will free you to do what you want to do. That's why I have said any tax cut we have should not interfere with our effort to pay off the publicly held debt of this country over the next 15 years to get us out of debt for the first time since 1835 when Andrew Jackson was President.

Now, why—why would the allegedly more liberal party—and I say—or, the actually more liberal party—be for paying the country out of debt? It's the progressive thing to do. Why? Because in a global economy where interest rates are set by global markets as well as by central banks, our ability to grow depends upon your ability to get money. And our ability to give people a good life depends upon their ability to finance their homes, their cars, their businesses, their college loans for their kids.

And if we can get America out of debt, then, number one, we won't be crowding our own people, and interest rates will be lower here, which will mean higher growth and lower living costs for people; and, number two, when our friends get in trouble, as the Asian societies did a couple of years ago and we need to help them get back on their feet, they'll be able to get money at lower costs.

This is a huge, big idea. For 30 years, everybody in my generation was taught in college that a country had to have a good deal of debt; it was a healthy thing. There's not a soul here over 35 years old that took any number of economic classes that wasn't told that in economics. And it was right, under the model that existed at the time. But in a global economy with global capital markets, if we can get this country out of debt, we ought to do it so you can continue to borrow to grow the economy and create opportunity for a generation. It will change the whole future of America for 30 years.

The last thing I want to say is this. We must believe that all of America can be like this crowd of people standing in this yard tonight. That's why I'm for the "Employment Non-Discrimination Act." That's why I'm for the hate crimes legislation. That's why I started that—I've got a Presidential office on race now.

I've spent so much of my time trying to make peace in the Middle East, trying to make peace in Northern Ireland, trying to stop the Bosnian Muslims and the Kosovar Albanians from being slaughtered, trying to give the Africans the capacity to avoid the future Rwandas. And all over the world, I see people in this so-called modern world where we're celebrating all of your modern ideas and your modern achievements—what is the biggest problem in the world in America? We are dragged down by the most primitive of hatreds. It's bizarre. It's bizarre.

We celebrate all these companies that are here, and we read about Matthew Shepard being strung up in Wyoming and James Byrd being dragged to death in Texas. And a crazy guy that belongs to a church, alleged church that believes not in God but in white supremacy, goes out and starts killing people of color

in the Middle West. And another crazy guy goes and shoots a bunch of kids at a Jewish school and then guns down a Filipino postman in California.

You think about it. It is unbelievable that at the dawn of a new millennium, where technology is changing the way we work and live and relate to each other and the rest of the world more than at any time in history by far, opening vistas of human possibilities no one could have dreamed of a few years ago, we are being paralyzed by primitive hatreds.

And, therefore, I say to you the most important thing of all—more important than the economic policy, more important than anything else—is that our Nation stand for the proposition that we believe in the innate dignity and equality of every human being and anybody who is law abiding and hard working has a place at the American family table. That is the most important thing of all.

So what are we fighting about in Washington? The Congress—first, they wanted to have a tax cut that would give away the entire non-Social Security surplus, which they said they could do without cutting anything. I vetoed that because it wasn't true and it wasn't responsible. Now, their own Congressional Budget Office says they've already spent $18 billion of the Social Security surplus this year, which proves that the tax cut couldn't be financed. And all they're doing, instead of coming and trying to work it out with me, is running television ads trying to say we're doing it even though we don't have a majority vote in Congress.

Meanwhile, today Barbara Boxer spent all of her time fighting to keep our commitment to give the funds to the States and the school districts for 100,000 teachers so we can get class size down in the early grades, with the biggest student population we ever had in 1998—when the Congress passed it right before the election, all the Republicans went out and said, "This is our kind of program: no bureaucracy, no problems, great things, smaller classes." Now they're trying to kill it because they don't want the Democratic administration to have any achievement that is demonstrable and tangible that changes the lives of people. It is the smallest kind of politics. And who cares what happens to the kids?

So if you believe we have changed America for the better, then you should know—a lot of you have been my friends; you were there for me in the beginning, and I'm not on the ballot in the year 2000—but I want you to understand something. All I feel about this is gratitude. I am grateful that I had a chance to serve. I am grateful that I had a chance to play some role in this. But the reason we're around here after over 220 years is that principles and ideas are more important than individuals.

And that's why this Presidential race, that's why every Senate race, that's why every House race is so important. That's why your presence here is so important. So I implore you—I thank you for being here. I thank you for your contributions. It's a long way between now and the year 2000, but I'm telling you, every time you nodded your head tonight on every single issue I mentioned, there is a difference between where we stand and where they stand. So you stand with us and stand with us all the way until November 2000, and then we can make all of America more full of the things that you celebrate here in your own backyard.

Thank you, and God bless you. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:20 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to reception hosts Tom Adams and Jeanne Lavan; reception cochairs Steve Westly, chief executive officer, eBay, and Chris Larsen, founder and chief executive officer, E-Loan; Roy Romer, former general chair, Beth Dozoretz, national finance chair, and Joseph J. Andrew, national chair, Democratic National Committee; Mr. Romer's wife, Bea, and Ms. Dozoretz's husband, Ronald; Larry Stone, Santa Clara County, CA, assessor; and Bill Gates, chairman and chief executive officer, Microsoft Corp. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in Palo Alto

October 1, 1999

Thank you very much. I am delighted to be here in this beautiful home and this beautiful tent. I think I should tell you that when Eric and Wendy and their daughters have

opened their home to us, they have also opened their swimming pool to us. We're on top of the swimming pool; I say that not to make you nervous—[*laughter*]—because we all know that this is a community where technology reigns supreme. There will be no failure of the technology here.

You might be interested to know that the White House press room, where you sometimes see me answering questions at briefings, that's also on a swimming pool. The President used to have a swimming pool there. And when President Nixon got in, he thought that he should do something for the press and give them closer access to the White House, so he covered up the swimming pool and gave it to the press, which resulted in his getting a lot of really good press as a result of that great and generous gesture. [*Laughter*] I said that because I always like to see the reporters laugh, and they're over there. [*Laughter*]

I am delighted to be here. I thank Joe Andrew and Beth Dozoretz and Governor and Mrs. Romer and all the people from the Democrat Party for being here. I'm glad Congresswoman Anna Eshoo got home. I don't know when she got back, but they have been voting like crazy for a long time. I want to thank John and Ann Doerr and Sandy Robertson and Scott Cook for their help on this event tonight, as well.

Let me say, what we're going to do tonight is what I prefer to do, which is after we have dinner, we're just going to have a little conversation. And so I won't speak very long. I want to thank Eric for what he said. I have tried to be a good President, to support the growth and opportunities of this community, although it is not true that I'm not technologically challenged; I am. But I understand a lot of things I can't do. Most of you do, too. So I try to understand well enough to be a good President, and I've had an enormous amount of help from the Vice President, from others, and from many people here.

I think that a lot of people in this community who have been working with us since 1991 would genuinely be surprised at how very much influence and input you have had in the decisions that we've tried to make for America over the last 7 years. And you've also had very articulate voices speaking up for you, including Anna Eshoo, Zoe Lofgren, Ellen Tauscher, and others, and I thank them all.

The other thing that I would like to say is that I am very grateful for the opportunity I've had to serve as President, to have a chance to help to give you the chance, and people like you all over America the chance to do all the marvelous things which have occurred in the last 6½ years. I especially feel that way about the technology community which represents—the high tech community represents about—directly—not indirectly but directly, about 8 percent of our economy, but 30 percent of our growth since 1993. And it's something that you can be very proud of.

So what I tried to do for this community—I also was very mindful—was something we were doing for all of America, that it would benefit all of America, that it would lift our country and broaden the horizons and possibilities of the future for our children.

The last point I would like to make is this, and I hope we can talk more about it inside. The central issue for the American people as citizens, as we head into a new election season, and the first one in a long, long time I haven't been a direct part of, is not whether we will vote for change, but what kind of change we want to embrace.

You know here, as well as any group of people in America, that avoiding change is not an option; if we all do nothing, we're going to change because the way we work and live and relate to each other and the rest of the world is changing at a breathtaking pace. So the question is, what deliberate decisions will we make about the nature of change that we hope to shape and we hope to grasp?

The argument I've been trying to make to the American people, I think with some success, to the Democrats in Congress with some success and to the Republicans in Congress with more limited success, is that we ought to identify the largest challenges facing our country that we now are in a position to grasp because of our current prosperity and the projected financial lines that we see in the future.

The biggest ones, I believe, are, number one, the demographic challenge caused by the retirement of the baby boomers. We have to lengthen the life of the Social Security Trust Fund, as well as to make it easier for people to have more private savings so that when people my age and younger retire, the baby boomers, we don't bankrupt our kids and undermine their ability to raise our grandkids.

Number two, that requires not only Social Security but some changes in Medicare as well. Number two, we have to deal with the education of the most diverse and the largest group of schoolchildren in our history. Eric told you that he was at the education summit that the Governors had—the second one over the last 4 years. It was the 10th anniversary of the first education summit we had at the University of Virginia when I represented the Democratic Governors and President Bush was in office, and we set goals.

And then we argued that there ought to be standards to achieve those goals, and now, when I became President, only 16 States, led by Governor Romer, who was the leader of the Governors on education, had really enforceable standards. Now 50 do—in 4 years. That's good. Only 11 States had real accountability for schools and teachers and students. Now we still only have 16. So the next big thing we've got to do is get more charter schools out there, more options, and then assist them where you end social promotion, but give kids the support they need. And you have to turn around failing schools or shut them down, but there are options like charter schools if the schools aren't working. That's the next big frontier there, but that's very important.

The third big challenge I think we face is the global environmental challenge. Many of you in this room work on technologies which demonstrate to you every day that modern developments have broken the link between economic growth and putting more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. But a lot of people don't believe that.

A House subcommittee last year made us spend something like $400,000 trying to defend our position on global warming, which was not taxes, not regulation; it was markets and tax incentives to basically accelerate the development and the widespread use of available technologies that would grow the economy while improving the environment. And they think it's some dark conspiracy to take us back to the stone age economy. And we see this all over the world, and it will be a terrible problem for our children unless we do something about it.

There's a new book out by Paul Hawken, and it's called "Natural Capitalism," that I commend to all of you. No one could read it and come away with any conclusion other than we could actually accelerate the growth of this economy if we got very serious about energy conservation and the development of alternative energy sources. We would accelerate, not slow down, the growth of the economy. So it's a huge issue, I think.

The fourth thing that I would like to say is I think that we have got to find a way to sustain, to keep pushing the limits of the business cycle. When I became President, I was told by my own economists that if we got the unemployment rate below 6 percent for 6 months or more, we'd have inflation. And it's been below 4.5 percent for 2 years, and we don't have much. I don't think we've repealed all the laws of economics here. I don't even think you can do that. But what we have done is to plug into the global economy and emerging technologies in a way that make it possible to fundamentally change the parameters of business cycles and the heaves of supply and demand. In order to do that, what I think we have to do, among other things, in Government, is to keep paying down the debt.

And I've given the Congress a proposal that, if they would adopt it, would deal with these other challenges I've mentioned, provide for a modest tax cut and still enable us to get America out of debt by 2015 for the first time since 1835. And I think it would be very good economics, because with interest rates set by global markets to have in America a situation where the Government wasn't competing with you for money, and we were going to have lower interest rates for a generation, in my judgment would lead to higher standards of living, more business growth, more jobs, and a more stable future.

So I think this idea of paying down the debt, which sounds like a very old idea in the context of the global economy, is actually a new one. There are a few of you here in this room that are almost as old as I am, and anybody who is—certainly anybody who is 40 or over who went to college and took any number of economics courses, was taught by people that we ought to have a healthy amount of debt; every country needed a certain amount of debt because you were always borrowing to invest in the future.

Then, in the 12 years before I took office, we borrowed just to put food on the table as a government, which was a disaster. We may need to do that again someday. But right now, in this global economy, we'd be better off getting out of debt.

The last point I want to make is, this is something you should all ponder—no it's not, it's the next to the last point I want to make is—[*laughter*]—not everybody has participated in this economic growth. Yes, we've got the lowest poverty rate in 20 years, the lowest African-American poverty rate ever recorded, the lowest Hispanic poverty rate in 20 years, and I'm proud of all that. But there is a huge number of working people and their children in poverty and skirting on the edges. They have not participated in this recovery, and we just have to face that. Even though unemployment is the lowest it's been in 29 years. And a lot of them are physically isolated in inner cities and the Delta of the Mississippi River and Appalachia and Indian reservations. Technology can have a lot to do with how we overcome that. But we have got to find a way to bring enterprise to poor people, because the distribution of intelligence in this country is fairly even. We have to figure out a way to make the distribution of usable opportunity even enough to get a core of enterprise in these poor areas here and around the world.

This really is the last point. One of the most ironic experiences I have had as President is that I have been privileged to work with you and others to build a truly modern economy for America, an economy for the 21st century. But so much of my leadership in foreign and domestic policy has been required to deal with the emotional and practical and national security demands caused by the eruption of primitive hatreds—from Bosnia to the Middle East to Northern Ireland to African tribal warfare to the Oklahoma City bombing to this whole spate of the ethnic and racial and religious and anti-gay violence we've had in America in the last 2 years.

It's quite interesting, isn't it? I mean, here you are out here; all you think about is the new millennium—you just gave me a book about the these hard questions to ask about the next thousand years. Isn't it ironic that the thing that's holding us back most in fulfilling our shared potential is our inability to form a community around our common humanity because of our vulnerability to mankind's most ancient fears—the fear of the other? And so I think we need to deal with that.

I'm very proud that I believe my party is on the right side of all those issues, and I thank you for being here to help us tonight.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:35 p.m. to a private residence. In this remarks, he referred to dinner hosts Eric and Wendy Schmidt; Joseph J. Andrew, national chair, Beth Dozoretz, national finance chair, and Roy Romer, former general chair, Democratic National Committee; Mr. Romer's wife, Bea; attorney John Doerr and his wife, Ann; Sandford Robertson, founder and chair, Banc Robertson Stephens; and Scott Cook, founder and director, Intuit, Inc. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

October 2, 1999

Good morning. Although my voice has been a little hoarse, I want to speak with you this morning about your voice, about how you can make the difference this week to help secure the vital health care protections you've long deserved.

Like many of you, I've been appalled by the tragic stories of men and women fighting for their lives, and at the same time forced to fight insurance companies focused only on the bottom line. I've met the husbands and wives of those who have died when insurance

companies overruled a doctor's urgent warnings. I met a former HMO employee who broke down in tears when describing how callous delays wound up costing a 12-year-old cancer patient his leg. If we work together, we've got the power to put patients first once again.

Just this week Governor Gray Davis signed into law an ambitious health care reform package, giving 20 million residents of California a strong and enforceable Patients' Bill of Rights. Now it's time to do the same for every American, because it doesn't matter whether you're from California or Connecticut or anywhere in between; families all across our Nation need greater patient protections at this time of great change in medical care.

My administration has worked hard to do its part. Through executive action, we've granted all of the patient protections we can give under law to more than 85 million Americans who get their health care through Federal plans.

Today I'm pleased to announce that this month we'll propose rules to extend patient protections to each and every child covered under the Children's Health Insurance Program. These children are from some of our hardest pressed working families. That's why I feel so strongly about giving them not only access to health care but also the guarantee of quality care.

Yet, some in Congress still seem intent on moving in the opposite direction. Republican leaders recently have attached language to a budget bill to deprive 120 million employees of the right to a timely internal appeal of any coverage decision that denies them care they were promised. Blocking this basic right is simply unacceptable. It puts special interests first and patients last.

But this week the House of Representatives has a chance to effectively erase this action as they sit down to vote at long last on whether to give all Americans in health plans all the protections of the Patients' Bill of Rights. This vote is critical. For all of the steps this administration and many States have taken to extend patient rights, we don't have the authority to protect every family unless Congress acts.

So I encourage you to urge your Representatives to vote for the comprehensive bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights, sponsored by Congressmen Charlie Norwood and John Dingell. This legislation will give every American the right to emergency room care and the right to see a specialist; the right to know you can't be forced to switch doctors in the middle of a cancer treatment or pregnancy; the right to hold your health care plan accountable if it causes you or a loved one great harm.

The bill had already been endorsed by more than 300 health care and consumer groups all across America. I'm convinced the votes are there to pass this Patients' Bill of Rights this week. But we need your help to make it clear to the Republican leaders that we can't tolerate any attempt to kill this bill with legislative poison pills.

Together, let's tell them to give this legislation the straight up or down vote it deserves. Let's not allow anything to jeopardize the remarkable bipartisan consensus we have worked so hard to build. If you make your voice heard and Republican leaders permit every Member to vote on the strong bipartisan bill that stands today, this week can bring the most important health protections in years. Partisan posturing and delay will only make matters worse. To me, it's the same choice patients face every day: active, preventive medicine now or expensive, last-minute interventions later. The American people are counting on the Congress, and especially the Republican leaders, to make the responsible choice.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 12:50 p.m. on October 1 in the Eiffel Tower Restaurant at the Paris Hotel in Las Vegas, NV, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on October 2. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 1 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast.

Remarks at an Access Now for Gay and Lesbian Equality Dinner in Beverly Hills, California

October 2, 1999

Thank you. Let me say, first of all, I thank you for that. I'm profoundly moved. And I was thinking when I was watching David Mixner make those remarks that 30 years ago, when I let him sleep on my floor—[*laughter*]—when we were much younger men in England, and I didn't charge him a nickel for it—[*laughter*]—I never dreamed that either of us would be in this place tonight doing these things. [*Laughter*]

David's life has taken a lot of twists and turns since then. He's had his ups and his downs like all the rest of us. But I can tell you something, when I met him when he was young, I thought I had never met a person whose heart burned with the fire of social justice so strongly. He has never forgotten the roots of his childhood. He has never forgotten not only the pain that he and other gay and lesbian Americans have endured; he also cares for other people who are dispossessed and downtrodden and underrepresented and often forgotten.

And tonight I was watching him, and he introduced his wonderful sister—who has also been a friend of mine for nearly 30 years now—and I was thinking how fortunate we are in this country at this time, with all the things we've had to do, to have had his energy, his heart, his devotion, his passion. It was 8 years ago that he and Scott Hitt and a few other ANGLE members met with me this week 8 years ago, here. Then in May of '92 we had a big event out here, and some of you were there. And I told you that I had a vision of America, and you were part of it, that we were all part of the same community.

Well, tonight I thank you for helping to make that happen. I thank my good friend Governor Gray Davis for the leadership he has given in California. I thank our leader in the House of Representatives, who—when David made that crack about the "Canterbury Tales" and how we're known by our traveling companions—[*laughter*]—it kind of made me feel sorry for Dick Gephardt. [*Laughter*] You talk about a guy that gets up and goes to work every day under adverse conditions and continues to do the right thing, he does.

But I know that Representatives Baldwin and Becerra and Kennedy and Sherman and Waxman are here, and they're his good fellow travelers. We just may need five more in the company to make it a much better trip. [*Applause*] Thank you.

I want to thank Bill Melamed, Skip Paul, Gwen Baba, Roberta Bennett for putting this together. I want to thank the members of our administration who came: Sean Maloney, Karen Tramontano, Minyon Moore, Fred Hochberg, Richard Socarides, Marsha Scott. And I want to thank Scott Hitt, especially, who's been the Chair of the AIDS council. He's having his last meeting as Chair on Monday, and he's been magnificent, and we ought to give him a big hand. [*Applause*]

I'd also like to thank the Gay Men's Chorus. I was back there feverishly trying to write down all those lines. [*Laughter*] I want to call Hillary and give her those best lines tonight. You know, I'm trying to remember them all. It was unbelievable. If someone would furnish me with the lyrics of that song, I would be eternally grateful. [*Laughter*]

You know, I'd like to put what brought us all here tonight just for a minute—I know a lot of other people are going to speak and have a lot of great things to say, but I would like to put this in, just for a moment, in the context of history and the larger context of our future, and how the fight for equal rights and equal opportunity and full participation to build one America fits in with all the other things we should be doing as a country, and how what we are at home will determine what we can do around the world in the new millennium.

When I ran for President in 1992, most Americans felt things were pretty dismal in this country. The economy was in bad shape; the society was divided; all the social indicators—crime, welfare, and other things—were going in the wrong direction. Politics was, as we all remember from the convention they had back then on the other side, a matter of division, you know, just drive a wedge in society and make sure your wedge is bigger than their wedge; you get more votes, you

win; and if everybody is all torn up and upset, who cares, you're in power.

And over and over and over again, things in Washington were sort of repeating themselves like a broken record. And I felt that we could do better with a unifying vision. That's why I set out a vision of America, and you were part of it. But I also had a vision that we could build an economy that was good for working people and employers. I believed we could build a country where we could grow the economy and make the environment better, not worse.

I have always believed that the real purpose of life and growth is to try and figure out how to develop these unifying visions and to move closer to them and to break down all these funny walls we have to put up in our minds to organize life into little boxes so we can figure out how to get from here to there.

And, you know, in '92, the American people just sort of took a chance on me and Al Gore. I mean, it was an argument we made and there was no evidence for it because the other crowd had been in so long. We just made an argument. And it was not an easy race. A month after we had that meeting out here in May of '92, I won the California primary. And the headline the next day was that the exit poll showed that all the people that voted for me really wanted Ross Perot to be President. [*Laughter*] And I was in third place.

And then he and President Bush got in a fight about who messed up whose daughter's wedding or something. [*Laughter*] You remember that? I mean, it was an amazing—and I thought to myself, people don't have jobs; they're being foreclosed on; why are you guys fighting about this? The wedding went off without a hitch. What is this about? [*Laughter*] And somehow the American people decided to give me a chance, decided to give Al and Hillary and Tipper and all the people that came in the administration a chance.

I guess what I'd like to say tonight, first of all—not with arrogance, but with humility—is that we now know that there is evidence that we're right and that pulling things together and moving forward actually works. We have the lowest unemployment in 29 years, the lowest welfare rolls in 32 years, the lowest poverty rates in 20 years, the lowest crime rates in 26 years, the first back-to-back budget surpluses in 42 years, the highest homeownership in history, the longest peacetime expansion in history.

And you have to—15 million Americans took leave under the family leave law. And when it was vetoed in the previous administration, they said, "Oh, well, we've got to veto this bill because if we let people take time off from work when their babies are born or their parents are sick, why, it will ruin the small business economy." And every year, we've set a new record for new small businesses in America.

Ninety percent of our kids are immunized against serious diseases for the first time, our young children. We're giving 5 million more of them health insurance. A hundred thousand young people served in AmericCorps. I could just go on and on. And along the way, we gave America the most diverse, truly representative government by far in the history of America. That included you and everybody else.

What I want to say to you is, this is not an argument anymore. [*Laughter*] We have evidence. And so you should be of good cheer. And when you look ahead to these elections in 2000, you should be absolutely sure that anybody who is not with you knows they're doing it in the face of the evidence.

And because—what really bothers me about what's going on in Washington now, it's like there are all these people out there making decisions in the congressional majority as if the last 6½ years just didn't happen. And that bothers me. So I say to you, when they say, looking at the Vice President and our party, "Well, America needs a change," I agree with that. America always needs a change. We've got a lot more to do on your agenda. America needs a change? The question is not whether we'll change, but how are we going to change? How are we going to change?

You mark my words, the world is changing so fast in how we work and live and relate to each other and folks around the globe, that the world will change. The question is, how? And are we going to use this unprecedented moment, the chance of a lifetime to say, okay,

what are our big challenges out there, and seize them? Or are we going to do what got us into so much trouble in the first place? Are we going to pretend that the last 6½ years just didn't happen? That's very important.

And I want to try to put the things that you're thinking about now into that context. What are the really big challenges facing America that affect you, too? One, the aging of America—I hate it because I'm doing it. [*Laughter*] But I'm the oldest of the baby boomers. The number of people over 65 will double in the next 30 years; there will be two people working for every one person retired and drawing Social Security.

Now, we have never been in a position, until now, in my lifetime, to deal with that challenge. But we now have the ability to run the life of Social Security out 50 years, to add more than a decade to the life of Medicare, to cover prescription drugs for elderly people—three-quarters of them cannot afford quality prescription drugs today—and to do it in a way that all of you who are younger than that should rejoice about. Because I can tell you those of us in the baby boom generation are plagued by the notion that our retirement will be so expensive for our country that it will burden our children and our ability to give our grandchildren the childhoods they deserve. But we can fix it now. So I gave them a plan to do it. So far, they say no.

Another thing that really bothers me—we've got the largest and most diverse group of children in our school in history. We never had over 53 million children in schools, and they come from more different backgrounds than ever before. And that will be a godsend to 21st century America if, but only if, they all have a world-class education. And I think they're entitled to it.

So I gave Congress a plan to build and modernize 6,000 schools and hire 100,000 teachers for smaller classes; make sure all the kids had computers in their classrooms; make sure we stopped social promotion, but had after-school programs for the kids who needed it; and more of these charter schools that California has led the way in bringing to our children. So far, they said no.

Funny thing, maybe Mr. Gephardt will talk about this later, but one of the most interesting things is last year, right before the election in '98, they got religion on this education program. [*Laughter*] And they supported this big downpayment on our plan for 100,000 teachers, and we funded 30,000 of those teachers. And you had those real liberals, like Mr. Armey—[*laughter*]—going home—this is serious business, ask Dick. You had these real liberals going out and saying, "Man, this is a great thing we've done. We've made a big downpayment on 100,000 teachers; we're going to put 30,000 teachers out there, and this is a great Republican program because there is no bureaucracy in it. We just give it to the schools, and they hire the teachers." They thought it was the greatest thing since sliced bread before the election.

They have just voted not only to refuse to fund any more of those but to no longer earmark the money for the 30,000. So there's a big difference here.

I'm worried about the families of our country. I'm worried about all these working people. How are they going to have the child care they need? How are they going to have the health care they need? Why don't we pass the Patients' Bill of Rights that protects working people? There's a difference between the two parties on that, and I think it's important.

We're finally going to get a chance—we've been working for 2 years—finally going to get a chance to vote on the Patients' Bill of Rights in the House next week. I'm very worried about this fabulous economy, because we've left some people behind. Yes, we've got the lowest poverty rate in 20 years, but there are still people in places that have not felt this recovery. If you come from—a lot of you come from other places, the Mississippi Delta, Appalachia, the Indian reservations, many of the inner cities. So I want to do some things that I think will change all that. I want to, first of all, give Americans with money the same incentives to invest in poor areas in America we give them to invest in poor areas around the world. I think that's important.

I hope in the near future we'll be able to make access to the Internet as universal as

telephone access is. It will have a huge impact on the economy. Last night I was in northern California, and I was with some people who work with eBay. A lot of you probably buy things on eBay. [*Laughter*] It seems like everybody does now. And I learned that over and above the employees of that company, there are now over 20,000 people, including a lot of people that used to be on welfare, who actually make a living buying and selling things, trading on eBay, over 20,000 people.

Well, I'm telling you, that means nothing at the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota, where the unemployment rate is 73 percent. Now, we can do better. And we ought not to quit until every American has the chance to participate in our prosperity if he or she is willing to work. And I won't rest until that happens.

I want you to keep a checklist in your mind, and when I get to the end, ask yourself what's all this about, what's it got to do with you as Americans. This is part of being part of America. I think we need to do more, not less, for the environment. The Vice President has this livability agenda to deal with, using all kinds of computer technology to alleviate traffic congestion, to buy more green space in urban areas. We're trying to lead the world toward recognizing that this global warming is real, but that you do not have to end your economic growth, because now there are technologies available to allow us to grow the economy as we reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. There are people in the other party who believe that this is some sort of subversive plot to wreck America's economic future.

Not very long ago, I came out here and went to San Bernardino, to the Inland Empire, and we announced a housing development for low income working people in which the developers pledged, by the use of energy conservation technologies, to cut the utility bills of these low income working people by 40 percent. And I just got a report that the average reduction is 60 percent. That's good for the economy. That's not bad for the economy, and it's good for the environment.

Let me just mention a couple of other things. I am very concerned that America, even though we've got the lowest crime rate in 26 years, is still a pretty dangerous country compared to other countries. We should be the safest big country in the world. This is a free and prosperous place. We welcome all kinds of people. It is not rational. Why aren't we the safest country in the world? Because we haven't taken reasonable steps, not enough of them, to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and children. And because, frankly, even though we've put 100,000 more police on the street in community policing, we've still got neighborhoods that don't have enough coverage.

So I gave Congress a plan to deal with both those things: put 50,000 more police officers out there to prevent crime in the highest crime areas of the country and to deal with guns and so forth. They say no. Our crowd says yes; their crowd says no. Big difference.

What about our role in the world? I've tried, from Bosnia to Kosovo to the Middle East to Northern Ireland, to stand up for the idea that people ought not to be murdered or moved wholesale because of their race or their religion. We have worked to support other countries and to build the capacity in Africa to prevent future Rwandas, because people ought not to be murdered because of what tribe they're in. And you can define tribe however you want. [*Laughter*]

We're about to start a great debate on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, to end nuclear testing, something that Dwight Eisenhower and John Kennedy wanted us to do years ago. We're finally going to have a chance to do it. In so many of these areas, there are partisan differences which surprise me. And let me come back to you.

Why are we for the hate crimes legislation? Why are we for "ENDA"? Because if we can't build one America, it's going to be very hard to have a unifying force that will deal with every other one of these issues. And that's what I want you to think about. Don't you think that it's interesting that here we are on the verge of this new millennium with all these absolutely breathtaking technological breakthroughs that people who are technologically challenged, like me, can hardly keep up with? [*Laughter*]

I mean, isn't it amazing to you that we have—modernity is bursting out all over in

the form of high technology. And yet, the world's largest problem, and America's largest problem, that you can see when those kids got shot at that Jewish school and that Filipino postal worker was murdered here; that you could see when that guy who said he belonged to a church that didn't believe in God but did believe in white supremacy killed all those people of color and wounded others in Illinois and Indiana; that you could see when Matthew Shepard was murdered and James Byrd was torn apart; and that you can see in the tribal slaughters of Rwanda, and the persecution of the Kosovar Albanians or the Bosnian Muslims or the fights in Northern Ireland or the continued agonies of the Middle East—here we are on the verge of this great modern world, where we can make movies with virtual reality now, and virtual reality seems sometimes more real than what is real. And the biggest problem we've got is the primitive, age-old fear and hatred and dehumanization of the other people who aren't like us.

And so I say—I'm nearly done; I just want to say this—[*laughter*]—I'm going to do everything I can, every day that I have, to remind people of that, that we have to be one America. We can have honest differences over issues, but we can't have honest differences about whether we share a common humanity. And we cannot be under the illusion that either material prosperity or technological breakthroughs alone can purge the darkness in our hearts.

I believe that America's best days are still out there. I believe with all my heart that we can find a way to marry prosperity and peace and humanity. But we must have a unifying vision. I want to say, again, I am grateful to people who have worked in my administration who have made me more alive to the concerns of your community, not only those who themselves are gay and lesbian, but others, beginning with my Vice President, who has been terrific on all of that in ways you will never know.

But people are still scared of people who aren't like them. And other people are scared of themselves, and they're afraid they won't count unless they've got somebody to look down on. And if you have to find somebody to look down on, it must be somebody that is different from you. Because if you look down on somebody who is just like you, then you're looking down on yourself. [*Laughter*] And so we, in our little minds, come up with all these boxes. But all of life is a struggle to find a more and more and more and more unifying vision that, at least for me, makes us both more human and more in tune with our maker.

I wish I could have done better. But we've done pretty well. And we're a long way from where we were. But I want you to think about this a little bit every day between now and next year, 13 months until the millennial election to define what America will be like; whether we will continue to embrace these big challenges and change in a positive way, building on what we now have evidence of; whether we will continue to look for those unifying visions that allow us all to join hands and go forward together.

And I want you to remember the enthusiasm with which you greeted me tonight. And I want you to remember that it's easy to shout in the moment. But the world is turned by those who day in and day out, with courage and determination and heart and hope, stay the course. We need you. America needs you. I still believe in the future of America, and you are a part of it.

Thank you, and God bless you. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:10 p.m. in the International Ballroom at the Beverly Hills Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to ANGLE member David Mixner, who introduced the President, and his sister, Patricia Mixner Annison; H. Scott Hitt, Chairman, President's Advisory Council on HIV/AIDS; Gov. Gray Davis of California; and ANGLE members and dinner cochairs Bill Melamed, Skip Paul, Gwen Baba, and Roberta Bennett. The President also referred to ENDA, the proposed "Employment Non-Discrimination Act."

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Reception and Dinner in Brentwood Park, California

October 2, 1999

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, I've already been to the ANGLE dinner tonight. We had a wonderful time. I've looked forward to coming to Rob and

Michelle's place; they've been so great to me and to Hillary all these years. But it's 2 o'clock on my body clock—[*laughter*]—and I'm reduced to being Gray Davis' straight man. [*Laughter*] I mean, it's humiliating enough to think about leaving office, you know—[*laughter*]—trading in "Hail to The Chief" for a rap. [*Laughter*]

I mean, if President Reagan could be an actor and become a President, if Michael Douglas is your next choice, maybe I could become an actor. [*Laughter*] And I've got a good pension; I can work cheap, which is unusual around here. [*Laughter*]

I told Mel Brooks when I met him, that I was so thrilled. I mean, I got to see Carl and meet Mel and tell him I've read "The 2000 Year Old Man" book and gotten all my laughs. I have a videotape of "Blazing Saddles," and I watch it every 6 months whether I need to or not. [*Laughter*] I told him, you know, all the Republicans, they've been fighting over what to do about Pat Buchanan now that he's got this interesting interpretation of World War II. [*Laughter*] And I suggested that Mel might put him in a remake of "The Producers." That would be a good thing to do with Pat Buchanan. [*Laughter*]

Let me say very briefly that the problem with all these events is that at some point, I know we're all preaching to the saved, but there are a few points I would like to make. I want to thank Rob and Michele and Alan and Cindy for cohosting this, and all the cochairs who put this together. I want to thank the Governor and Sharon and Attorney General Lockyer, Speaker Villaraigosa, and Kathleen Connell and the assemblywoman who is here—congratulations on your legislation being signed today. I want to thank my longtime friend and former colleague Governor Romer, and Beth Dozoretz, our finance chair of the Democratic Party, and all of you who came here.

You know why you're here, but I would like to just make a couple of points very quickly about what we're facing, what the stakes are, why this is important. When I came to California in 1991, this State was in terrible shape economically, and there was an awful lot of social tension. We even had a civil disorder here. And the politics of America were dominated by the continuing attempts of the Republicans, nationally, basically to demonize the Democrats after the fashion that Gray Davis described. And Washington seemed to be basically in this sort of death grip of repeating the same old fight over and over again.

I had this idea that no one else in America thought like they behaved in Washington—unfortunately, it is still largely true—[*laughter*]—and that we needed a unifying theory of our national politics, one that would bring people together; that would increase opportunity for every responsible citizen; that would say to every person, without regard to their race or gender or sexual orientation or their religion, you can be part of our America if you're willing to do your part; and that unless we did that we could never fulfill our responsibilities around the world or maximize people's opportunities here at home.

But it was just an argument. I mean, I said, look, you know, we can help labor and business; we can improve the economy and actually make the environment cleaner, not worse. We can expand trade and put a more human face on the global economy. We can prevent crime and still punish people, who do really bad things, more severely. We can have a unifying theory. We've got to get out of this either/or business and dividing the electorate up into wedges and hope you get the biggest piece of the pie. But it was just an argument, because there was no evidence because they'd had the White House a long time.

And except for the 4-year Carter interregnum, they'd had it since 1968, with various incarnations of the same social politics of division, and then Mr. Reagan and Mr. Bush brought in the supply-side economics, which defied arithmetic and quadrupled the debt in 12 years. [*Laughter*]

And there were periods when we had a good economy, but I used to have a senior Senator named Dale Bumpers who had a great line about supply-side economics. He said, "If you'll let me write $2 billion worth of hot checks, I'll show you a good time, too." [*Laughter*]

Anyway, so I said, "Look, this may give you a headache, but we've got to get rid of this debt. We've got to bring the deficit

down, eventually get rid of it, turn it around, and we've got to do it in a way that continues to invest in our future." I tried to find unifying ways of getting people to think about how we could all win and all go forward. But it was just an argument.

And then the American people gave Al Gore and me a chance to serve, led by the electoral votes of California. And in '96, things were rocking along pretty well, so you gave us another chance to serve, and we got an even bigger vote in California.

But it's not an argument anymore. The evidence is in. And that's what makes the present struggle in Washington and the reported political strength of our adversaries so interesting, because the evidence is in. We have the lowest unemployment rate in 29 years, the lowest welfare rates in 32 years, the lowest crime rates in 26 years, the lowest poverty rates in 20 years, the lowest African-American poverty rate ever before, the first back-to-back budget surpluses in 42 years, the highest home ownership in history, the longest peacetime expansion in history. This is not about argument; it's about evidence.

Now, I say that not to say, "Boy, I did a great job." Because I don't believe—I'm very touched if somebody comes up to me and says, "Gosh, I wish you could run again." You know how politicians are. You hear one person, you're convinced they're 50 million calling. [*Laughter*]

I say that to make this point—not a personal one. I feel privileged to have been able to serve. I'm grateful. If my life ended tomorrow, I'd be way ahead. But if we had done the wrong things, we would not have gotten those results. The reason I'm here for the Democratic Party—I can't run for anything else—I'm here because I think we did the right things. And I want us to keep doing the right things, and I want America to keep doing the right things.

The other guys will say, "Well, we ought to make a change." And guess what? I agree with that. I wouldn't vote for anybody who said, whose campaign was, "I think Bill Clinton's the greatest thing since sliced bread; vote for me, and I'll do what he did." [*Laughter*] I would vote against that person. We're not around here after over 200 years for any reason other than we kept true to our principles, but we were always reinventing ourselves, always seizing new vistas.

The issue is, what are we going to do now? I've asked the Congress and the country to take this huge moment of opportunity to deal with the consequences of the baby boomers retiring; to save Social Security and Medicare; to deal with the consequences of the largest and most diverse student population in history, being in our schools; to bring genuine excellence to our schools; to deal with the consequences of the fact that there's still a lot of people, believe it or not, who aren't a part of this marvelous economy of ours.

If you go to the Mississippi Delta or to Appalachia or to the Indian reservations or to many of our inner-city neighborhoods, there are people and places where there is no free enterprise. And I've offered a plan for that to give people like you the same incentives to invest in poor communities in America that we give you to invest in poor communities overseas. I think we ought to work to make Internet access as universal as telephone access is. It will make a huge impact in the poor areas of our country.

You know, I learned in northern California last night that there are 20,000 Americans making a living on eBay. Not people who work for eBay, not people who work for the company, people who—including a lot of people who used to be on welfare—people who make a living trading on eBay. Just think what we could do in America if access to the Internet were as universal as access to the telephone.

So I want us to do something about that. I want to think about the economy of the next generation. I want us to—we're paying the debt down now. If I'd run for President, if I had come here in '92 and said, "Vote for me; I'll balance the budget, run a surplus, and start paying down the debt," you would have said, "He is such a nice young man, but he's totally deluded." [*Laughter*] "Let's see if we can't get him a good psychiatrist to see and vote for someone else." If I had told you, "Vote for me, we'll have 19½ million jobs, in 6½ years, we'll be paying the debt down," you would have thought I was crazy.

But we can pay this debt down. And the Democrats, as the progressive party, should

be for our plan to pay the debt down over the next 15 years so that we're out of debt for the first time since 1835 when Andrew Jackson was President. Why? Because in a global economy, money is fungible and crosses international borders quickly. And if we don't owe anything as a government, all the money you have to borrow, and people like you, will be cheaper. That means there will be lower cost business loans, more businesses, more jobs, higher incomes; families can send their kids to college cheaper; they can finance homes cheaper; and when our friends around the world get in trouble, the way the Asians did over the last couple of years, they can get the money they need for less. This is a huge deal.

Now, those are just some of the things. Let me just mention a couple of other things. I believe, as strongly as I can tell you, that the environment will be an even bigger issue in the next 20 years than it has in the last 20. And I believe that the United States will either lead the way or block the way toward a solution to this problem of global warming. Global warming occurs when we burn things that put greenhouse gases in the atmosphere—primarily, coal and oil.

It used to be that you couldn't grow a modern economy and get a whole people rich unless you burned a lot of coal and oil. That is not true anymore. That's a big idea that's no longer true. Just outside Los Angeles, in San Bernardino, there's a working class, low income housing development that our administration built with the homebuilders with a view toward energy conservation, and we promised these low income working people, if they bought those homes, their utility bills would go down an average of 40 percent. So far, the average is down 60 percent. Why? Better windows, better lights, better insulation. It is not rocket science.

One of the Japanese car manufacturers will offer a car in the United States next year that will get 70 miles to the gallon, that will run on a composite of electricity and gasoline: Turn it on with electricity, get up to 30 miles an hour, automatically kicks into gasoline; you break down, it automatically kicks back into electricity. These are just two simple examples.

There's a new book out I commend to you by Paul Hawken and Amory and Hunter Lovins called, "Natural Capitalism." And if you read it, you will be convinced that whatever you're doing and however well you're doing it, you could make a lot of money on the side by getting into alternative sources of energy and energy conservation. This is a huge deal.

What do all these ideas have in common? They are things that bring us together instead of driving us apart. We ought to do—Gray Davis did a good thing on gun control, but we can make America so the crime rate's the lowest it's been in 26 years. We ought to make America the safest big country in the world. If we're the most prosperous big country in the world, if we're the freest big country in the world, we ought to be the safest big country in the world. Why aren't we? Because we don't do enough to keep guns out of the hands of the wrong people, because we don't do enough to give kids positive things to do, because we don't do enough to get mental health care in a preventive way to people who need it. We can make America the safest big country in the world. But to do it, we have to have a unifying theory.

We can't continue to believe that if we jail more people than anybody else on Earth and that's all we have to do because that'll get us by the next election, that that's enough. Now, I am a Democrat by heritage, instinct, and conviction. But we have proved that the ideas we have will give us a stronger economy, a safer country, a more constructive role in the world, a fair and more decent society, and a cleaner environment. We've proved that.

But there are these huge challenges out here. And I'll just close with this. I've spent a lot of my time as your President trying to stop people from killing each other because they hated each other over their racial or regional or tribal differences, whether it was the Kosovar Albanians or the Bosnian Muslims or the continuing conflict in the Middle East, in Northern Ireland, or trying to help African nations build their own ability to stop future Rwandas.

And when you put that—we look at that and we think, oh, that's so horrible, and just look what happened in America in the last

few weeks. Here is Los Angeles, you had the shooting at the Jewish school, and then the same guy apparently murders a Filipino postal worker. Then, there is a guy out in the Middle West in Illinois and Indiana who says he belongs to a church that doesn't believe in God but does believe in white supremacy, so he kills a black former basketball coach and a young Korean coming out of his church—a church where he did believe in God—and a number of others. Then you have—this is the year anniversary of Matthew Shepard's death, and you had that African-American man literally dragged to death and torn apart in Texas. And I could go on and on.

Don't you think it's interesting that we are living in the time of greatest technological advance in history? You know, if you think about it, the Internet is probably more significant, in terms of its long-term impact on the change in the nature of communication, maybe even than the printing press. Just think about it; it's the fastest growing—do you know there were only 50 webpages in the entire world when I became President? In the whole world. The Internet was the providence of theoretical physicists when I took office.

So every day all we do is think about all this modernity and all this great technology and all this stuff going on, and yet, all of our dreams for our children are threatened by our vulnerability to the most primitive of human weaknesses: the fear, the hatred, the dehumanization of the other people who are different from us. Interesting, isn't it?

So we're going into this new millennium where we're going to all have 500 channels on our television, and we're all going to be able to shop on the Internet, and all of our kids will live to be 150 because they will get a little genome map—at least our grandchildren, at my age. And they're looking at this world which should be the most brilliant, wonderful, interesting, exciting time in all of history, and from the Middle East to Northern Ireland to the Balkans to Africa to our own mean streets, we are all fighting the most primitive of human weaknesses.

And if you look at every issue I mentioned, the position my party has taken since I've been privileged to be President is different from the position being advocated by the other party. And the consequences for our country are enormous in these coming elections for Congress, for Senate, for the White House. Look at the difference Gray Davis has made here with these legislative leaders, that are here with him, in the last year in California. You've gone—in 11 months only you've gone—leading the country on the cutting edge of these important issues.

And if you think about what kind of world you want for your children, just remember what I told you. I'm glad we've got a good economy. I've worked hard for it, and I'm grateful that I've had a good team and enough insight and a great country behind me that we got these results. And I'm glad we've made progress on the environment, on giving children health care and immunizing, all of the things we've done.

But I'm telling you, it won't amount to a hill of beans unless we figure out how to get along together. It won't amount to a hill of beans unless we figure out how to develop a more unifying understanding of our relationship to one another, our relationship to the future, our relationship to the Earth. And if—when you strip it all away, I belong to a party that believes in the fundamental unity of our common humanity. And we are struggling for the direction of America. We're the party that enjoys power and is willing to divide people to get it.

The money you invested to come here tonight, I'm going to do my best to see is well spent. I won't be on the ballot in 2000, but as long as I have breath and strength to do it, I will fight for the things that I believe in to make this country what it ought to be.

And you just remember this when you leave here: We were just making an argument in 1992. It's not an argument anymore. The evidence is in. And all of us ought to be willing to fight to take the next steps for our children's future in a millennium that should contain America's greatest days.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:10 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, the President referred to film director Rob Reiner and his wife, Michelle, dinner hosts, and Alan Horn, president, Warner Brothers Studios, and his wife, Cindy, dinner cohosts; Gov. Gray Davis of California and

his wife, Sharon; actor Michael Douglas; comic actors Mel Brooks and Carl Reiner; Patrick Buchanan, author of "A Republic, Not An Empire"; State Attorney General Bill Lockyer; State Assembly Speaker Antonio R. Villaraigosa; State Controller Kathleen Connell; State Assemblywoman Shelia Kuehl; and Roy Romer, former general chair, Democratic National Committee. The President also referred to ANGLE, Access Now for Gay and Lesbian Equality.

Remarks at a Luncheon for Representative Brad Sherman in Beverly Hills, California

October 3, 1999

Thank you very much. Thank you. Let me, first of all, say to Dick and Daphna, Brad Sherman said I was patient; I could have stayed up there all day. I'm looking at you and all your happy faces and the kids on the trampoline and the other kids in the playhouse back there and these beautiful children who sang for us. And somebody back up there with half a dozen saxophones—it must be a wise person—[*laughter*]—in this beautiful, beautiful setting.

So let me begin by just thanking you all for coming. I thank our attorney general, Bill Lockyer and Controller Kathleen Connell and, of course, our wonderful first lady, Sharon Davis, for being here. I want to say I just got off the phone with Hillary a few moments ago, and we admire so much the work that Daphna has done and the prodding of us she has done to try to change the laws of our country to make adoption easier and to do what is always in the best interest of the children. And she has played a genuine national role in that, and that is a very elegant way of saying I never saw her that she wasn't pushing me to do the right thing. And I want to thank her for that very much. [*Applause*] Thank you.

I want to say that I'm glad to be here for Brad Sherman, too, because—you would know why if Brad Sherman had ever asked you to do anything. [*Laughter*] He's really a perfect Congressman. When Brad Sherman asks you to do something, you can do it now, or you can do it then—[*laughter*]—after he has gnawed on you for months or years, or however long it takes. Eventually when he asks you to do something, if it involves his work, you will do it. So I've learned to do it sooner rather than later. It saved me a lot of trouble, and I've had a lot of fun. [*Laughter*]

You should know that he genuinely is, I think, one of the most energetic and effective Members of the United States Congress, with a great future, very much liked by all of us, and very much trusted by all of us. So I thank you for being here for him. And in a larger sense, I thank you for being here for what his election represents.

You know, Brad was reading off those statistics, and he was very kind to do so, but I would like to ask you to think about something else. Remember what it was like in California in 1992? We had a bad economy, a terribly, terribly fractious social climate here, a lot of tensions between the races. We had a sense of drift and division, and the politics of the national Republican Party were basically designed to divide the country up between us and them, and as long as their "us" was bigger than our "them," they won and who cared what the consequences were.

Al Gore and I came to the people of California and the United States and said, "We would like to try a different way. We're sick of all this division. We think there can be a unifying theory of American citizenship in our American community. We believe, for example, that we could reduce and get rid of this deficit, which is crippling our economy, and still continue to invest in education and the environment, things that are important. We believe we could help business and labor. We believe we could grow the economy and actually clean up the environment, given the technological advances of recent years." And on and on. You know, when I came here in '92, it was an argument; that is, we made an argument and they made an argument and, thank God, you agreed with us and you gave us the chance to serve.

But nobody knew whether we were right or not because they had been in for so long. And you heard those statistics Brad reeled off. I just want to say them again, not to give myself credit but to give the American people credit. A unifying, community-oriented, balanced view of America that gives us all a chance to bring out the best in one another

and to work together, works. We do—it's given us the lowest unemployment in 29 years, the lowest welfare rolls in 32 years, the lowest crime rates in 26 years, the lowest poverty rates in 20 years, and the first back-to-back budget surpluses in 42 years. So it's not an argument anymore. There is evidence. This way works. It works better than the other way.

Let me say, the land is cleaner; the water is cleaner; the air is cleaner; the food is safer. We've set aside more land than any administration except those of Franklin and Theodore Roosevelt. We didn't hurt business. The previous President vetoed the Family and Medical Leave Act; I signed it; 15 million people took advantage of it. They said it was bad for business. Every year, there's been a record number of new small businesses.

The previous administration vetoed the Brady bill; I signed it and the ban on assault weapons. They said hunters were going to lose their weapons. That didn't happen, but 400,000 people with criminal records did lose their weapons, and that's one of the reasons we got the lowest crime rate in 26 years.

So I say to you, you have to see this election in 2000, Brad Sherman's election and all these others, in that context. We made an argument in 1992. In the year 2000, there is no argument; we have evidence. The question is, will the American people act on the evidence, or will they once again be vulnerable to the siren songs that the Republicans put out?

Now, what I think I should be doing, primarily, is not out here politicking, because I'm not on the ballot. What I do most of the time is just try to give you every day I've got left to be the best President I can. But let me tell you, you need to know that when we brought our economic program forward, 100 percent of the Republicans opposed it. When we brought our crime program forward, 90 percent of them were against it. When they passed welfare reform, I had to veto it twice because they didn't guarantee medical care and food for the children of the families on welfare we were requiring to move to work.

They are still fighting us every step of the way on the environment. And I could go on and on and on. We have a different view of America's future. It is a deeply and honestly held difference. I don't question their motives, but I think they're wrong and now we have evidence that they're wrong. But the one thing I like about the Republicans is they are undeterred by the evidence; they go right on. [*Laughter*] They go right on.

And you know, we have—our prosperity has been indiscriminate; we've let the Republicans make money, too. [*Laughter*] Why do you think Governor Bush has so much money in his campaign treasury? [*Laughter*] I've been thinking of listing that as one of the seminal accomplishments of my economic policy, the George Bush campaign treasury. [*Laughter*]

So they're never in doubt. It doesn't matter what the evidence is. But the rest of us, we have to act on that. So I'm trying to get the Congress today to deal with the challenge of the aging of America. We're going to double the number of people over 65 in the next 30 years. We ought to take the opportunity now to save Social Security, save Medicare, add a prescription drug coverage to the Medicare program. Three-quarters of the seniors in this country can't afford it. We ought to do that. We're for it, and they're not.

As California knows, we have the largest and most diverse student population in history. We ought to take this opportunity to give all the students who need it not only high standards and accountability but the summer school and after-school and mentoring programs they need. We need more teachers, and we need more modern schools. We've got a program to do all three of those things. The Democrats are for it, and they're fighting us every single step of the way.

I'll tell you an interesting thing. It was a big issue in California last time. We made a downpayment right before the election in 1998 on putting 100,000 teachers in the schools for smaller classes. And the Republicans voted with us right before the election. And then they all went home and said, "We voted for 100,000 teachers and this is a great thing, and this is like a Republican program. There is no bureaucracy here; it is wonderful."

You know what they just did? They refused to continue the commitment, and they undid

it. Why? Because this is not an election year. And they don't want the Democrats to be able to say they did anything for our children. Doesn't anybody care about whether it's good for the kids or not? Isn't there anybody in their party that will say, "To heck with the politics, we did it in '98 when we wanted votes; it was the right thing then for kids; it's still the right thing"? There are serious and deep differences up there. And Washington is a long way from California, but what Gray Davis and all these other fine State and local officials can do is shaped, to some extent, by what we do.

On the environment, last year we spent $400,000 complying with subpoenas from one Republican subcommittee in the House of Representatives because they thought our attempts to fight global warming and promote energy conservation and alternative sources of energy was some sort of deep conspiracy to wreck the economy of the United States. You have no idea—however bad you think it is, multiply it by three or four. [*Laughter*]

We are five seats away from a majority in the House of Representatives. They will not vote to close the gun show loophole. They have kept 2 years—they let 2 years go by until we could vote on a Patients' Bill of Rights, which finally we're going to get a vote on this week. We are five votes away from a majority. We can't lose a guy like Brad Sherman, and we can pick up three or four more seats in California if you will fight.

If you believe we ought to meet the challenges of the future; if you are for dealing with the challenge of the aging of America; if you're for giving all these kids a world-class education; if you're for putting America back in the lead to a safe and healthy environmental future; if you're pleased that we've got the lowest crime rate in 26 years, but you would like America to be the safest big country in the world; if it bothers you that not everybody in America has participated in our prosperity and you think every person who's willing to work ought to have a chance to be a part of our successful, free enterprise system, and you want us to do something for the poor, to give them a chance, too; if you believe that we are all one people, without regard to our race or our gender or our religion or our sexual orientation and we ought to all be part of America's future and you're sick and tired of the politics of division, and you want us to pass the "Employment and Non-Discrimination Act" and the "Hate Crimes Prevention Act" and, in a larger sense, you want us to stand for these things around the world; if you thought we were right to try to stop ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and Kosovo and to try to bring peace to the Middle East and Northern Ireland, and to do our best to diffuse the tensions between India and Pakistan—if you believe that ought to be America's role at home and abroad and you don't want to see us go into the 21st century, everybody hooked up to a modern computer and everybody hooked down and held down by paralyzing primitive hatreds, then you ought to be a Democrat and you ought to be for Brad Sherman and take him back to Congress and holding the White House and helping us to build a country this Nation can be in the 21st century.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to luncheon hosts Richard S. and Daphna Ziman; California State Attorney General Bill Lockyer and Controller Kathleen Connell; Sharon Davis, wife of Gov. Gray Davis of California; and Gov. George W. Bush of Texas.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in Beverly Hills

October 3, 1999

The President. Thank you very much. Clarence, I'd like to spend the night and—[*laughter*]—and we could have quite a bunking party here. [*Laughter*] But you'll have to give me a raincheck.

I want to thank Clarence and Jackie and their family for having us here, and all the other people who helped to sell tickets and make this event possible. I'd like to thank my good friend Maxine Waters for being here and for her passionate leadership for our party. Having Maxine for a friend, a supporter, and an occasional rebuker has been one of the more interesting experiences of my life. [*Laughter*] And I like it. I'd like to thank Governor Romer; I'd like to thank

Beth Dozoretz, our national finance chair of the DNC, for being here. I want to thank all of you.

You know, I was thinking, particularly here, all of you have to come to so many of these dinners, and you listen to so many people give speeches. And I'm trying to decide what can I do to make this memorable. I guess I could give the talk I normally give. I remember one time Tina Turner came to Little Rock to give a concert—when she was just sort of making her comeback—it was right after she'd come out with that "Private Dancer" album. You all remember that? And she had that big macho saxophone player with chains and everything—it made me want to go pump iron and apply for a new job. [*Laughter*] But anyway, she sang all these new songs, and she was a big hit and everybody loved her. And we got to the end of the concert and the band started playing her first hit, "Proud Mary," playing the introduction to "Proud Mary." And she kind of moved up to the microphone, everybody cheered, and she moved back. She moved up and everybody cheered, and she said, "You know, I've been singing this song for 25 years, but it gets better every time I do it." [*Laughter*] So maybe this will be a little better. [*Laughter*]

But I would like to just ask you to take just a few minutes to be a little serious with me tonight about why you came. If somebody asked you tomorrow why you came, what are you going to say? If somebody asked you tomorrow why you contributed, what are you going to say?

When I came to California as a candidate for President and then later the Vice President and I came together, this State was in trouble. It was in trouble economically; it was divided socially; there was a great sense of anxiety and frustration. Maxine took me into her home, and we walked down the streets and the neighborhoods that she represented, and people were worried about the future. And I had this idea that—this general idea that there was something wrong with American politics in the early nineties because it was basically all focused on repeating the same old arguments we'd been having in America for years and having the same old fights with the same old language and seeing who could divide the pie up. And it was all about the politics of division. And when you got through slicing the citizens up, you just hoped that your share of the pie was bigger than the other person's share of the pie.

It didn't seem to me to be working very well. I mean, after all, we had high unemployment; we had social tension; we had no driving vision; we had quadrupled the debt of the country in 12 years. We had a lot of problems. So I said, "Give me a chance to lead the country on a philosophy that there should be a community of all Americans, and that we should look for unifying ways to do our business together. We should look for an economic policy that gets rid of the deficit and continues to invest in the education of our children. We should look for an economic policy that helps business and labor. We should be able to grow the economy and make the environment cleaner, not dirtier. We should be able to respect all of our differences and treat everybody with respect and still be more united by our common humanity." It sounded kind of Pollyanna, I'm sure, to some people, but I believe it.

So I was making an argument to the American people and, thankfully, the American people said, "Okay, we'll give these guys a chance." And they did. But they didn't know. They couldn't know. It was my argument.

In 1996 people thought there was some evidence that it was working, and so they renewed my contract. If anybody comes to me and talks to me about running for President, I say it's the world's biggest job interview. [*Laughter*] You get an employment contract if you win. And then you move to a place where everybody who talks to you tries to make you to forget who you really work for and what you're supposed to be doing.

So here we are now, almost 7 years into this grand experiment. It is not an argument anymore. One reason you should be here is, the politics of community and progress together work. This country has had, in the last 7 years, the longest peacetime expansion in history; we now have the lowest unemployment rate in 29 years, the lowest welfare rates in 32 years, the lowest crime rates in 26 years, the lowest poverty rates in 20 years, the first back-to-back budget surpluses in 42

years, and the highest homeownership in history. This is not an argument; there is evidence. What we have done has worked for America. And I'm glad that we have been a part of that. But that's not enough.

We've got the country working again. What I think we have to do now is to look at the great, long-term challenges of the country. Once in a lifetime do people get a chance to do what we have a chance to do now—to look around and say if we wanted to paint a picture of tomorrow for our children and our grandchildren, if we wanted to celebrate the new millennium not just with the brilliant show that Quincy is putting together for me on The Mall, but with a really different way of living in America, where we were working for ourselves and for our neighbors and where things were really working in ways that we could all be proud of—what would we do?

When I got here, we couldn't ask these questions. We had to get the country working again, you know? We had—as somebody said—what's that old saying? If you're up to your ears in alligators, it's hard to talk to somebody about draining the swamp. [*Laughter*] Well, now we can drain the swamp. Now we can look ahead. We can imagine what would we really like America to be like in the new millennium and what would we have to do to get there.

I want us to think about big ideas. Let me just say, some of them are things that I can make some real headway on in the time I'm in office, and some of them are things that will have to be dealt with when I'm not President anymore. But the main reason I hope that you will say tomorrow if somebody said, "Well, why did you go there last night"—I hope you'll be able to say, "Well, I bought their argument, but it works; but, more importantly, I share their vision for tomorrow, and I want to be part of it. Because elections are always about tomorrow."

I'll just tell you one other little story, then I'll go back. When I was a Governor of what President Bush used to call a small Southern State, every year I would go out to the State Fair, and I would have Governor's day. Sounds kind of august. Really what I did was go into this big tin shed and find myself a little booth, and I'd sit there and any citizen who wanted to come up who was at the fair and talk to me and say anything would do it.

And so in 1989, in October, this month, 10 years ago, I'm having Governor's day at the fair. And there's another election coming up in 1990, at which time I will have been Governor for 10 years and four terms, because we went from 2- to 4-year terms. So this guy comes up to me, about 70 years old in overalls, and he looks at me and he says, "Bill, are you going to run again?" Except he said, "again." [*Laughter*] And I said, "Well, I don't know. If I do, will you vote for me?" He said, "Yeah, I guess I will; I always have." And I said, "Well, aren't you sick of me after all these years?" He said, "No, I'm not, but nearly everybody else I know is." [*Laughter*] And this guy might have won me the election in 1990.

So I had this conversation. So I got sort of hurt and huffy, and I said, "Well, don't you think I've done a good job?" He said, "Yeah, but"—this is exactly what he said—he said, "Yeah, I do." But he said, "You did get a paycheck every 2 weeks, didn't you?" [*Laughter*] He said, "That's what we hired you to do." He said, "If you want to win this next election, you'll have to tell them what you're going to do next time." He said, "The fact you did a good job doesn't mean much." He said, "We paid—we gave you a salary, gave you a nice house to live in, you know."

And that's very important. But the reason that the achievements of our administration and our party and our Members of Congress like Maxine matter is that they are some evidence that if we're going to change, we need to keep changing, building on what we've done that's right, rather than changing by taking a U-turn and going back to what got us in trouble in the first place. Neither she nor I should get some sort of gold star. The question is, is it evidence of whether we're moving in the right direction as a country?

Now, here are some of the things that I think we ought to be doing if we want America to look like it should. Number one, we've got to deal with the aging of America. When the baby boomers retire, the number of people over 65 will double. There will be two people working for every one person drawing Social Security. I am the oldest of the baby

boomers. Tony told me tonight—Tony Robbins—that he was the youngest. I wish I could switch positions. [*Laughter*]

But I can tell you that my people, the people I grew up with, middle class people, people without a lot of money, they are plagued by the notion that the retirement of the baby boom generation will impose an intolerable burden on our children and our grandchildren. And we have a chance now to take care of Social Security and Medicare, so we take care of the elderly, but the income of their children is free to raise their grandchildren. It's a big deal.

The second thing we ought to do is to recognize that we have an extra-special responsibility to children and families because we've got more kids in school today than ever before, from more diverse backgrounds. The school district across the river from me in Washington, DC, in Alexandria, Virginia, has people from 180 different national and ethnic groups, speaking 100 different languages—one school district—even slightly more diverse than the Los Angeles county schools, unbelievably enough.

Now, this is a godsend in a global economy with a global society if we can figure out how to take our conviction that all these children can learn and turning it into an educational environment in which all of them do learn. We ought to have after-school and summer school programs for the kids who need it. We ought to end social promotion but not blame the kids for the failure of the system, so you've got to give them the support they need. There ought to be universal access to the Internet. We ought to have more teachers for smaller classes and modern schools. These things are all terribly important. And you should know that there's a big difference in the parties on these two things—what to do for the seniors, what to do for the children.

The third thing we ought to do is to do something about poor people who haven't been part of our prosperity. It really bothers me that we've got the greatest economy in the history of America, the lowest poverty rate in 20 years, the lowest African-American poverty rate ever measured—we've only been measuring it about just under 30 years—but if you go to any inner city, if you go to the Mississippi Delta, if you go to Appalachia, if you go to the Indian reservation—unemployment on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota is 73 percent—you will see that there are people who have not participated in our prosperity. And we cannot do it by just Government programs alone, because we still have to—I'll say more about that in a minute, but we've got to find a way to bring enterprise to these people.

And I'll just give you two examples, two ideas I have. Number one, if you want to invest in the Caribbean and Latin America, in Africa, in poor countries in Asia, we will give you significant loan guarantees and tax credits to do so. I think we ought to give people the same tax incentives to invest in poor areas in America we give them to invest in poor areas around the world. Let me be very clear: I don't want to take away those other things. I want Americans to help other people work their way out of poverty. I'm trying to pass an Africa trade bill right now that will bring us closer to Africa. I'm trying to pass a Caribbean Basin Initiative right now that will bring us closer to the Caribbean and do more to help those people, but I want to help people here at home.

The other thing—think about this. I was in northern California the night before last with a bunch of people that worked for eBay. Did you ever buy anything off eBay? Do you know eBay? Do you know there are now over 20,000 people who make a living not working for eBay, the company, but trading on eBay the Internet site? Many of them used to be on welfare. They actually make a living trading on eBay.

Now, think what we could do for the economy of America, for poor people, if we could, within the next couple of years, make access to the Internet as universal as access to the telephone is—access to the Internet as universal as access to the telephone—giving investors in America the same incentives to invest in poor areas they have to invest around the world, we can do something to bring enterprise and opportunity to people who aren't part of our prosperity. And I think we ought to do it. It's the right thing to do.

One last economic thing, a big idea that I think I've sold most of my fellow Democrats on that no one ever thought the more

liberal party in America would advocate; if we follow the budget outline that I gave the Congress, we can actually afford a modest tax cut and still get this country out of debt in 15 years for the first time since 1835 when Andrew Jackson was President.

Now, everybody in this room who is over 40 years old who studied economics was taught that the country ought to be in debt a little bit; a little debt was a healthy thing. Why do I think we ought to get out of debt? Because everybody in this room that is in the global economy in any way, shape, or form—whether it's in entertainment, investment, or anything else—you know that there is a worldwide market for money. Every time a country gets in trouble, they find out they can't keep their money in if people want to put it somewhere else.

If we got this country out of debt, what would it mean? It would mean lower interest rates forever. It would mean lower interest rates if Berry wants to start a new business in his second childhood. [*Laughter*] It means more jobs. It means higher incomes. It means you can send your kids to college cheaper. It means you can buy a home cheaper. It means that our friends around the world who are poorer than we are can borrow money that we used to take away from them. This is a big deal. We can give our children a generation of prosperity if we make America debt-free.

Let me just give you a couple other ideas. We've got the lowest crime rate in 26 years. Does anybody seriously think that it's low enough? Don't you think America is still a pretty dangerous place? Don't you think we're still losing too many of our kids? Don't we still have too many people in prison?

Okay, now, we can talk all day about this, but I just want to say one thing. I think America should adopt as a goal, say, okay, for a long time we didn't think we could get crime down. Now we know we can drive crime down, 7 years in a row; big deal. It is a big deal. And it's the lowest it has been in 27 years. There are some places where the murder rate is half what it was 5 years ago. This is huge. But no one believes this country is safe enough.

Why don't we adopt a big goal and say we're going to make America the safest big country in the world? If we're the most prosperous country in the world, if we're the freest country in the world, why shouldn't we be the safest country in the world? Well, I'll tell you one thing. We're going to have to do more to keep kids out of trouble and help them and support them. We're going to have to do more to keep guns out of the wrong hands. It's crazy.

You know, every time I have a fight with the NRA, they say guns don't kill people, people do. They say this is about evil. So I said the other day, I said, "Okay, it's about evil. I agree with that." I mean, this guy shoots this Filipino postal worker out here and shoots at these little Jewish kids. Yes, that's evil. But do you believe America is more evil than any other country in the world because we have a higher murder rate? I don't.

Or what about this—listen to this. The number of children killed accidentally by handguns in America—accidentally—is 9 times greater than the number of children killed accidentally by guns in the next 25 biggest industrial economies combined.

Now, do you believe we're more stupid than any other country?

Audience Member. Yes. [*Laughter*]

The President. So are we, like, 9 times more stupid than—you see where I'm going with this? Look, I grew up—I was shooting cans off fenceposts with .22's when I was 12 years old. I governed a State where we shut factories and schools down on the opening day of deer season because there wouldn't be anybody there anyway. [*Laughter*]

But this is madness, to let people go to gun shows and buy guns with criminal records and go out and shoot people when you can stop it. And don't let anybody tell you we can't do something with reasonable restraints—400,000 people have not been able to get guns because they have criminal backgrounds since the Brady bill passed, and don't you kid yourself for a minute—that's one of the reasons we've got the lowest crime rate in 26 years. Let's make America the safest big country in the world.

And I want to say just two other things, one thing that people normally—maybe you wouldn't see raised in a group like this. But

I think environmental issues are too little discussed outside environmental groups. You know, the economy has gotten better in the last 7 years; the air is cleaner; the water is cleaner; the food is safer; we set aside more land than any administration in history, except those of Franklin and Theodore Roosevelt. But we're still in the grip of a big idea that's not right anymore.

Most of you now believe—I think you do—that global warming is real. I hope you do. Nine of the 11 hottest years in the last 500 years have been in the last 12 years. If this thing happens—I just was down in New Zealand near the South Pole—the polar ice cap melting, big chunks of it coming off. If the planet heats too much, the polar ice caps melt, the water level rises, island nations can be flooded. Sections of Louisiana and Florida can be flooded. The whole center of agriculture, the people who produce our food that we live by, will be moved to the north, changing and disrupting societies. This is a big deal.

You have malaria now today in places in Africa where it has never been before at altitudes it has never been before because the mosquitoes are going higher because it's hotter up there. This is a serious thing. Now, what's that got to do with all of you? It's a big deal.

Most—for a long time, it was true that you could not build a rich country unless you put more greenhouse gases into the air by burning coal and oil. It was true. But it isn't true anymore, and most people still think it is.

So the Indians and the Chinese, they think they can't get rich, and when I tell them they don't have to do this, they think, "old Bill Clinton's trying to hold us down on the farm." In America, in Congress, there are people who think that I have some dark plan to wreck the American economy. Well, if I wanted to wreck the American economy, I've done a poor job of it.

But I'm telling you, we now can conserve our way to greater wealth. We will be a wealthier country if we are environmentally responsible. We will be a wealthier planet if we protect the Earth. And the young people in this room, you mark my words; someday you'll remember I said this—10 years from now, if you go to one of these events, I'll bet you environmental issues take up 30 percent of the discussion, maybe more.

So why don't we turn it around now while we can? Why don't we say we'll make America the first country in the world to give up an idea that's not true anymore and embrace the future?

The last thing I want to say is this. The thing I most worry about of all is that we're on the verge of a new millennium with these unbelievable technologies and these unbelievable scientific discoveries—a lot of the young women in this room tonight will have babies in the future, will have your children after the human genome project is completed and we have decoded all the mysteries of the human gene. So, literally, this might start in 5 years—you have a baby and then you come home from the hospital and you have a road map of you child's future. And it's a little scary because it says, well, your child may be more likely to develop heart disease at an earlier age, but it will also say, but if you do these five things for the first 10 years of his or her life, you'll add another 20 years to their life.

The average 65-year-old person today has a life expectancy of 82. The children—Quincy said thank you. [*Laughter*] You think about this. Think about young mothers bringing home their children thinking their kids are going to be 90 or 100 years old, and they'll be alert and active and healthy and strong. It will be great.

So you've got all this—and we're all hooked in on the Internet, and all this stuff is happening. And whoop-dee-do, and it's wonderful. And there are more rich people than ever before. But what is the biggest problem in the world today? What do I spend my time worrying about? That there are still people who insist upon killing each other and preventing the children of their areas from having a decent future because of their racial, their ethnic, their religious, their tribal differences.

And what's the biggest problem we're dealing with in America today? From the bombing in Oklahoma City to stretching poor, young Matthew Shepard out on a rack and killing him a year ago in Wyoming this week; to dragging James Byrd until he came apart, literally, in Texas; to what happened

out here at the Jewish school and with the Filipino postal worker; to what happened in Illinois and Indiana with that young man who was a member of a church that said they didn't believe in God, but they did believe in white supremacy, so he went—he murdered a former basketball coach at Northwestern and murdered a young Korean coming out of church—the guy was coming out of a church and he got shot in the back and killed—what do all these people have in common?

They are on the verge of a new millennium that is the most modern of times, absolutely in the grip of the most primitive and ancient of hatreds—the fear, the hatred, and the dehumanization of people who are different from them.

And that's the last thing I want to say to you. All these other things I've said to you are important, but they're by and large mental problems. This is a spiritual problem. But it should be part of the political platform of any group of citizens that really seeks to make the future America's greatest days. You have to ask yourself if you really believe that what we share in common is more important than what divides us.

And if you just think about it, I mean, here, we're—I'm trying to get this thing done in Northern Ireland, where my people grew up—in my family, there were both Catholics and Protestants, and they lived on the line between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland, and this has been going on for a few hundred years now. It's not like we're unacquainted with the issues. And they've been fighting for 30 years, and now they've all agreed what to do and everybody's agreed that they all have to do what they're supposed to do and everybody's agreed they all have to do what they're supposed to do by a certain date. And a lot of people are prepared to let it all go back to smithereens again because they want to have an argument about who goes first, like you used to have when you were 6 or 7 years old on the playground.

I'm just telling you, just think about it. Look, we all wake up every day with, like, little scales inside of hope and fear and light and darkness. We all do. Everybody has bad days. But it is unbelievable that we're almost in a new millennium and the world is in a grip of this level of primitive hatred and destruction. My party believes that we are one America. My party believes that I did the right thing in trying to stop the slaughter of the Muslims in Bosnia and the Albanians in Kosovo.

I believe that when my child is my age, she will live in a golden age if, but only if, we have married all this modern science and technology to a higher level of humanity. Thank you very much.

[*At this point, dinner host Clarence Avant, chairman, Motown Record Co., made brief remarks and presented a gift to the President.*]

The President. Thank you. Let me say, you know, one of the things that all this money you give to the Democratic Party does is to finance a lot of the election activities in 2000, and my wife may be part of those election activities. And she has—the reason I can't spend the night with Clarence and participating in this bunking party is that she has to go on a trip tomorrow. And I am going to get home before she leaves, because I want to see her before she leaves for a week, so I can't stay. But I thank you for this, and I thank you for your friendship and support. I wouldn't take anything for the last 7 years, warts and all. And a lot of you made it possible for me to serve and for us to do what we've done. Just don't quit.

Believe me, these are big issues, and I hope I gave you some things to think about tonight that'll make you want to keep on fighting all the way through next year. Thanks.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:15 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to Mr. Avant's wife, Jacqueline; Roy Romer, former general chair, Democratic National Committee; musician Quincy Jones, a coordinator of the planned millennium celebration on The Mall; motivational speaker Anthony Robbins; and Berry Gordy III, founder, Motown Records Industries.

Proclamation 7232—Child Health Day, 1999

October 1, 1999

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

As America's children begin their exciting journey into the 21st century, one of the greatest gifts we can give them is a healthy start; and we should recognize that the well-being of our young people includes both their physical and mental health.

We have already made great strides in addressing children's physical health care needs through the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), which funds State efforts to provide affordable health insurance to millions of uninsured children. Sadly, however, as many as one in ten American children and adolescents today may have behavioral or mental health problems; and parents, teachers, and health care professionals need to realize that even very young children can experience serious clinical depression. The majority of children who commit suicide are profoundly depressed, and the majority of parents whose children took their own lives did not recognize that depression until it was too late.

My Administration is working to increase children's access to mental health care and to help communities expand counseling, mentoring, and mental health services in our schools. In addition, we fought to ensure that funding for CHIP contains a strong mental health benefits component. While there is no substitute for parents becoming and remaining involved in their children's lives, we must give families the tools they need to meet the challenges they face.

Perhaps the most vital step we can take to ensure that every child reaches his or her full potential is to fight the stigma that prevents so many Americans with mental illness from making the most of their lives. In June of this year, under the leadership of Tipper Gore, we convened the first-ever White House Conference on Mental Health, where, among other important issues, we discussed how to reach out to troubled young people and put them on the path to mental and emotional health. The first and most crucial effort we can make is to talk honestly about mental illness and begin to dispel the myths that surround it. I am pleased that the Surgeon General and Mrs. Gore have committed to a major new campaign with these goals in mind. With powerful public service announcements and strong partners in the private sector, we can reach millions of Americans with a simple but life-changing message: Mental illness is nothing to be ashamed of, but bias and discrimination shame us all.

To acknowledge the importance of our children's health, the Congress, by joint resolution approved May 18, 1928, as amended (36 U.S.C. 143), has called for the designation of the first Monday in October as "Child Health Day" and has requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this day.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Monday, October 4, 1999, as Child Health Day. I call upon families, schools, communities, and governments to dedicate themselves to protecting the health and well-being of all our children.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 6, 1999]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 7. This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 4.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Iraq's Compliance With United Nations Security Council Resolutions

October 1, 1999

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

Consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1) and as part of my effort

to keep the Congress fully informed, I am reporting on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations Security Council. My last report, consistent with Public Law 102–1, was transmitted on August 2, 1999. I shall continue to keep the Congress informed about this important issue.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 4.

Remarks Prior to a Meeting With the National Security Team and an Exchange With Reporters

October 4, 1999

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

The President. Is everybody in? I'd like to make a brief statement, and then I'll answer your questions.

Our national security team is about to meet to discuss the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to end nuclear weapons testing forever. This is very important for protecting our people from the danger of nuclear war. That's why so many prominent Americans, including four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, support it.

For 2 years, the opponents in the Senate have blocked any consideration of the treaty. Now, we have been given just 8 days before the Senate vote. I will do all I can to get the treaty ratified.

Our experts have concluded that we don't need more tests to keep our own nuclear forces strong. We stopped testing in 1992, and now we are spending $4.5 billion a year to maintain a reliable nuclear force without testing. Since we don't need nuclear tests, it is strongly in our interest to achieve agreement that can help prevent other countries, like India, Pakistan, Russia, China, Iran, and others, from testing and deploying nuclear weapons.

The treaty will also strengthen our ability to monitor if other countries are engaged in suspicious activities, through global chains of sensors and onsite inspections, both of which the treaty provides for. This is a crucial decision the Senate is about to make that will affect the welfare of the American people well into the next century. I hope the American people will pay close attention to this, and I hope the Senate will pay close attention and that we will have a careful debate as much as possible within the time that's been allotted.

Q. Mr. President, why do you think the Republicans handled this in the way they did and just said, "Okay, let's go ahead and vote on it in a few days?" And you've been pushing this for a long time. Why is it that you're so behind the eightball on getting the votes for it?

The President. Well, we've been pushing it, but there has been no consideration of it. If you look at how other treaties have been handled in the past, you have 8 days of hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee, 12 days of hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee. The Democrats in the Senate were frustrated because the whole thing had been stonewalled. And finally, they said, "Okay, you can have a debate and a vote right now or no vote at all."

So we decided we would take the "right now" and do our very best to do it. I don't want to speculate on other people's motives. We'll have to ask them why they decided to do it this way.

Q. Mr. President, you need a lot of Republicans if you're going to pass this treaty. How many do you think you have right now?

The President. I don't know. We don't have enough now; I hope we can get them. I think the critical thing is, if you look at all these—anybody who expresses reservations, there can only be, it seems to me, two arguments against it. One is that we have to test and maintain our stockpile. And Secretary Richardson is here—the people at the energy labs and many other experts say that is absolutely not true. And we are spending $4.5 billion a year to make sure it's not true, that we can maintain the integrity of our stockpile.

The other argument that we saw a version of in the press yesterday that I think is just a missing point is that maybe somebody,

somewhere, is doing a very small-scale test, and we won't pick it up. Well, the point I'd like to make about that is the following: Number one, if you get the really small test, they're hard to pick up. They're hard to pick up now; they'd be hard to pick up if this treaty is ratified. If this treaty is ratified, there are new tools to monitor the testing levels. We'll have monitoring stations; we can do on-site visits. There's the deterrent impact of a country signing and then getting caught violating it. So we'll have a lot more ability to pick up all kinds of testings at all levels and a lot more deterrent against it if we ratify the treaty than if we don't.

There is another thing the American people need to think about and the Senate needs to think about. If any of the 44 original signatories of this treaty don't sign and don't ratify it, then it cannot enter into force. For decades, the United States has led the world against proliferation. If the United States Senate votes this treaty down, it would be a signal that the United States now wants to lead the world away from the cause of nonproliferation. We would be giving the green light to all these other people.

We're not testing anyway. That's why Britain and France and nine other of our NATO Allies have already ratified this treaty. They understand this. That's why there is such overwhelming support for it. So it would be, in my judgment, a grave mistake not to ratify the treaty.

Chinese Nuclear Espionage

Q. Mr. President, on a related matter, I'm sure you've been briefed that the FBI is sort of starting all over this week on the Chinese espionage investigation. Are you concerned now, looking back, about the way the investigation was handled?

The President. I think the only thing I would say about that, I think the only appropriate thing for me to say is, number one, they ought to do whatever they can to find our whatever the truth is. Number two, this is another lesson that we should not assume anyone's guilt, ever. We should let the investigations take their course. And I think that's—we just have to support the proper—the investigative process.

Health Care Coverage

Q. Mr. President, on health care, do the new numbers mean that you've failed in your effort to expand coverage to people who are not insured?

The President. Well, first of all, they mean that the First Lady and I and all the rest of us were right in 1994 when we told you in 1994 that if this were voted down, the insurance companies would continue to drop people and employers would because of the system we have. So what has happened is exactly what we said would happen.

Now, what are we doing about it? We passed the 1997 Children's Health Insurance Program, but it was only this year that all the States finally signed up. I do believe you will see this year significant numbers of children enrolled in our Children's Health Insurance Program. And I've talked with Senator Kennedy and others in the Congress about what else we can do to try to get several million more children insured.

Number two, I do believe that the Kennedy-Jeffords bill will pass this year which will allow people with disabilities to go into the work force and keep their health insurance, and that will be good.

Number three, we have before the Congress and have had for 2 years a proposal to let people between the ages of 55 and 65, one of the biggest problem groups without insurance, buy into the Medicare program. That would help a lot if Congress would pass that. Some Republicans have said in the past that they favor that sort of approach. I would urge them to take another look at this. They ought to allow Medicare buy-in. It's the cheapest, least costly, least bureaucratic way for people in that age group to get insurance.

And number four, we have granted to some innovative States waivers from the Medicaid program which they have used to let people who are lower income working people buy into Medicaid. If we can get some more States to do that, that can make a big difference.

If you look at these numbers, you've got people between the ages of 55 and 65, you've got people who have moved from welfare to work and then get jobs above the income level when they're eligible for Medicaid. Then you've got all these middle class people

who work for companies that are dropping health insurance. So I think we ought to keep working on these things. I certainly don't think we ought to give up. I do think you'll see the numbers improve with children over the next 2 years.

I think that if we pass Kennedy-Jeffords, which I think we will, you'll see that improving. But we need the Medicaid buy-in and the Medicare buy-in for the older people and more States could solve this problem. We could give them the money through Medicaid waivers to let lower income working people buy into that. All those would make a big difference.

Let me also finally say I'm glad to see that this has become a source of discussion in the Presidential campaign for the Democrats, and I'm proud that the candidates in my party are trying to do something about it, and I hope that we will continue to see this debated. But these numbers confirm exactly what the First Lady said in '94, and we have some specific things we can do about it if the Congress and the States will help, and I hope they will.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:02 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on Departure for the Pentagon and an Exchange With Reporters

October 5, 1999

Patients' Bill of Rights

The President. Good afternoon. I am delighted to be joined this afternoon by Secretary Shalala, Secretary Herman, and leaders of some of our Nation's top health, consumer, and provider organizations, including Dr. Thomas Reardon of the American Medical Association; Beverly Malone, the president of American Nurses Association; Judy Lichtman, the president of the National Partnership for Women and Families; John Seffrin, the CEO of the American Cancer Society; and Ron Pollack, the president of Families USA.

Before I leave for the Pentagon to sign legislation to enhance our national security, I want to say a few words about legislation to enhance the security of patients and the health of our families.

Tomorrow the House is set to begin the long-awaited debate on the Patients' Bill of Rights. We are here today to urge Congress to act responsibly and pass strong, enforceable, bipartisan legislation to protect working families with the real health care protections they sorely need.

We have had enough of tragic stories from every corner of our land, families forced to switch doctors in the middle of pregnancy or cancer treatment, parents whose children had to bypass one or more emergency rooms before they received care, Americans who saw their loved ones die when their health plans overruled a doctor's urgent recommendations. The fact is Americans who are battling illness shouldn't have to also battle insurance companies for the coverage they need.

Our administration has done everything we could to protect patients. Through executive action, we've granted all of the safeguards in the Patients' Bill of Rights to more than 85 million Americans who get their health care through Federal plans. This past week I announced we'll publish rules to extend similar patient protections to every child covered under the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Many States are also making progress. But no State law, no executive action, can do what Congress alone has the power to achieve. Only Federal legislation can assure that all Americans, in all plans, get the patient protections they need and deserve.

Congressmen Charlie Norwood and John Dingell have a bill to do just that. It's a bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights that would guarantee Americans the right to see the medical specialist they need, the right to emergency care wherever and whenever a medical crisis arises, the right to stay with a health care provider throughout a program of treatment, the right to hold a health plan accountable for harmful decisions.

But before Americans can be assured these fundamental rights, the Norwood-Dingell bill must be assured a fundamental right of its own, and that's the right to be offered on the House floor, with a straight

up or down vote. No legislative poison pills. No weakening amendments. No parliamentary sleights of hand.

Let's be clear: This is about more than congressional rules or legislative prerogatives. It's about providing Americans basic rights. It's about making sure medical professionals are able to do their jobs, about providing families with the quality care they deserve, and above all, about putting patients' interests above special interests. That's what all of us standing here and our allies in both parties in the House of Representatives are committed to.

Now, I'm told this morning some Republican leaders sat down with insurance company lobbyists who are fighting to defeat a strong Patients' Bill of Rights. On the eve of this vote, I'd like to ask them to think about sitting down with America's families instead.

This is not a partisan issue anywhere in the United States except Washington, DC. The legislation that we endorse has the endorsement of more than 300 health care and consumer groups across America, including groups where I would imagine most of the members are in the Republican Party.

The support for this legislation across America is broad and deep. We cannot allow a small group in Congress, representing a large, well-financed special interest, to thwart the will of doctors, nurses, medical professionals, and working families. We can't allow some parliamentary trick to litter this bill up like a Christmas tree and then have people vote for it to give people the impression they are for the Patients' Bill of Rights, when they are, in fact, against it.

So again, I ask Republican leaders to be straight with the American people. Instead of watered-down provisions, just give the people an up or down vote. Let the will of the people prevail. Let them see where every Member of the House stands on this profoundly important issue. Let's have a fair vote. If we have a fair vote, there will be a bipartisan majority for the Patients' Bill of Rights in the House of Representatives that reflects the overwhelming bipartisan, even nonpartisan, feeling for it out in the United States of America.

Thank you very much.

Medicare Reform

Q. Mr. President, do you believe after meeting with Senator Roth today that you'll get a competent Medicare reform program this year? And where might you be willing to compromise to get that?

The President. Well, first of all, I had a very good meeting with him, and I'm going to put out a statement about it. We talked about Medicare reform. He and Senator Moynihan assured me they're still committed to that and will work on it in a timely fashion. They also talked to me about the need to restore some of the restrictions or cuts in funding from the '97 Balanced Budget Act to some of the medical providers. I strongly agree with that, and I think we should do it.

We talked about some trade issues, the importance of the research and experimentation tax credit, and a number of other issues that I think are quite important that affect all Americans. So we had a good meeting, and I prepared and signed off on a statement which goes into greater detail about it.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Q. Mr. President, do you think you could try to postpone the vote on the treaty?

The President. On the test ban treaty?

Q. Yes.

The President. Well, let me say this: I think for the Senate to reject it would send a terrible message. It would say to the whole world, "Look, America's not going to test, but if you want to test, go right ahead. We're not interested in leading the world toward nonproliferation anymore."

I'm going to have a dinner tonight and talk to a number of Senators about it. I think a lot of thoughtful Republicans who normally support us in matters like this are, number one, under enormous political pressure not to do so, and number two, have the legitimate feeling that this very important issue, which in previous Congresses would have received 8, 10, 12 days of hearings, a week or more of debate, is for some reason being rushed at an almost unprecedented pace.

So we're going to talk through this. I'm going to make the best case I can. I'm going to tell them why I think it's in the national

interest. But I think it is a very curious position that some of the leaders of the opposite party are taking that they don't really want us to start testing again, and they know we have the most sophisticated system in the world for maintaining our nuclear stockpile without testing, but they don't want to vote for this treaty even if that says to Pakistan, to India, to China, to Russia, to Iran, to everybody else, you all go on and do whatever you want to do, but we're not going to do it. I think that's a very curious thing to do and would be very, very damaging to the interests of the United States and, even more important, to the safety of children in the 21st century all across the world.

We have been a leader for nonproliferation, including for the concept of a test ban treaty since the time of Dwight Eisenhower. He's the first person who recommended this. And before this Congress, it would have been unthinkable that a treaty of this kind, with these protections—particularly with the strengthening reservations that I have offered to work with Congress to put in—it would have been unthinkable before this Congress that such a treaty would not pass. So I'm going to work and do the best I can, and we'll see what happens.

Q. Sir, there seems to be the compliance, it cannot be verified, and that the integrity of the arsenal cannot be maintained absolutely——

The President. Well, I would like to respond to those two things. Number one, on the compliance issue, keep in mind what the reports say—that you cannot, with 100 percent certainty, detect small nuclear tests everywhere in the world. That's all they say. Our national security people, including all of our people at the Pentagon, say that any test of the magnitude that would present any sort of threat to the United States could, in fact, be detected, number one.

Number two, if we don't pass this treaty, such smaller tests will be even more likely to go undetected. Why? Because if the treaty goes into force, we'll have over 300 sophisticated sensors put out in places all across the world, and we'll have the right to onsite inspection, and we will also have the deterrent effect of people being found violating the treaty. Now, if you don't put the treaty into force, no sensors, no onsite inspections, no deterrent, and if the United States walks away from it, the rest of the world will think they've been given a green light. So I think that argument has literally no merit, because nothing changes except our ability to increase our determination of such tests with the passage of the treaty.

Now, on the first argument—the idea that, some say, we can't with absolute 100 percent certainty maintain the integrity of the stockpiles—that is not what the people who lead the energy labs say. That's not what the Joint Chiefs say. Some people disagree—they do. They say they're not sure that forever-and-a-day we'll be able to do that. I have offered the Senate a reservation to the treaty which makes it clear that if ever there comes a time we think we can't preserve the integrity of our nuclear stockpile, we can take appropriate steps to do so, number one.

Number two, we spend $4.5 billion a year, with by far the most sophisticated system in the world, to maintain that. Now, if all the—this treaty doesn't go into effect unless all the nuclear powers and several dozen other countries agree to it; 44 in total must agree. If they all agree, I'm sure that all the people who are making this argument would acknowledge that our system of maintaining the integrity of our stockpile without tests is far in advance of what anybody else has. So our relative security will be increased, regardless.

Final point I want to make: None of these people will stand up and say, let's start testing again. So what they're saying is, "Okay, America won't test, but if everybody else tests, well, so be it." I think it would be a big mistake.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:13 p.m. in the South Portico at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Thomas R. Reardon, president, American Medical Association; and Ronald F. Pollack, executive director, Families USA.

Remarks on Signing the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000

October 5, 1999

Thank you very much, Secretary Cohen, for your remarks, your leadership, and for the depth of your concern for our men and women in the military.

Secretary Richardson, Secretary West, Deputy Secretary Hamre, General Shelton, General Ralston, Senior Master Sergeant Hall—he told me today this is the fourth time we've met, and the first time in Washington, DC. I've tried to get around to see people like the senior master sergeant in uniform in the Middle East and Asia and elsewhere.

I want to thank all those who serve them: the senior service chiefs, the service secretaries, the senior enlisted advisers. I'd also like to say a special world of thanks to all the Members of Congress here, too numerous to recognize them all. But I do want to acknowledge the presence of Senator Warner, Senator Levin, Senator Thurmond, Senator Robb, Senator Allard, Representative Spence and Representative Skelton, and the many other Members of the House of Representatives here today.

This, for me, more than anything else, is a day to say thank you; thank you for recognizing the urgent needs and the great opportunities of our military on the edge of a new century.

Today should be a proud day for men and women in uniform, not only here in this audience but all around the world. Time and again, they have all delivered for our country. Today America delivers for them.

In a few moments, I will have the privilege of signing the National Defense Authorization Act. As you have already heard, it provides for a strong national defense and a better quality of life for our military personnel and their families. It builds on the bipartisan consensus that we must keep our military ready, take care of our men and women in uniform, and modernize our forces.

Today, we have about 1.4 million men and women serving our country on active duty, doing what needs to be done from Korea to Kosovo, to Bosnia, to Iraq, to helping our neighbors in the hemisphere and in Turkey dig out from natural disasters, to simply giving us confidence that America is forever strong and secure.

We ask our men and women in uniform to endure danger and hardship, and you do; to suffer separation from your families, and you endure that. We ask you to be the best in the world, and you are. In return, you ask very little. But we owe you the tools you need to do the job and the quality of life you and your families deserve.

This bill makes good on our pledge to keep our Armed Forces the best equipped and maintained fighting force on Earth. It carries forward modernization programs, funding the F–22 stealth fighter, the V–22 Osprey, the Comanche helicopter, advanced destroyers, submarines, amphibious ships, command and control systems, and a new generation of precision munitions. The bill also recognizes that no matter how dazzling our technological dominance, wars still will be won today and tomorrow as they have been throughout history, by people with the requisite training, skill, and spirit to prevail.

The excellence of our military is the direct product of the excellence of our men and women in uniform. This bill invests in that excellence. It authorizes, as you have already heard, a comprehensive program of pay and retirement improvements that add up to the biggest increase in military compensation in a generation. It increases bonuses for enlistment and reenlistment, and provides incentives needed to recruit and retrain our military personnel.

I would like to say a special word of appreciation to all the members of our military, including a lot of enlisted personnel, who have discussed these issues with me over the last 2 or 3 years, in particular. And I would like to thank the Members of Congress not only for the work they did on the pay issue but also on the retirement issue. And I'd like to say a special word of appreciation on that to Congressman Murtha, who first talked to me about it, and I know labored very hard on it.

Now, an awful lot of people worked to make this bill a reality. And I'm glad that there are so many members of both parties of the House and the Senate Armed Services Committee here today. I also want to thank

Secretary Cohen, General Shelton, and all the people at the Pentagon for their leadership and determination.

This bill is an expression of America at its best. It's about patriotism, not partisanship. It's about putting the people of our Armed Forces first. No matter how well we equip these forces to deal with any threat, I would also argue that we owe them every effort we possibly can to diminish that threat—the threat to the members of our Armed Forces and to the American people whom they must defend.

One of the greatest threats our people face today, and our Armed Forces face, is the threat of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We have worked in a bipartisan way to diminish those threats, passing the Chemical Weapons Convention, getting an indefinite extension of the nonproliferation treaty. We are now working to strengthen the Biological Weapons Convention.

At this time, the Senate has a unique opportunity to diminish that threat by ratifying the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It will end nuclear weapons testing forever, while allowing us to maintain our military strength in nuclear weapons and helping to keep other countries out of the nuclear weapons business.

We stopped testing nuclear weapons in 1992 in the United States. Instead, we spend some $4.5 billion a year on programs that allow us to maintain an unassailable nuclear threat. This treaty will strengthen our security by helping to prevent other countries from developing nuclear arsenals and preventing testing in countries that have nuclear weapons already but have nowhere near the sophisticated program we do for maintaining the readiness of our arsenal in the absence of testing.

It will strengthen our ability to verify by supplementing our intelligence capabilities with a global network of sensors and onsite inspections, something we will not have if the treaty does not enter into force. It will make it easier for us to determine whether other nations are engaged in nuclear activity and to take appropriate action if they are.

Obviously, no treaty—not this one or any other—can provide an absolute guarantee of security or singlehandedly stop the spread of deadly weapons. Like all treaties, this one would have to be vigorously enforced and backed by a strong national defense. But I would argue if the Senate rejects the treaty we run a far greater risk that nuclear arsenals will grow and weapons will spread to volatile regions, to dangerous rulers, even to terrorists.

I want to emphasize again, the United States has been out of the testing business for 7 years now. We are not engaged in nuclear testing. If we reject this treaty, the message will be, "We're not testing, but you can test if you want to," with all the attendant consequences that might have in India, Pakistan, China, Russia, Iran, and many other places around the world. I want to avoid a world where more and more countries race toward nuclear capability. That's the choice we face, not a perfect world, but one where we can restrain nuclear testing, but train the growth of nuclear arsenals.

Dwight Eisenhower and John Kennedy first advocated a comprehensive test ban treaty. Four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, together with Chairman Shelton and our Nation's leading nuclear scientists, including those who head our national weapons labs, advocate this treaty. I believe the treaty is good for America's security. I believe walking away and defeating it would send a message that America is no longer the leading advocate of nonproliferation in the world.

So, all I ask today is not a vote; the discussion just began. What I ask is that we meet this challenge in the same bipartisan fashion in which we approached the defense authorization bill. The stakes are exactly the same. When a young man or woman joins the United States military, they don't ask you if you're a Republican or a Democrat. And you all make it clear you're prepared to give your life for your country. We should do everything we can to ensure your safety, to give you a bright future, even as we give you the tools and the support to do the work you have sworn to do.

Let me say in closing, after nearly 7 years in this office, there has been no greater honor, privilege, or joy than the opportunity I have had to see our men and women in uniform do their jobs, all kinds of jobs all

over the world. I have also been very moved by how honestly and frankly and straightforwardly they have answered every question I have ever put to any of them. In a very real sense today, the work the Congress did and the support that I and our administration gave to this legislation is purely and simply the product of what our men and women in uniform, from the highest rank to the lowest, told us needed to be done for them and for America.

So again I say, this is a day for celebration and thanksgiving, and more than anyone else, I feel that deep gratitude to you.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:15 p.m. on the River Terrace at the Pentagon. In his remarks, he referred to Senior M.Sgt. Robert E. Hall, Sergeant Major of the Army. S. 1059, approved October 5, was assigned Public Law No. 106–65.

Statement on Signing the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000

October 5, 1999

Today I have signed into law S. 1059, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000." This Act authorizes FY 2000 appropriations for military activities of the Department of Defense, military construction, and defense activities of the Department of Energy. Although I have serious reservations about some portions of this Act, I believe S. 1059 provides for a strong national defense, maintains our military readiness, and supports our deep commitment to a better quality of life for our military personnel and their families.

The more we ask of our Armed Forces, the greater our obligation to give them the support, training, and equipment they need. We have a responsibility to give them the tools to take on new missions while maintaining their readiness to defend our country and defeat any adversary; to make sure they can deploy away from home, knowing their families have the quality of life they deserve; to attract talented young Americans to serve; and to make certain their service is not only rewarding, but well rewarded—from recruitment to retirement.

This Act helps us meet that responsibility. It endorses my comprehensive program of improvements to military pay and retirement benefits, which add up to the largest increase in military compensation in a generation. The Act increases bonuses for enlistment and reenlistment, providing incentives needed to recruit and retain skilled and motivated personnel and to maintain readiness.

The Act also helps make good on my pledge to keep our Armed Forces the best equipped fighting force on earth. It carries forward our modernization program by funding the F–22 stealth fighter, the V–22 Osprey, the Comanche helicopter, advanced destroyers, submarines and amphibious ships, and a new generation of precision munitions. I commend the Congress for recognizing the need to improve the way we dispose of property at closing military bases. In April of this year, I requested the authority to transfer former military base property to communities at no cost if they use the property for job-generating economic development. This new policy of no-cost Economic Development Conveyances will allow us to speed the transfer of such property to local communities and minimize the time that the property lies fallow. In this way, we can give an economic jump start to affected communities and help to stimulate the investments necessary to attract new job-creating businesses.

I am pleased with the Act's support for missile defense capabilities. The Act authorizes important funding for both theater and national missile defense. I am particularly pleased that the Act authorizes full funding for the Medium Extended Air Defense System cooperative program with Germany and Italy, authorizes funding for national missile defense military construction planning and design, and helps fix cost growth problems in the Patriot Advance Capability-3 and Navy Area Defense programs. The Act's requirement to develop Theater High Altitude Area Defense and Navy Theater Wide systems concurrently is being taken into account in the Department's review of its acquisition strategy for these upper-tier programs.

Although I believe most provisions of the Act—especially the quality of life enhancements—are beneficial and support a strong

national defense, I have strong reservations about a number of provisions of S. 1059.

The most troubling features of the Act involve the reorganization of the nuclear defense functions within the Department of Energy. The original reorganization plan adopted by the Senate reflected a constructive effort to strengthen the effectiveness and security of the activities of the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons laboratories. Unfortunately, the success of this effort is jeopardized by changes that emerged from the conference, which altered the final product, making it weaker in enhancing national security. Particularly objectionable are features of the legislative charter of the new National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) that purport to isolate personnel and contractors of the NNSA from outside direction, and limit the Secretary's ability to employ his authorities to direct—both personally and through subordinates of his own choosing—the activities and personnel of the NNSA. Unaddressed, these deficiencies of the Act would impair effective health and safety oversight and program direction of the Department's nuclear defense complex.

Other provisions of S. 1059 have been faulted by the Attorneys General of over 40 States as placing in question the established duty of the Department of Energy's nuclear defense complex to comply with the procedural and substantive requirements of environmental laws. Moreover, the Act removes from the Secretary his direct authority over certain extremely sensitive classified programs specified in the Atomic Energy Act, and establishes in the NNSA separate support functions—such as contracting, personnel, public affairs, and legal—that are redundant with those now within the Department. This redundancy even extends to the counterintelligence office reporting directly to the Secretary that was established in accordance with my Presidential Decision Directive 61, and which was designed to be the single authoritative source of counterintelligence guidance throughout the Department. The Act establishes a companion counterintelligence entity within the NNSA, compounding simple redundancy with the blurring of lines of authority that can too readily result because the NNSA is largely immunized from outside direction within the Department.

Experience teaches that these are not abstract deficiencies. As the Hoover Commission concluded half a century ago, the accountability of a Cabinet Department head is not complete without the legal authority to meet the legal responsibilities for which that person is accountable. The Act's provisions summarized above skew that authority. These provisions blur the clear and unambiguous lines of authority intended by Presidential Decision Directive 61, and impair the Secretary of Energy's ability to assure compliance at all levels within the Department of Energy with instructions he may receive in meeting his national defense responsibilities under the Atomic Energy Act.

The responsibilities placed by S. 1059 in the National Nuclear Security Administration potentially are of the most significant breadth, and the extent of the Secretary of Energy's authority with respect to those responsibilities is placed in doubt by various provisions of the Act. Therefore, by this Statement I direct and state the following:

1. Until further notice, the Secretary of Energy shall perform all duties and functions of the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security.

2. The Secretary is instructed to guide and direct all personnel of the National Nuclear Security Administration by using his authority, to the extent permissible by law, to assign any Departmental officer or employee to a concurrent office within the NNSA.

3. The Secretary is further directed to carry out the foregoing instructions in a manner that assures the Act is not asserted as having altered the environmental compliance requirements, both procedural and substantive, previously imposed by Federal law on all the Department's activities.

4. In carrying out these instructions, the Secretary shall, to the extent permissible under law, mitigate the risks to clear chain of command presented by the Act's establishment of other redundant functions by the NNSA. He shall also carry out these instructions to enable research entities, other than those of the Department's nuclear defense complex that fund research by the weapons laboratories, to continue to govern conduct of the research they have commissioned.

5. I direct the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to work expeditiously with the Secretary of Energy to facilitate any administrative actions that may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the instructions in this Statement.

The expansive national security responsibilities now apparently contemplated by the Act for the new Under Secretary for Nuclear Security make selection of a nominee an especially weighty judgment. Legislative action by the Congress to remedy the deficiencies described above and to harmonize the Secretary of Energy's authorities with those of the new Under Secretary that will be in charge of the NNSA will help identify an appropriately qualified nominee. The actions directed in this Statement shall remain in force, to continue until further notice.

I am concerned with the tone and language of a number of provisions of S. 1059 relating to China, which could be detrimental to our interests.

China is undergoing a profoundly important but uncertain process of change, and I believe we must work for the best possible outcome, even as we prepare for any outcome. The Act's provision requiring annual reports on Chinese military power, similar to those previously produced on Soviet military power, assumes an outcome that is far from foreordained—that China is bent on becoming a military threat to the United States. I believe we should not make it more likely that China will choose this path by acting as if the decision has already been made. The provision establishing the Center for Study of Chinese Military Affairs is troubling for the same reason. The Secretary of Defense will ensure that the Center is held to the highest standards of scholarship and impartiality and that it explores a wide range of perspectives on the Chinese military.

Our long-term strategy must be to encourage China to grow into a more prosperous and open society; to integrate China into the institutions that promote global norms on proliferation, trade, the environment, and human rights; to cooperate where we agree, even as we defend our interests and values with realism and candor where we do not. We cannot do that simply by confronting China or seeking to contain it. We can only do that if we maintain a policy of principled, purposeful engagement with China's government and China's people.

I intend to implement the China provisions of the bill in a manner consistent with this policy, including, where appropriate, combining several of the reporting requirements.

Further, I am disappointed that S. 1059 contains damaging restrictions on our threat reduction programs in the former Soviet Union. Since 1992, these programs have helped to deactivate almost 5,000 nuclear warheads in the former Soviet Union; eliminate nuclear weapons from Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan; strengthen the security of nuclear weapons and materials at over 100 sites in the region; tighten export controls and detect illicit trafficking; engage over 30,000 former weapons scientists in civilian research; and purchase hundreds of tons of highly enriched uranium from dismantled Russian weapons.

Restrictions on the Cooperative Threat Reduction program and new certification requirements on the Nuclear Cities Initiative threaten to slow the pace of Russian disarmament, which is contrary to our national interests. I urge that future appropriations for the Nuclear Cities Initiative not be conditioned on this certification. I also urge the Congress to reverse its current ban on chemical weapons destruction assistance to Russia.

In order to avoid any confusion among our allies or elsewhere regarding the new NATO Strategic Concept, I feel compelled to make clear that the document is a political, not a legal, document. As such, the Strategic Concept does not create any new commitment or obligation within my understanding of section 1221(a) of the Act, and therefore, will not be submitted to the Senate for advice and consent.

I am concerned about section 1232, which contains a funding limitation with respect to continuous deployment of United States Armed Forces in Haiti pursuant to Operation Uphold Democracy. I have decided to terminate the continuous deployment of forces in Haiti, and I intend to keep the Congress informed with respect to any future deployments to Haiti; however, I will interpret this provision consistent with my constitutional

responsibilities as President and Commander in Chief.

A number of other provisions of this bill raise serious constitutional concerns. Because the President is the Commander in Chief and the Chief Executive under the Constitution, the Congress may not interfere with the President's duty to protect classified and other sensitive national security information or his responsibility to control the disclosure of such information by subordinate officials of the executive branch (sections 1042, 3150, and 3164). Furthermore, because the Constitution vests the conduct of foreign affairs in the President, the Congress may not direct that the President initiate discussions or negotiations with foreign governments (section 1407 and 1408). Nor may the Congress unduly restrict the President's constitutional appointment authority by limiting the President's selection to individuals recommended by a subordinate officer (section 557). To the extent that these provisions conflict with my constitutional responsibilities in these areas, I will construe them where possible to avoid such conflicts, and where it is impossible to do so, I will treat them as advisory. I hereby direct all executive branch officials to do likewise.

Finally, S. 1059 provides for participation in the Thrift Savings Plan by full-time members of the uniformed services and reservists, but subject to my proposing and the Congress' passage of separate legislation to pay for the costs of their participation. I shall consider this proposal when determining my Fiscal Year 2001 Budget.

Notwithstanding the concerns noted above, I believe that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, as a whole, will enhance our national security and help us achieve our military and related defense objectives. By providing the necessary support for our forces, it will ensure continued U.S. global leadership well into the 21st century.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
October 5, 1999.

NOTE: S. 1059, approved October 5, was assigned Public Law No. 106–65.

Statement on Senate Action on the Nomination of Ronnie L. White To Be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri

October 5, 1999

Today the Senate defeated the nomination of Ronnie White for the Federal District Court in Missouri. This vote was a disgraceful act of partisan politics by the Republican majority and creates real doubt on the ability of the Senate to fairly perform its constitutional duty to advise and consent. By voting down the first African-American judge to serve on the Missouri Supreme Court, the Republicans have deprived both the judiciary and the people of Missouri of an excellent, fair, and impartial Federal judge.

Judge White was a casualty of a judicial confirmation process that has lost any pretense of fairness. There was never any doubt about Judge White's ability to apply the law impartially. To defeat the candidacy of Judge White, the Republican majority maligned and distorted White's death penalty record, falsely creating a pretext for his defeat. While serving on the Missouri State Supreme Court, Judge White affirmed the imposition of the death penalty in almost 70 percent of the cases that came before him. Moreover, in 10 of the 18 reported instances in which Judge White voted to not impose the death penalty, he did so with an unanimous court.

The disappointing action of the Senate today provides strong evidence for those who believe that the Senate treats minority and women judicial nominees unequally. This is a sad day for the cause of equal justice.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting the Report on Implementation of the Partnership For Peace

October 5, 1999

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In accordance with section 514(a) of Public Law 103–236, I am submitting to you this report on implementation of the Partnership for Peace (PFP).

As noted in last year's report to the Congress, PFP has been a critical tool in helping

all the Partners, regardless of their desire to join NATO, to build stronger ties with the Alliance and develop closer cooperative relationships with all their neighbors. As you will see from the attached report, NATO Allies and Partners have managed to create a fundamentally different Partnership through the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) and PFP enhancements.

The EAPC and PFP have provided a means for incorporating Partners into NATO's operation in Bosnia, assisting Albania in rebuilding its armed forces, and helping Partners in Southeastern Europe cope with the Kosovo crisis. Enhancements to PFP provide a solid foundation for closer NATO-Partner collaboration and a mechanism for Partners to develop the interoperability with NATO that will be necessary for future NATO-led Allied/Partner missions.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Jesse Helms, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and Benjamin A. Gilman, chairman, House Committee on International Relations.

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

October 5, 1999

Dear _____:

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

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

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

Proclamation 7233—German-American Day, 1999

October 5, 1999

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Throughout America's history, we have drawn strength from the diversity of our people. Men and women from many different countries and cultures have arrived here, determined to forge a new life in a new land, and their talents have contributed to our national life. Germans were among the earliest ethnic groups to emigrate to America, arriving at William Penn's invitation more than 300 years ago. Whether motivated by the pursuit of religious liberty, intellectual freedom, or economic opportunity, the millions of Germans who have made their home in America have played an important part in advancing the peace and prosperity that our country enjoys today.

The achievements of notable German Americans have enriched every aspect of our society. The leadership of statesmen such as President Eisenhower and Henry Kissinger helped guide our Nation securely through the difficult Cold War years. The military acumen of German Americans has benefited us—from the Revolutionary War, when Baron Friedrich von Steuben's training programs brought discipline and organization to the Continental Army, to the Gulf War, when General Norman Schwarzkopf helped lead our troops to victory over Saddam Hussein. Prominent authors H.L. Mencken and Theodore Dreiser have enlightened our literary tradition, while inventors George Westinghouse and Charles Steinmetz have fueled our technological advancement. The world of American sports has been energized by outstanding athletes of German descent, providing a showcase for the talents of such greats as Babe Ruth and Lou Gehrig.

But by focusing on the achievements of prominent individuals, we risk understating the overall importance of the German heritage to our Nation's strength and development. Today, nearly one-quarter of all Americans can trace their ancestry to Germany, just as our English language finds its roots

in the Germanic tongues of centuries past. German Americans honor the traditions of their lineage in the way they live, reflecting the sense of personal honor and strong work ethic passed down to them by their forebears.

As Americans seek to become a more united people, we must not forget our roots, for they remind us of who we are and of what we have to share with others. German-American Day offers us an invaluable opportunity not only to honor the contributions of Germany Americans, but also to celebrate the close relationship that we enjoy today with our German friends across the Atlantic. Next month, we will join them in commemorating the 10th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall—a symbolic triumph of democracy and self-determination. As we look back on half a century of joint accomplishments with Germany that reflect our shared respect for the rule of law, human rights, and social justice, we can look ahead to a new era of cooperation, whether working together to restore peace to the war-torn Balkans or assisting the former Eastern Bloc nations on their own road to democratization and economic recovery.

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 the laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim Wednesday, October 6, 1999, as German-American Day. I encourage all Americans to applaud the important contributions made to our country by our millions of citizens of German descent and to celebrate our close ties to the people of Germany.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 7, 1999]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 6, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on October 8.

Remarks on the Legislative Agenda

October 6, 1999

Good afternoon. I want to say a few brief words about three critical issues now pending before Congress. There have been major developments on all of them in the last 24 hours that demand our attention and the attention of the American people.

First, yesterday's defeat of Ronnie White's nomination for the Federal district court judgeship in Missouri was a disgraceful act of partisan politics. Once again, this creates a real doubt about the Senate's ability to fairly perform its constitutional duty to advise and consent.

Unfortunately, by voting down the first African-American judge, who was already serving—the first African-American judge to serve on the Missouri State Supreme Court, the Republican-controlled Senate is adding credence to the perceptions that they treat minority and women judicial nominees unfairly and unequally.

I would just point out that that strict party-line vote included Republicans who had previously voted in the Judiciary Committee to recommend him to the full Senate.

I hope the Senate leadership will reverse this course and begin to provide timely and fair consideration of all judicial nominees. In particular, I ask the Senate to act on the nominations of Marsha Berzon and Richard Paez, who has been held up for years now. They're both excellent candidates for the Ninth Circuit and have been waiting for quite some time to receive a vote from the Senate.

Meanwhile, I will continue to fulfill my obligations to nominate and press for the confirmation of the most qualified candidates possible for the Federal bench.

The second thing I want to talk about is congressional action on the Patients' Bill of Rights. Today was supposed to be the day the American people have long waited for, the day a bipartisan majority passed a strong Patients' Bill of Rights. Now, the Republican leadership knows there is a majority for that bill. But unfortunately, as a result of an 11th hour appeal by the insurance industry lobbyists, which all of you reported on yesterday,

once again it appears that the will of the American people will be thwarted.

In the dead of the night last night the House leaders concocted a process filled with enough poison pills and legislative sleights of hand to practically guarantee the defeat of this bill. This is a travesty. It's the sort of thing they did to kill commonsense gun legislation in the aftermath of Littleton. The American people want something; there is a bipartisan majority for it; the leadership makes a deal with the special interest and figures out some procedural way to tie everything up in knots to keep it from passing.

Now, a bipartisan majority is poised to pass this bill. But now they are being blocked by legislative tactics concocted by the leadership that blatantly put special interests ahead of the interests of the American people.

What is the result of this? The Republican leadership would ensure that the American people will have to wait for the right to see a specialist, wait for the right to have access to the nearest emergency room care, wait for the right to stay with their health care provider throughout a course of cancer treatment or pregnancy, wait for the right to hold their health plan accountable for harmful decisions.

Again, I ask the bipartisan majority who favor the Patients' Bill of Rights: Don't make them wait. Reject these tactics. Insist that the leadership allow a fair up or down vote on the Norwood-Dingell bill. Insist on an up or down vote on a bill that is comprehensive, enforceable, and paid for. Don't let this 11th hour gimmick kill 2 years of hard work for something the overwhelming majority of Americans of all political persuasions know we need to do.

The American people deserve more than partisan posturing and legislative gamesmanship on an issue this vital. The people who think it's the wrong thing to do ought to just stand up on the floor and vote against it. But they know they're in the minority; they shouldn't be able to pull some 11th hour deal that keeps the vote from coming out the way a majority want it to come out.

Let me say, finally, we also should proceed with our actions to protect Americans from the threat of nuclear weapons. Later this afternoon, I'll meet here at the White House with Nobel laureates, former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and others on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. I fervently believe, as all of you know, that this treaty will restrain the spread of nuclear weapons, while enabling us to maintain the effectiveness of our nuclear arsenal.

As you know, there are discussions between Republicans and Democrats on the Hill about a better process for deliberating on this important treaty. After 2 long years of inaction, one week is very little time for considered action. The Chemical Weapons Convention, for example, that we ratified in 1997, had 14 full days of hearings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee after a long process of negotiations. But for now, the vote is scheduled for Tuesday, and I will continue to aggressively argue to the Senate and to the American people that this is in our national interests.

And I will have a little more to say about this later today at the other event.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:10 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Remarks Following a Meeting With Supporters of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty

October 6, 1999

Thank you very much. Let me begin by saying a profound word of thanks to Senator Glenn, to General Shalikashvili, to Dr. Townes, and to Secretary Cohen for what they have said. I thank General Jones and Admiral Crowe for being here. I thank all the other Nobel laureates who are here; Secretary Richardson and General Shelton and the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Mr. Berger and Mr. Podesta, the other people from the White House. And I thank Senators Biden and Dorgan for their presence here and their enormous leadership on this issue, and other committed American citizens who are in this audience.

Let me say that I was sitting here thinking two things when the previous speakers were speaking. One is, it made me very proud to be an American, to know that our country had been served by people like these four, without regard to party. The second is that

each in their own way represent a different piece of the American experience over the last 50 years and bring a remarkable combination of intellect, knowledge, experience, and humanity to the remarks that they made.

There's a reason that President Eisenhower said we ought to do this and a reason that President Kennedy agreed. They saw World War II from slightly different angles and different ranks, but they experienced the horror of the atomic era's onset in much the same way. I think you could make a compelling argument that this treaty is more needed now than it was when they advocated it, when there were only two nuclear powers. I think you could make a compelling argument that, given the events of the last couple of years, this treaty is more needed than it was when I signed it at the United Nations 3 years ago. Nuclear technology and know-how continue to spread. The risk that more and more countries will obtain weapons that are nuclear is more serious than ever.

I said yesterday—I'd like to just stop here and go off the script. I am very worried that the 21st century will see the proliferation of nuclear and chemical and biological weapons; that those systems will undergo a process of miniaturization, just as almost all other technological events have led us to, in good ways and bad; and that we will continue to see the mixing and blending of misconduct in the new century by rogue states, angry countries, and terrorist groups. It is, therefore, essential that the United States stay in the nonproliferation lead in a comprehensive way.

Now, if you look at what we're trying to do with the Biological Weapons Convention, for example, in putting teeth in that while increasing our own ability to protect our own people and protect our friends who want to work with us from biological weaponry, you see a good direction. If you look at what we did with the Chemical Weapons Convention, working in good faith for months with the Congress to ask the same question we're asking here—are we better off with this or without it?—and how we added safeguard after safeguard after safeguard, both generated out of the administration and generated from leaders of both parties in the Congress, that's how we ought to look at this.

But we have to ask ourselves just the same question they all presented, because the nuclear threat is still the largest one, and are we better off or not if we adopt this treaty?

I think we start with the fact that the best way to constrain the danger of nuclear proliferation and, God forbid, the use of a nuclear weapon, is to stop other countries from testing nuclear weapons. That's what this test ban treaty will do. A vote, therefore, to ratify is a vote to increase the protections of our people and the world from nuclear war. By contrast, a vote against it risks a much more dangerous future.

One of the interesting things—I'll bet you that people in other parts of the world, particularly those that have nuclear technology, are watching the current debate with some measure of bewilderment. I mean, today we enjoy unmatched influence, with peace and freedom ascendant in the world, with enormous prosperity, enormous technical advances. And by and large, on a bipartisan basis, we've done a pretty good job of dealing with this unique moment in history.

We've seen the end of the cold war making possible agreements to cut U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals by more than 60 percent. We have offered the Russians the opportunity of further cuts if they will ratify START II. But we know the nuclear peril persists and that there's growing danger that these weapons could spread in the Middle East, in the Persian Gulf, in Asia, to areas where our troops are deployed. We know that they can be present in areas where there are intense rivalries and, unlike at least the latter years of the cold war, still very much the possibility of misunderstanding between countries with this capacity.

Now, let me say the reason I say that I think other countries will be looking at this, one of the concerns that I have had all along is that the countries we need to get involved in this, India, Pakistan, all the other countries, will say, "Well, gosh, when we all get in this Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the Americans have a big advantage, because they're spending $4.5 billion maintaining the integrity of their nuclear stockpile." And I always thought that, too. And I think that's a good thing, because people around the

world know we're not going to abuse this responsibility we have.

But it is strange to me—and I'm sure strange for people in foreign capitals analyzing the debate going on in Washington—that there are people against this treaty who somehow think we will be disadvantaged by it. So instead, they propose to say, well, we—they don't, any of them, say we should start testing again. So the message of not ratifying this treaty is, "Okay, we're not going to test, but you guys have a green light."

Now, forgive my less than elevated language, but I think we've got to put this down where everybody can get it. And I don't think we ought to give a green light to our friends in India and Pakistan, to the Chinese or the Russians, or to people who would be nuclear powers. I think that would be a mistake.

I think we ought to give them an outstretched hand and say, let us show common restraint. And see this in the framework of our continuing work with the Russians to secure their own nuclear materials, to destroy nuclear weapons that are scheduled for destruction, and to continue our effort to reduce the nuclear threat.

The argument, it seems to me, doesn't hold water, this argument that somehow we would be better off, even though we're not going to start testing again, to walk away from this treaty and give a green light to all these other countries in the world.

Now, I sent this test ban treaty up to the Senate over 2 years ago. For 2 years, the opponents of the treaty refused to hold any hearings. Suddenly, they say, "Okay, you've got to vote up or down in a week." Now, this is a tough fight without much time, and there are lots of technical arguments can be made to confuse the issue. But I would like to just reiterate what has already been said by previous speakers and make one other point.

There are basically three categories of arguments against the treaty. Two have been dealt with. One is, "Well, this won't detect every test that anybody could do at every level," and General Shalikashvili addressed that. We will have censors all over the world that will detect far more tests than will be detected if this treaty is not ratified and does not enter into force. And our military have repeatedly said that any test of a size that would present any kind of credible threat to what we have to do to protect the American people, we would know about, and we could respond in an appropriate and timely fashion.

The second argument is, no matter what all these guys say, they can find three scientists somewhere who will say—or maybe 300, I don't know—that they just don't agree and maybe there is some scenario under which the security and reliability of the nuclear deterrent in America can be eroded. Well, I think that at some point, with all these Nobel laureates and our laboratory heads and the others that have endorsed this—say what they say, you have to say, what is the likelihood that America can maintain the security and reliability of its nuclear deterrent, as compared with every other country, if they come under the umbrella of this and the treaty enters into force?

The same people say that we ought to build a national missile defense, notwithstanding the technological uncertainties, because our skill is so much greater, we can always find a technological answer to everything. And I would argue that our relative advantage in security, even if you have some smidgen of a doubt about the security and reliability issue, will be far greater if we get everybody under this tent and we're all living under the same rules, than it will be if we're all outside the tent.

Now, there's a third sort of grab-bag set of arguments against it, and I don't mean to deprecate them. Some of them are actually quite serious and substantial questions that have been raised about various countries' activities in particular places and other things. The point I want to make about them is, go back and look at the process we adopted in the Chemical Weapons Convention. Every single other objection that has been raised or question that has been raised can be dealt with by adding an appropriately worded safeguard to this treaty. It either falls within the six we've already offered and asked for or could be crafted in a careful negotiation as a result of a serious process. So I do not believe that any of these things are serious stumbling blocks to the profound argument that this is in our interest.

Look, 154 countries have signed this treaty—Russia, China, Japan, South Korea, Israel, Iran, all our NATO Allies—51 have already ratified, 11 of our NATO Allies, including nuclear powers Britain and France. But it can't go into effect unless the U.S. and the other designated nations ratify it. And once again, we need American leadership to protect American interests and to advance the peace of the world.

I say again, we're spending $4½ billion a year a protect the security and reliability of the nuclear stockpile. There is a reason that Secretary Cohen and Secretary Richardson and our laboratory heads believe that we can do this. Once again, I say the U.S. stopped testing in 1992. What in the world would prevent us from trying to have a regime where we want other people to join us in stopping testing?

Let me just give one example. Last year the nuclear tests by India and Pakistan shook the world. After those tests occurred, they had a serious confrontation along the line of control in Kashmir. I spent our Independence Day, the Fourth of July, meeting with the Pakistani Prime Minister and his senior government officials in an intense effort to try to help defuse this situation.

Now, both of these countries have indicated they will sign this treaty. If our Senate defeats it, do you think they'll sign it? Do you think they'll ratify it? Do you think for a minute that they will forgo further tests if they believe that the leading force in the world for nuclear nonproliferation has taken a U-turn? If our Senate defeats the treaty, will it encourage the Russians, the Chinese, and others to refrain from trying to find and test new, more sophisticated, more destructive nuclear weapons? Or will it give them a green light?

Now, I said earlier we've been working with Congress on missile defense to protect us from a nuclear attack should one ever come. I support that work. And if we can develop a system we think will work, we owe it to the American people to work with the Russians and others to figure out a way to give our people the maximum protection. But our first line of defense should be preventing countries from having those weapons in the first place.

It would be the height of irresponsibility to rely on the last line of defense to say, "We're not going to test. You guys test. And we're in a race to get up a missile defense, and we sure hope it will work if the wheels run off 30 or 40 years from now." This argument doesn't hold water.

People say, "Well, but somebody might cheat." Well, that's true, somebody might cheat. Happens all the time, in all regimes. Question is, are we more likely to catch them with the treaty or without?

You all know—and I am confident that people on the Hill have to know—that this test ban treaty will strengthen our ability to determine whether or not nations are involved in weapons activities. You've heard the 300 sensors mentioned. Let me tell you what that means in practical terms. If this treaty goes into effect, there will be 31 sensors in Russia, 11 in China, 17 in the Middle East alone, and the remainder of the 300-plus in other critical places around the world. If we can find cheating, because it's there, then we'll do what's necessary to stop or counter it.

Let me again say I want to thank the former chairs of the Joint Chiefs who have endorsed this. I want to thank the current Chair, and all the Joint Chiefs, and the previous service chiefs who have been with us in this: Lawrence Eagleburger, the Secretary of State under President Bush; Paul Nitze, a top Presidential adviser from Presidents Truman to Reagan; former Senator Nancy Kassebaum Baker, many Republicans and Democrats who have dealt with this issue for years have stayed with us. John Glenn, from *Mercury* to *Discovery*—are you going up again, John?—has always been at the cutting edge of technology's promise. But he's also flown fighter planes and seen war.

The Nobel laureates who are here, Dr. Ramsey, Dr. Fitch, both part of the Manhattan Project; Dr. Ramsey, a young scientist, Dr. Fitch, a teenage soldier, witnessed the very first nuclear test 54 years ago in the New Mexico desert. Their letter says, "It is imperative"—underline "imperative"—"that the test ban treaty be ratified."

Let me just say one other thing. There may be a suggestion here that our heart is overcoming our head and all that. I'd like to give

you one example that I think refutes that on another topic. One of the biggest disappointments I've had as President, a bitter disappointment for me, is that I could not sign in good conscience the treaty banning landmines, because we have done more since I've been President to get rid of landmines than any country in the world by far. We spend half the money the world spends on demining. We have destroyed over a million of our own mines.

I couldn't do it because the way the treaty was worded was unfair to the United States and to our Korean allies in meeting our responsibilities along the DMZ in South Korea and because it outlawed our antitank mines while leaving every other country's intact. And I thought it was unfair.

But it just killed me. But all of us who are in charge of the Nation's security engage our heads, as well as our hearts. Thinking and feeling lead you to the conclusion that this treaty should be ratified.

Every single serious question that can be raised about this kind of bomb, that kind of bomb, what this country has, what's going on here, there, and yonder—every single one of them can be dealt with in the safeguard structure that is normally a product of every serious treaty deliberation in the United States Senate. And I say again, from the time of President Eisenhower, the United States has led the world in the cause of nonproliferation. We have new, serious proliferation threats that our predecessors have not faced. And it is all the more imperative that we do everything we possibly can to minimize the risks our children will face.

That is what you were trying to do. I thank the Senators who are here with us today and pray that they can swell their ranks by next week.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:43 p.m in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to former Senator and astronaut John Glenn, who introduced the President; former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. John M. Shalikashvili, USA (Ret.), Gen. Davis C. Jones, USA (Ret.), and Gen. William J. Crowe, Jr., USN (Ret.); and Nobel Prize for Physics recipients Charles H. Townes (1964), Noram F. Ramsey (1989), and Val L. Fitch (1980).

Statement on the London Commuter Train Crash

October 6, 1999

I want to offer my deepest sympathies to the families and friends of those who were injured or killed in yesterday's train crash in London. This incident was particularly tragic because it happened in such an everyday setting—as commuters headed towards another day at work. Our thoughts and prayers go out to the Americans who were among the injured, and all the victims and their families.

Proclamation 7234—General Pulaski Memorial Day, 1999

October 6, 1999

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

In the more than two centuries that have passed since the signing of our Declaration of Independence, America has grown from a struggling democracy into the most powerful Nation on earth. But today, even as we enter the new century as a proud, prosperous, and free people, we must never forget those friends who cast their lot with us when the outcome of our bid for independence was unclear. Among those to whom we owe such a debt of gratitude is General Casimir Pulaski of Poland, who gave his life for our freedom on a Revolutionary War battlefield 220 years ago this month.

Casimir Pulaski had scarcely reached adulthood when he joined his father and brothers in the struggle for sovereignty for their native Poland. Though the Polish forces were skilled in battle, neighboring empires outnumbered and defeated them, and Pulaski himself was forced into exile. But soon the young soldier answered another call for freedom—this time on behalf of the fledgling United States of America. He distinguished himself in his first military engagement in our War for Independence, and the Continental Congress immediately commissioned him as a brigadier general and assigned him to command the cavalry of the Continental Army. Fighting with characteristic valor and

distinction, General Pulaski was killed during the Battle of Savannah and earned an enduring place in our Nation's history.

As we honor Casimir Pulaski this year, we give thanks that for the first time, Poles and Americans can proudly observe the anniversary of General Pulaski's death as NATO allies. In the years to come, both our peoples will continue to draw strength from the memory of Casimir Pulaski and from the courage and sacrifice of so many Poles and Polish Americans who have helped ensure the freedom, peace, and prosperity our two countries enjoy today.

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 Monday, October 11, 1999, as General Pulaski Memorial Day. I encourage all Americans to commemorate this occasion with appropriate programs and activities.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 12, 1999]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 13.

Remarks on the Unveiling of a Portrait of Former Secretary of Commerce Mickey Kantor

October 6, 1999

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. Secretary Daley, thank you for your comments and your extraordinary leadership. I thank Secretary and Mrs. Glickman, Secretary Richardson, Ambassador Barshefsky, John Podesta, Ambassador Zuzul from Croatia for being here, and the many friends and family members of Mickey Kantor, but especially Heidi, and Leslie and Bruce, and Doug and Allison, and Alix—and of course, Ryan and Zachary.

I think that when they're old enough to watch the videotape of this ceremony, they will enjoy it a lot. They will see that their father was one of America's greatest public—their grandfather was one of America's greatest public servants. They also, because of what I am about to say, will know that he's known for something other than cuddles and hugs. [*Laughter*] After all, you don't earn the title he actually earned in a poll once, there of the "third most hated man in South Korea"—[*laughter*]—by being Mr. Nice Guy all the time. [*Laughter*]

I went to South Korea, and I gave a speech to the South Korean Parliament—and it's always a big deal, the American President goes to a foreign parliament. I spoke to the French Parliament; I've spoken to parliaments all over the world, and they're always so excited and happy, not because of me but because it's the United States. Not in Korea. [*Laughter*] They all sat there glumly, with—and they held up little protest signs that said, "Rice." [*Laughter*] Thanks a lot, Mickey. It was great. [*Laughter*]

Secretary Daley has already alluded to this, and I just want to say briefly, in April of 1996, after Ron Brown and the other fine people from the Department of Commerce died in that terrible plane crash, I really thought there was no one else I could turn to to run this Department. I hesitated to ask Mickey to do it. I thought that he had been one of the truly most outstanding and effective Trade Ambassadors we had every had.

But when I did ask him, without a moment's hesitation, even though he'd rather carry his own scheduling book and make his own deals, he came over here to this massive Government Department to do the Nation's work again. And he did it out of loyalty to me, to Ron, to the thousands of grieving Commerce Department employees, and to the United States. And I am very grateful.

I like this portrait an awful lot. Mr. Polson, you did a remarkable job. But on the way over here, I was sort of hoping that you'd break the mold and you would lift this curtain and I would see Mickey in his Speedo bathing suit, flexing his biceps. [*Laughter*] But instead he's got that double-breasted suit on, he can afford now that he's left Government service. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Mickey for many things. I've been a close friend of his for what seems like forever now, more than 20 years. Bill mentioned his service in the Navy. I think it's worth, for the record, to point out that he served on an aircraft carrier. What you may not know is that he and the rest of the crew of the U.S.S. *Wasp* were on the frontlines of the Cuban missile crisis, locked eyeball-to-eyeball with Russian sailors for those 14 harrowing days.

I think it was good preparation for the rest of his life and the constant, constant occasions he has had to call upon his steel nerves. This has served Mickey well in everything he's ever done. In turning 9th inning double plays at Vanderbilt, to dealing with 11th hour crises in our '92 campaign, to closing the deal on some of the largest trade negotiations in America's history.

Back in 1993, when Mickey was using those nerves of steel in a series of complex negotiations with the Japanese, some teenagers were spotted at Japanese Disneyland with a T-shirt that sums it up well. Mickey Kantor was drawn to look like Mickey Mouse calmly beating the dickens out of sumo wrestlers 10 times his size. [*Laughter*]

We all like watching Mickey work. If we want to watch Mickey at all, we have to like to watch Mickey work. [*Laughter*] We've all seen him up for days and nights at a time on some difficult negotiation. Instead of just throwing in the towel or throwing a chair, he sort of does that "I'm just a country lawyer from Tennessee" routine, and you turn around, and you've lost your wallet.

We all know that Mickey has on occasion shown displays of temper—at least he has to me, but I deserved it, and it served the conversation well at the time. But let me say to all of you, the thing that I like about him so much is that he does have passion, and he does have nerves of steel. He has courage and a good mind, but he also, most importantly, has the right kind of heart.

When he was a teenager, he was profoundly moved when his father lost his job on the Nashville School Board because he had the temerity to believe that Nashville ought to abide by the Supreme Court's order to desegregate our schools. Later he was inspired by the activism of Caesar Chavez and went down to Florida to defend poor farm workers against labor abuses.

As Secretary Daley mentioned, Mickey worked with Hillary on the board of the Legal Services Corporation when President Carter served here, helping to secure every American's right to equal justice under the law. He also served on the board of the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund and created an award and scholarship in Valerie's name. He created the Los Angeles Conservation Corps, giving hundreds of young people a chance to make a difference in their communities and exposing me to the Corps in 1991 and 1992, which was, along with City Year in Boston, for me, the model that led to AmeriCorps, and has now given over 100,000 young Americans the chance to serve in their communities and earn some funds to go on to college—in just 5 years, more people than served in the first 20 years of the Peace Corps. I am very proud of that and very grateful to Mickey for giving me the inspiration.

Mickey has done things that, I think, are important for America's politics beyond the jobs that he's held. He's always believed we could fight for the underdog and make life good for everyone else. He was the prototypical New Democrat, before the phrase became popular.

When we were working on this campaign, in '91 and '92, whenever he sensed the message of the campaign drifting he would always say, "We have to prove that our party can grow the economy, can get the deficit down, is committed to expanding trade, not running away from the globalized future we all face. We have to prove that we believe in welfare reform, that able-bodied people can work and raise their children and succeed." And he used to talk all the time about how important it was for us to follow policies that would drive down the crime rate and make America safer, things that didn't always fall within the direct ambit of his work in the campaign and later as trade negotiator. And whenever he felt we were drifting away, he would call me on the phone and say, "Remember what we ran; remember what we promised; remember what we've got to do." And still—even though he's not in public

service—and now that he's not in my employ—sometimes with greater color—[*laughter*]—he calls and reminds me of that, if he ever senses any drift.

So Mickey, before I turn the program over to you and give you a chance to rebut the charges of the Koreans, the Japanese kids, and your President, let me say, thank you for 21 or more remarkable years of genuine friendship. Thank you for astonishing public service. Thank you for being a good model, as father and husband and citizen. And thank you for believing in things and people, enough to fight for what you believe in. Our country is much better because you have served it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:05 p.m. in the main lobby at the Herbert C. Hoover Building. In his remarks, he referred to Secretary Glickman's wife, Rhonda; Croatian Ambassador to the U.S. Miomir Zuzul ; and artist Steven Polson, who painted the portrait.

Remarks at a Reception for Representative Bart Stupak

October 6, 1999

The President. Thank you. Well, first of all, I would like to thank our host for providing this magnificent room for us to meet in tonight in Union Station. When I was a college student in Washington, DC, Union Station was one of Washington's big eyesores. There's a young woman here nodding; she wasn't even alive when I was in college. How does she know that? [*Laughter*] But to see what's happened to it, for those of us who love this city and its monuments, it's a great thing, and I'm delighted that we're here.

I also want to acknowledge—Bart's a good politician; he called everybody's name in this audience tonight who can actually vote for him. [*Laughter*] Right before I came in here, I got a call on the cell phone from Hillary, who is in Europe on a trip, saying to say hello to Bart and Laurie. They are two of her favorite people, and she loves the Upper Peninsula and its Representative.

But I think if you—everybody wants to know why I'm here—if you want to see an indication of why Congressman Stupak has been so successful, I'd like for every Member of the House of Representatives here to raise your hand—everybody who is here in the House: one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten. That's pretty good, isn't it? Let's give them a hand. [*Applause*]

I saw seven with my bad eyesight, and I knew that if I tried to do what he did—he had everybody written down—[*laughter*]—I'd be making a political mistake.

Anyway, I want to thank them for coming. I also want to tell you that—Bart said I had been to the Upper Peninsula—we had a Governors conference in Traverse City in 1980—I said '88, maybe it was '87—'87, I think. And I went to—we were obviously in Traverse City, where my most vivid memory besides the beautiful lake is that impossible golf course that Jack Nicklaus built there.

Audience member. The Bear!

The President. The Bear—and it is—and all of the beautiful little towns around there, including the place where they make the biggest cherry pie in the world—[*laughter*]—in the summertime that literally took up the whole courthouse lawn. I got a piece of that cherry pie. [*Laughter*] And I've been trying to get back there ever since. [*Laughter*]

We also went to Mackinaw Island for a Democratic Governors meeting, and all the then-Democratic candidates for President came and met us there at the Grand Hotel, where I stayed and where the then-Governor of Michigan, Jim Blanchard, put on a Motown revue, with Martha and the Vandellas and Junior Walker and the All-Stars. And they asked me to come play with them, and I did. It was the first time I'd played saxophone in 3 years, and I've been playing ever since. So I feel—again, I mean, from my former—so I feel very indebted to the Upper Peninsula for a lot of things. And I have very vivid memories of running around the outside of Mackinaw Island jogging there in the summertime, and how much I loved it. So I hope I can come back.

Let me be to the point here. When we passed the economic plan in 1993—that did raise taxes on the wealthiest 1½ percent of the American people, but cut taxes for 15 million working families and promised to reduce the deficit at least $500 billion—the very announcement of the plan, before I

even took the oath of office, began to drop interest rates. And then when we introduced it, they dropped some more. And when we kept fighting for it, they dropped some more.

But everybody knew what would happen if we did it, that the Republicans would try to convince everybody that we'd raised taxes on them. And sure enough, that's what happened. They decided that they would not give us one vote, even though they knew that these deficits had quadrupled the national debt, given us high interest rates, slow growth, and a terrible recession, stagnant earnings.

And we all decided that we would jump off that bridge together. And I felt terrible about it because a third of the Senate comes up for election every 2 years, and every House Member does, but the President doesn't have to run for 4 years. And we all knew that there was a very good chance, if we passed that plan in August of 1993, that it would bring the deficit down and bring interest rates down, but people might not feel the improved economy or believe, even, that the deficit was coming down by the '94 election.

For the Members from rural America, particularly after we passed the crime bill—we passed the Brady bill for background checks; we passed the crime bill, which banned 19 assault weapons; and we put those 100,000 police on the street, like Bart said—they put an enormous burden on rural Democrats. Now—and Bart went home to run for reelection. And a number of our people, I think, were hoping they could make the election about something else.

Bart Stupak decided to make the election about the vote he cast. He was proud of it. He thought it was right, and if the people wanted to vote him out for it, so be it. But he wanted to make sure they knew exactly what was in the bill, which is not at all what his opponent said was in the bill. So he went home and adopted an in-your-face position, and he's still standing here. And I admire the fact that he voted with us when it would have been easy for him to take a pass, because if we had lost one vote, the plan would have failed.

Then I admire the fact that he was not ashamed of the vote he'd taken and wasn't about to run and hide from it, because he knew it would help to turn America around. The same thing with having been in law enforcement and what he said about background checks.

Now, when I was running in '92, we just made an argument to the American people, those of us that came in in '92. It was an argument. We said, "Give us a chance. We can put people first. We can do better. We can create opportunity for every responsible citizen. We can create an American community where we don't forget about rural America, we don't forget about the minorities in the inner cites, we don't forget about anybody. We give everybody a chance to be a part of this. Give us a chance." It was an argument.

By the time I got to run for reelection—you should know this—the deficit was coming down for almost 4 years before a majority of Americans believed it. The economy was getting better for almost 3 years before a majority of Americans believed it—before they could feel it and feel secure. There is a lag time.

When you have to make a very tough decision and then you try to turn a big country around, it's like trying to turn an ocean liner around. It's not like running a little powerboat with an outboard motor that you can turn on a dime. And there's a lot of groaning in the turn. And we did lose a lot of wonderful people in the United States Congress. The country's been paying for it ever since, I might add. [*Laughter*] But Bart stood strong. And now there's not an argument anymore.

As we go through the 2000 election, this is what I hope all of you from the Upper Peninsula will say about your Congressman: When the future of the country was on the line, when America's future in the 21st century was on the line, when the children of this country had an uncertain future, he stepped up—he loved being in Congress; he had just gotten there—and he was willing to throw it all away for you. And he had enough confidence in himself and his wife and his family—you know, if I had 10 people in my family, I'd have never lost an election, either. [*Laughter*] He had enough confidence in

himself, in the people he represented, to believe they could take the truth and make the right decisions

And it's not a debate anymore. And I want every Member of the House here who's with us to remember that. When you go home in 2000—we made an argument in '96—in '92. And in '96, we said, "We're doing a little better." It's not an argument anymore. There is evidence.

So when the Republicans come up for the elections in 2000, from the White House to the Senate to the House, you've got to tell the people, "If you vote for them now and what they want to do, you're doing it in the face of all the evidence." We implemented our economic policy over their opposition. We've got 2 years of back-to-back budget surpluses for the first time in 42 years, the lowest unemployment rate in 29 years, the lowest welfare rolls in 32 years, the lowest poverty rate in 20 years. We implemented our crime policy with a handful of them with us, almost all the rest of them against us. We've got the lowest crime rate in 26 years. Not a single hunter's been interrupted in the hunting season in the Upper Peninsula, but 400,000 people did not get guns who shouldn't have gotten them.

Now, these are facts. This is not an argument anymore. And we have worked our hearts out for over 6½ years to get this country going in the right direction again, to get the country together again, to do things that make sense again. What I want the American people to do—I'm not on the ballot; this is something I want as a citizen. What I want the American people to do in 2000 is to say, "Okay, we turned this great big ocean liner around, and we're going in the right direction and the country is working again. Now, for the first time in our lifetimes, we are free to look at the big challenges out there, to paint the future of America we want, to deal with the retirement of the baby boomers by saving Social Security and Medicare, to give all of our kids a world-class education, to get this country out of debt over the next 15 years for the first time since 1835, and give us a generation of prosperity." We can do big things. We've got the crime rate down to the lowest level in 26 years; how about the real goal? Why don't we make America the safest big country in the entire world? We can do these things. We've got 19½ million new jobs, and it's the most we've ever had in this period of time. But why don't we establish a real goal, to bring economic opportunity through free enterprise into every neighborhood in this country, all those rural towns that haven't felt it, up and down the Mississippi Delta where I grew up, in Appalachia, on the Indian reservations—everywhere.

Why don't we—if we don't get around to this now, we will never do it. We have a couple of Members from Pennsylvania here; there are still towns in Pennsylvania that have had no economic recovery. So why don't we establish a real goal—and so we say, "Look, great, we're growing. We've got a low unemployment rate. Let's bring enterprise and opportunity to people who haven't felt it yet." This is what we are free to do.

What they're going to say is, "Well, now, we learned we've got to be nice to everybody, and let's go back and do something else." And I just want to remind you this guy put his neck on the line and so did a lot of the other people here, and they tried to chop it off. But enough of us survived to see our argument tested, and we were right.

Now, should America continue to change? Should we vote for change in 2000? Absolutely. The question is: What kind of change? We've got the country going in the right direction. Now is the time to reach for the stars, not make a U-turn. Stick with this guy. He's the best.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:25 p.m. at B. Smith's Restaurant. In his remarks, he referred to Bart Stupak, candidate for Michigan's First Congressional District, and his wife, Mayor Laurie Stupak of Menominee, MI; and professional golfer Jack Nicklaus.

Remarks at a New Democrat Network Dinner

October 6, 1999

Thank you. I hope I have Joe Lieberman's remarks on the White House television camera back there somewhere. Thank you so much, Senator Lieberman, for—we're about

to start our 30th year of acquaintance, Senator Lieberman and I are. When I first met him, I had no gray hair. Now I have more gray hair than he does.

I thank Joe Lieberman and Cal Dooley for their leadership of this organization; my friend Simon Rosenberg, who has come a long way since he was in the Clinton-Gore war room in 1992. And he did a great job there. And I, too, want to acknowledge Al From and thank him for the inspiration he's given all of us.

I want to thank all the Members of Congress who are here and the candidates here who aspire to be in the House or the Senate. I want to reiterate what Joe Lieberman said, and I didn't think I could say this 6 months ago, but we now have, I believe, a reasonable chance to pick up enough seats not only to have a majority in the House, which everybody knows and even our adversaries acknowledge, but even in the Senate, thanks in no small measure to the extraordinary people who are running for the Senate seats on our side.

Now, let me say, I suppose I don't have to say much tonight because I'll be preaching to the saved. But I think it's worth analyzing where we are and where we're going and why the New Democratic coalition is important and why it's important to us to keep faith with the ideas that got this group started, with the ideals, and to keep always pushing to tomorrow.

You know, there are a lot of people who say, "Well, this election is going to be about change, even if they think the Clinton-Gore team has done a good job or the Democrats have done a good job. This election is about change." Well, I think it ought to be about change, too. The question is, what kind?

I was educated about this issue very well about 10 years ago. Some of you heard me tell this story before, but it's one of my favorite and most instructive political stories. When I was Governor of my State, every year in October, this month, we'd have a State Fair. And I always had Governor's day at the State Fair, and I'd go out there and give an award to the oldest person there and the couple that had been married the longest and the person with the largest number of great-grandchildren. And then I'd go in this big old shed and get me a little booth, and I'd sit there. And anybody who wanted to come by could talk.

And in October of not—it was '89, and there was a Governor's race the next year, and I had been Governor by then for 10 years. And this old guy in overalls came up to the Governor's booth, and he said, "Bill, are you going to run next year again?" And I said, "I don't know, but if I do, will you vote for me?" He said, "Oh yeah, I will." He said, "I always have, and I guess I'll keep on doing it." And I said, "Well, aren't you tired of me after all these years?" He said, "No, I'm not, but everybody else I know is." [*Laughter*]

And I got kind of—[*inaudible*]—and I said—you know how politicians are, we hate it when somebody says something like that. So I got kind of hurt and I said, "Well, gosh, I mean, don't you think I've done a good job?" He said, "Oh yeah, you've done a good job, but you got a paycheck every 2 weeks, didn't you?" [*Laughter*] He said, "That's what we hired you to do. What we've got to figure out is whether you've got anything left to do." Very instructive.

No matter how good a job you do, elections are always about tomorrow, and they should be. America has been changing and sort of reinventing itself on the great pillars of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence for over 200 years, and that's why we're still here. And this coalition came into being and the whole sort of new Democrat Third Way movement came into being because we thought not that our party should abandon its principles but that we should break out of a shell and adopt policies that would bring us together and move us into the future.

I just want to make a few points as we look to that future. First of all, in 1992, when I went out to the people in New Hampshire and all these other States and into the country and asked then-Senator Gore to join me, and we said, "Look, we've got this vision of America in the 21st century. We want this to be a country where everybody who is responsible enough to work for it has opportunity, where no matter how diverse we get, we're still coming together in one community, where we're still the world's leading

force for peace and freedom and prosperity. We want to take this opportunity, responsibility, community agenda and come up with concrete policies and ideas to get the economy moving again, to bring the crime rate down, to bring the welfare rolls down, to empower poor people, to get more young people into college, to raise the standards of our schools and have more choice and competition there. We've got some ideas. Give us a chance."

And all we were doing is making an argument. And against our argument, what the Republicans said was what they've been saying about Democrats for 30 years, you know, "They're too liberal. You can't trust them with your money. They'll raise your taxes. They never met a Government program they didn't like. They sleep next to a bureaucratic pile of rules at night. You know, they wouldn't defend the country if their life depended on it." You know, you've heard all that stuff.

They had this sort of cardboard cutout image of Democrats that they tried to paste on every candidate's face at election time. But all we had was an argument. And things were sufficiently bad in this country—the economy was in terrible shape; the society was divided; the crime rate and the welfare rolls were exploding—that people decided to take a chance on the argument.

And then we set about trying to turn this country around and made some very tough decisions. And some of our Members paid very dearly for it for the '93 economic plan to turn this country around, for voting for the Brady bill and the crime bill to bring the crime rate down. They paid dearly. But we kept chugging along.

And about 4 years later, the people decided to give us a—they renewed our lease because they could feel things were beginning to change. And then in '98 we had a historic victory in the congressional elections because we had an agenda to keep building on it. We said, "Now give us a chance to save Social Security and pass a Patients' Bill of Rights and build and modernize schools. Give us a chance to do some things that will really make a difference here."

And now we come up to 2000, and I want to make the following points. Some of them have been made before. You need to memorize this. This is not an argument anymore. And the members of the other party unanimously opposed our economic policy; almost all of them are against our crime policy. We finally, thank goodness, reached an accord on welfare policy, after two vetoes, and that's good. But still there is this sort of partisan rancor when we have evidence that the direction we've taken is right.

This is not an argument anymore. The people in this room have been part—the Members of Congress in this room have been part of the longest peacetime economic expansion in history, the lowest unemployment rate in 29 years, the lowest welfare rolls in 32 years, the lowest poverty rates in 20 years, the first back-to-back budget surpluses in 42 years, and the lowest crime rates in 26 years. This is not an argument anymore.

And along the way we've brought some real new ideas into American politics—the family and medical leave law, which the previous administration vetoed; doubling the earned-income tax credit; the empowerment zone program, which the Vice President has done so ably; the community financial institutions that are making loans to people that couldn't get money otherwise; the charter schools—we're up to 1,700 from one when I took office—the HOPE scholarships that have opened the doors of college, at least the first 2 years, virtually to every person in this country now; AmeriCorps, which has given over 100,000 young people in its first 5 years a chance to serve their communities, something it took the Peace Corps 20 years to do.

So we have been full, all of us, of these ideas, and we've worked along. And it's been exciting. It's not an argument anymore. So when we go into this election cycle, I want you to say, with all respect, you have to make a decision about not whether to change. Things are changing so fast, that's not an option.

Since I signed the telecommunications bill, over 300,000 new high-tech jobs have been created. We got this E-rate so we could provide discounts to rural schools and poor schools in the inner cities, so we could hook-up all of our classrooms and libraries to the

Internet by the year 2000, and it looks like we're going to make it.

I was out in California last weekend doing some work for our congressional and Senate candidates in our party, and I was with a lot of people. This great company, eBay—you all ever buy anything on eBay on the site? It's interesting. It's an interesting thing. Not working for the company, over 20,000 Americans are now making a living doing business on eBay. They don't work for eBay. They're just doing business on eBay. Over 20,000 people making a living, including a substantial number of former welfare recipients.

So what we've tried to do is to come with new ideas and policies that will really work, and it's not an argument anymore. That's the first thing I want to say. So say to people, "We're for change. The question is, what kind of change are you for?"

And the way I look at it, we've spent the last 6½ years trying to turn the country around and get it going in the right direction, and things are going well now. But I would like to suggest that the change we need is to say, "Okay, now we're moving in the right direction. Let's reach for the stars. Let's write the future of the 21st century. Let's imagine every challenge and every opportunity we've got out there that's really big and go get it. Let's don't change by taking a U-turn and going back to what got us trouble in the first place." That is the issue.

You can trust this coalition of people to deal with the aging of America. We're going to double the number of seniors in 30 years—I hope to still be one of them. [*Laughter*] The baby boomers will then be with us for at least another 20 years. We may or may not ever get an agreement with the Republicans on Social Security reform, but in good conscience, with this surplus, we must at least take the life of Social Security out beyond the reach of the baby boom generation. We have to do that.

If we don't agree on anything else, all it takes to take the life of the Social Security Trust Fund beyond the life of the baby boom generation is to commit to take 5 years of interest savings from saving the Social Security taxes, sometime in the next 15 years, and put them in the Social Security Trust Fund. If we don't do anything else, it'll take us out to 2050, and we ought to do it.

We ought to modernize Medicare. We ought to employ the most modern practices that you find in the private sector, and I think we ought to add a prescription drug coverage because if we were creating that program today, we would never create it without drug coverage. And 75 percent of the seniors in this country don't have affordable drug coverage. It will keep a lot of them out of hospitals. It will lengthen and improve the quality of their lives. It is the right and decent thing to do, and we can do it if we're also prepared to have some savings in the traditional program. We ought to take the lead in this. We should do it.

The second thing we ought to do is to keep working on the schools. We ought to have more charter schools. We ought to have a no social promotion policy. But we ought to give every kid who needs it an after-school program or a summer school program. We ought to modernize these schools, and we ought to hire the 100,000 teachers.

You know, if you ever wonder what the difference in the parties is, you ought to look at the debate going on in education now in the House of Representatives. Now, when the electorate was breathing down their throat in 1998 at the end of the congressional session, the Republicans worked with us to make a huge downpayment on 100,000 teachers to lower class size. And we gave the States money for 30,000 of them. And you ought to read the glowing statements made by such Democratic sympathizers as Dick Armey. [*Laughter*] In 1998, just last year, the chairman of the House Education Committee, lots of others say, "This could have been a Republican program. There is no bureaucracy here. This is a wonderful thing. We're helping these teachers."

They thought it was a great idea at election time. No electorate breathing down their throat, they have refused to fund the program anymore and taken out the dedicated funding for the teachers that's already there. This is about big ideas. We've got the largest student population, the most diverse student population, in history. They need more and better trained teachers. They need higher standards. They need accountability and they

need options so that the kids who aren't cutting it don't fail, but find a way to succeed. It's a huge issue.

We have the crime rate, the lowest rate in 26 years. That's very good. Does anybody think it's low enough? Why don't we have a real goal now? Why don't we adopt as a national goal that we're going to be the safest big country in the world?

If we have—we've got—you may think that's crazy, but everybody thought it was crazy when we said we'd balance the budget, too. I could never have been elected President if I said, "If you will vote for me, within 6 years I'll give you two surpluses in a row." [*Laughter*] People'd say, "He seems like a nice young fella. We'd better send him home and get him a little help. He's disturbed." [*Laughter*] "He's out of his mind."

If you don't envision this, it won't happen. Why should we say, "We've got the lowest crime rate in 26 years. It's good enough"? It's not good enough. It's nowhere near good enough. But if we're serious about it, we're going to have to do more in prevention. We already have the highest percentage of people behind bars of any country in the world. We're going to have to say there's no rational distinction between a flea market and a gun show and a gun shop. We're going to have to put 50,000 more police out there in the neighborhoods where the crime rate is still too high. We're going to have to do things that help communities that are driving their crime rates down do it everywhere.

But I think the Democrats ought to say, "We're not satisfied with the lowest crime rate in 26 years. We'll never be satisfied until America is the safest big country in the world, and we think we can help to make it that way."

I think this is important. Let's talk about the economy. It's probably the best economy we've ever had. But I'm not satisfied with it for two reasons: Number one, not everybody is a part of it; and number two, it's changing so fast, if we don't keep working we can't keep the growth going. So let me just offer you a few ideas that I think are important.

I think our new markets ideas are important. These empowerment zones are wonderful, and I want to get more of them. But it isn't fair for all the places that aren't part of it not to have some help from us to bring enterprise there.

If we've learned one thing, we've got the strongest recovery of the last 30 years, also the highest percentage of private sector jobs. We have the smallest Federal Government since President Kennedy was here. But we have not yet figured out how to bring enterprise to every community that hasn't been part of this recovery.

So for those of us who represent and live in the Mississippi Delta or in Appalachia or in—represent many of the inner-city areas or a lot of the small towns and rural areas all over this country or the Native American reservations, I have proposed a modest but, I think, important plan. What I want the Congress to do is to pass laws that give us the same incentives to Americans with money to invest in poor areas in America, we give them to invest in poor areas in Central America and the Caribbean and Africa and Asia and throughout the world. I think it is a very, very good thing to do.

The second thing I'd like to say is that I like what we're doing, hooking up all these classrooms to the Internet, and the E-rate allows us to hook them up in rural areas and poor urban areas. But if you think about it, I believe we could revolutionize the economy of these left-behind places if access to the Internet were as pervasive as access to telephones. So why don't we adopt that as a goal, study it, figure out how to achieve it, say we will not permit there to be any digital divide. That's the policy we've taken with regard to our schools. That's what the E-rate's all about. No digital divide for our kids in the schools.

But what if their parents all had it, too? What if their parents had access to that? What if we—why should we be content with the economy we have? If we don't reach our goal, it will be a lot better than it would otherwise, and we'll keep things going. I think we ought to think of that.

Let me just mention two other things. First of all, I want to mention something that may be sort of politically impolite, but one issue in which our caucus, in my view, is still divided too often in the wrong way, and that's the issue of trade.

Here's what I think. But there's a reason for that. You see it all over the world today. There is a move toward protectionism all over the world today, even in places that are doing well. Why? Because we have not figured out how to put a human face on the global economy. Because we haven't figured out how to tell people that, sure, there will be more dynamism in this economy, but here's what we're doing to protect the basic rights of working families. Here's what we're doing to try to protect the basic integrity of the environment. Here's what we're trying to do to make sure everyone can benefit from this.

So our party needs to take the lead in pushing for trade, but for doing it in a way that says we're determined to put a human face on the global economy. Because if we don't, it's not just in America; you see this everywhere. I see it in the Europeans. I see it in Asia again. I see it—the economy is now the strongest, here, it's been in a long time, and yet, the impetus for continuing to trade is not there.

Yet, you don't have to be a rocket scientist. We've got 4 percent of the people and 22 percent of the wealth. So if we want to keep strong and wealthy and growing, we've got to do something with the other 96 percent of the people out there. And I think it's very important.

I've got this big trade meeting coming up—we all do—in Washington State, in Seattle, in December. And I hope we can try to break down some barriers in other countries. But why should people break their barriers down if they think America's trying to have it both ways? So I think we have to go back at this.

And lastly—and I think maybe the most important thing of all for the next generation—I vetoed that tax bill that the Congress passed, the Republicans in Congress passed, because I was convinced that if I signed it we not only could never meet our obligations to our children and to our seniors and to our future in our investments in science and technology, I was convinced we would never finish the work of paying down our debt. Now we're paying down our debt now. And if we stay on the plane that I asked Congress to adopt in the budget, we will be debt-free in 15 years, for the first time since Andrew Jackson was President in 1835.

Now, why should the Democratic Party be for that? In conventional terms, we're the more liberal party. Why should we be for that? Everybody in this room who is 40 years of age or older, who studied economics in college, was told that a Government should always carry some debt. We were all taught that. Why? Because we're living in a global economy.

You look at what happens to these countries that try to hide their money; people still get it out. Interest rates are set in a global economy. If we get America out of debt, it means that all the Americans can borrow more cheaply. If the Government is out of debt, it means lower interest rates for businesses in this country, for home loans, for car loans, for college loans. It means more jobs and higher incomes. It means when our friends overseas who aren't as fortunate as we are get in trouble the way the Asians did in the last 2 years, they can get out of trouble at lower cost. And we'll start growing again more quickly.

I believe, if we do this, it would do more than anything else we could do to guarantee a whole generation of prosperity. Whatever happens in the future, we know not every day of every month of every year from now on will be as good as the last 6½ years have been, but whatever happens in the future, it won't be as bad as it would have been if we keep getting this country out of debt.

So I hope all of you will support that. We should not do anything that undermines our ability to shoot for that big idea, a debt-free America. An America with its lowest crime rate, an America where everybody has economic opportunity. These are big ideas, and they're worth fighting for.

So, yes, we ought to be changing. But just remember, you don't have to make an argument with anybody anymore. You have the evidence on your side. We were right. So tell them, "If we're going to change, don't make a U-turn. Reach for the stars."

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:40 p.m. in the Regency Room at the Hyatt Regency. In his remarks, he referred to Senator Joseph I. Lieberman and Representative Calvin M. Dooley,

cofounders, and Simon Rosenberg, executive director, New Democratic Network; and Al From, president, Democratic Leadership Council.

Executive Order 13140—1999 Amendments to the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States

October 6, 1999

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. 801–946), in order to prescribe amendments to the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, prescribed by Executive Order 12473, as amended by Executive Order 12484, Executive Order 12550, Executive Order 12586, Executive Order 12708, Executive Order 12767, Executive Order 12888, Executive Order 12936, Executive Order 12960, and Executive Order 13086, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Part II of the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, is amended as follows:

a. R.C.M. 502(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Qualifications of military judge. A military judge shall be a commissioned officer of the armed forces who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or a member of the bar of the highest court of a State and who is certified to be qualified for duty as a military judge by the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which such military judge is a member. In addition, the military judge of a general court-martial shall be designated for such duties by the Judge Advocate General or the Judge Advocate General's designee, certified to be qualified for duty as a military judge of a general court-martial, and assigned and directly responsible to the Judge Advocate General or the Judge Advocate General's designee. The Secretary concerned may prescribe additional qualifications for military judges in special courts-martial. As used in this subsection "military judge" does not include the president of a special court-martial without a military judge."

b. R.C.M. 804 is amended by redesignating the current subsection (c) as subsection (d) and inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

"(c) Voluntary absence for limited purpose of child testimony.

(1) Election by accused. Following a determination by the military judge that remote live testimony of a child is appropriate pursuant to Mil. R. Evid. 611(d)(3), the accused may elect to voluntarily absent himself from the courtroom in order to preclude the use of procedures described in R.C.M. 914A.

(2) Procedure. The accused's absence will be conditional upon his being able to view the witness' testimony from a remote location. Normally, a two-way closed circuit television system will be used to transmit the child's testimony from the courtroom to the accused's location. A one-way closed circuit television system may be used if deemed necessary by the military judge. The accused will also be provided private, contemporaneous communication with his counsel. The procedures described herein shall be employed unless the accused has made a knowing and affirmative waiver of these procedures.

(3) Effect on accused's rights generally. An election by the accused to be absent pursuant to subsection (c)(1) shall not otherwise affect the accused's right to be present at the remainder of the trial in accordance with this rule."

c. The following new rule is inserted after R.C.M. 914:

"Rule 914A. Use of remote live testimony of a child

(a) General procedures. A child shall be allowed to testify out of the presence of the accused after the military judge has determined that the requirements of Mil. R. Evid. 611(d)(3) have been satisfied. The procedure used to take such testimony will be determined by the military judge based upon the exigencies of the situation. However, such testimony should normally be taken via a two-way closed circuit television system.

At a minimum, the following procedures shall be observed:

(1) The witness shall testify from a remote location outside the courtroom;

(2) Attendance at the remote location shall be limited to the child, counsel for each side (not including an accused *pro se*), equipment operators, and other persons, such as an attendant for the child, whose presence is deemed necessary by the military judge;

(3) Sufficient monitors shall be placed in the courtroom to allow viewing and hearing of the testimony by the military judge, the accused, the members, the court reporter and the public;

(4) The voice of the military judge shall be transmitted into the remote location to allow control of the proceedings; and

(5) The accused shall be permitted private, contemporaneous communication with his counsel.

(b) Prohibitions. The procedures described above shall not be used where the accused elects to absent himself from the courtroom pursuant to R.C.M. 804(c)."

d. R.C.M. 1001(b)(4) is amended by inserting the following sentences between the first and second sentences:

"Evidence is aggravation includes, but is not limited to, evidence of financial, social, psychological, and medical impact on or cost to any person or entity who was the victim of an offense committed by the accused and evidence of significant adverse impact on the mission, discipline, or efficiency of the command directly and immediately resulting from the accused's offense. In addition, evidence in aggravation may include evidence that the accused intentionally selected any victim or any property as the object of the offense because of the actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, gender, disability, or sexual orientation of any person."

e. R.C.M. 1003(b) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (4) and

(2) by redesignating subsections (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), and (11) as subsections (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10), respectively.

f. R.C.M. 1004(c)(7) is amended by adding at end the following new subsection:

"(K) The victim of the murder was under 15 years of age."

Sec. 2. Part III of the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, is amended as follows:

a. Insert the following new rule after Mil. R. Evid. 512:

"Rule 513. Psychotherapist-patient privilege

(a) General rule of privilege. A patient has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing a confidential communication made between the patient and a psychotherapist or an assistant to the psychotherapist, in a case arising under the UCMJ, if such communication was made for the purpose of facilitating diagnosis or treatment of the patient's mental or emotional condition.

(b) Definitions. As used in this rule of evidence:

(1) A "patient" is a person who consults with or is examined or interviewed by a psychotherapist for purposes of advice, diagnosis, or treatment of a mental or emotional condition.

(2) A "psychotherapist" is a psychiatrist, clinical psychologist, or clinical social worker who is licensed in any state, territory, possession, the District of Columbia or Puerto Rico to perform professional services as such, or who holds credentials to provide such services from any military health care facility, or is a person reasonably believed by the patient to have such license or credentials.

(3) An "assistant to a psychotherapist" is a person directed by or assigned to assist a psychotherapist in providing professional services, or is reasonably believed by the patient to be such.

(4) A communication is "confidential" if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is in furtherance of the rendition of professional services to the patient or those reasonably necessary for such transmission of the communication.

(5) "Evidence of a patient's records or communications" is testimony of a psychotherapist, or assistant to the same, or patient records that pertain to communications by a patient to a psychotherapist, or assistant to the same for the purposes of diagnosis or treatment of the patient's mental or emotional condition.

(c) Who may claim the privilege. The privilege may be claimed by the patient or the guardian or conservator of the patient. A person who may claim the privilege may authorize trial counsel or defense counsel to claim the privilege on his or her behalf. The psychotherapist or assistant to the psychotherapist who received the communication may claim the privilege on behalf of the patient. The authority of such a psychotherapist, assistant, guardian, or conservator to so assert the privilege is presumed in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

(d) Exceptions. There is no privilege under this rule:

(1) when the patient is dead;

(2) when the communication is evidence of spouse abuse, child abuse, or neglect or in a proceeding in which one spouse is charged with a crime against the person of the other spouse or a child of either spouse;

(3) when federal law, state law, or service regulation imposes a duty to report information contained in a communication;

(4) when a psychotherapist or assistant to a psychotherapist believes that a patient's mental or emotional condition makes the patient a danger to any person, including the patient;

(5) if the communication clearly contemplated the future commission of a fraud or crime or if the services of the psychotherapist are sought or obtained to enable or aid anyone to commit or plan to commit what the patient knew or reasonably should have known to be a crime or fraud;

(6) when necessary to ensure the safety and security of military personnel, military dependents, military property, classified information, or the accomplishment of a military mission;

(7) when an accused offers statements or other evidence concerning his mental condition in defense, extenuation, or mitigation, under circumstances not covered by R.C.M. 706 or Mil. R. Evid. 302. In such situations, the military judge may, upon motion, order disclosure of any statement made by the accused to a psychotherapist as may be necessary in the interests of justice; or

(8) when admission or disclosure of a communication is constitutionally required.

(e) Procedure to determine admissibility of patient records or communications.

(1) In any case in which the production or admission of records or communications of a patient other than the accused is a matter in dispute, a party may seek an interlocutory ruling by the military judge. In order to obtain such a ruling, the party shall:

(A) file a written motion at least 5 days prior to entry of pleas specifically describing the evidence and stating the purpose for which it is sought or offered, or objected to, unless the military judge, for good cause shown, requires a different time for filing or permits filing during trial; and

(B) serve the motion on the opposing party, the military judge and, if practical, notify the patient or the patient's guardian, conservator, or representative that the motion has been filed and that the patient has an opportunity to be heard as set forth in subparagraph (e)(2).

(2) Before ordering the production or admission of evidence of a patient's records or communication, the military judge shall conduct a hearing. Upon the motion of counsel for either party and upon good cause shown, the military judge may order the hearing closed. At the hearing, the parties may call witnesses, including the patient, and offer other relevant evidence. The patient shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to attend the hearing and be

heard at the patient's own expense unless the patient has been otherwise subpoenaed or ordered to appear at the hearing. However, the proceedings shall not be unduly delayed for this purpose. In a case before a court-martial composed of a military judge and members, the military judge shall conduct the hearing outside the presence of the members.

(3) The military judge shall examine the evidence or a proffer thereof in camera, if such examination is necessary to rule on the motion.

(4) To prevent unnecessary disclosure of evidence of a patient's records or communications, the military judge may issue protective orders or may admit only portions of the evidence.

(5) The motion, related papers, and the record of the hearing shall be sealed and shall remain under seal unless the military judge or an appellate court orders otherwise."

b. Mil. R. Evid. 611 is amended by inserting the following new subsection at the end:

(d) Remote live testimony of a child.

(1) In a case involving abuse of a child or domestic violence, the military judge shall, subject to the requirements of subsection (3) of this rule, allow a child victim or witness to testify from an area outside the courtroom as prescribed in R.C.M. 914A.

(2) The term "child" means a person who is under the age of 16 at the time of his or her testimony. The term "abuse of a child" means the physical or mental injury, sexual abuse or exploitation, or negligent treatment of a child. The term "exploitation" means child pornography or child prostitution. The term "negligent treatment" means the failure to provide, for reasons other than poverty, adequate food, clothing, shelter, or medical care so as to endanger seriously the physical health of the child. The term "domestic violence" means an offense that has as an element the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against a person and is committed by a current or former spouse, parent, or guardian of the victim; by a person with whom the victim shares a child in common; by a person who is cohabiting with or has cohabited with the victim as a spouse, parent, or guardian; or by a person similarly situated to a spouse, parent, or guardian of the victim.

(3) Remote live testimony will be used only where the military judge makes a finding on the record that a child is unable to testify in open court in the presence of the accused, for any of the following reasons:

(A) The child is unable to testify because of fear;

(B) There is substantial likelihood, established by expert testimony, that the child would suffer emotional trauma from testifying;

(C) The child suffers from a mental or other infirmity; or

(D) Conduct by an accused or defense counsel causes the child to be unable to continue testifying.

(4) Remote live testimony of a child shall not be utilized where the accused elects to absent himself from the courtroom in accordance with R.C.M. 804(c)."

Sec. 3. Part IV of the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, is amended as follows:

a. Insert the following new paragraph after paragraph 100:

100a. Article 134—(Reckless endangerment)

a. Text. See paragraph 60.

b. Elements.

(1) That the accused did engage in conduct;

(2) That the conduct was wrongful and reckless or wanton;

(3) That the conduct was likely to produce death or grievous bodily harm to another person; and

(4) That under the circumstances, the conduct of the accused was to the prejudice of good order and discipline in the armed forces or was of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces.

c. Explanation.

(1) In general. This offense is intended to prohibit and therefore deter

reckless or wanton conduct that wrongfully creates a substantial risk of death or serious injury to others.

(2) Wrongfulness. Conduct is wrongful when it is without legal justification or excuse.

(3) Recklessness. "Reckless" conduct is conduct that exhibits a culpable disregard of foreseeable consequences to others from the act or omission involved. The accused need not intentionally cause a resulting harm or know that his conduct is substantially certain to cause that result. The ultimate question is whether, under all the circumstances, the accused's conduct was of that heedless nature that made it actually or imminently dangerous to the rights or safety of others.

(4) Wantonness. "Wanton" includes "reckless," but may connote willfulness, or a disregard of probable consequences, and thus describe a more aggravated offense.

(5) Likely to produce. When the natural or probable consequence of particular conduct would be death or grievous bodily harm, it may be inferred that the conduct is "likely" to produce that result. *See* paragraph 54c(4)(a)(ii).

(6) Grievous bodily harm. "Grievous bodily harm" means serious bodily injury. It does not include minor injuries, such as a black eye or a bloody nose, but does include fractured or dislocated bones, deep cuts, torn members of the body, serious damage to internal organs, and other serious bodily injuries.

(7) Death or injury not required. It is not necessary that death or grievous bodily harm be actually inflicted to prove reckless endangerment.

d. Lesser included offenses. None.

e. Maximum punishment. Bad-conduct discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for 1 year.

f. Sample specification. In that _____ (personal jurisdiction data), did, (at/on board—location)(subject-matter jurisdiction data, if required), on or about _____ 19__, wrongfully and recklessly engage in conduct, to wit: (he/she)(describe conduct) and that the accused's conduct was likely to cause death or serious bodily harm to _____."

Sec. 4. These amendments shall take effect on 1 November 1999, subject to the following:

a. The amendments made to Military Rule of Evidence 611, shall apply only in cases in which arraignment has been completed on or after 1 November 1999.

b. Military Rule of Evidence 513 shall only apply to communications made after 1 November 1999.

c. The amendments made to Rules for Courts-Martial 502, 804, and 914A shall only apply in cases in which arraignment has been completed or on after 1 November 1999.

d. The amendments made to Rules for Courts-Martial 1001(b)(4) and 1004(c)(7) shall only apply to offenses committed after 1 November 1999.

e. Nothing in these amendments shall be construed to make punishable any act done or omitted prior to 1 November 1999, which was not punishable when done or omitted.

f. The maximum punishment for an offense committed prior to 1 November 1999, shall not exceed the applicable maximum in effect at the time of the commission of such offense.

g. Nothing in these amendments shall be construed to invalidate any nonjudicial punishment proceeding, restraint, investigation, referral of charges, trial in which arraignment occurred, or other action begun prior to 1 November 1999, and any such nonjudicial punishment, restraint, investigation, referral of charges, trial, or other action may proceed in the same manner and with the same effect as if these amendments had not been prescribed.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
October 6, 1999.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 8, 1999]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 7, and it will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 12.

Statement on Signing the Executive Order Amending the Manual for Courts-Martial

October 7, 1999

I have signed an Executive order amending the Manual for Courts-Martial, which sets out procedures for criminal trials in the Armed Forces. The amendments make a number of desirable changes to modernize the rules of evidence that apply to court-martial proceedings and to take into account recent court decisions. These changes have been recommended by a committee of experts representing all the military services.

There are four principal changes. First, the new rules provide that evidence that a violent crime was a hate crime may be presented to the sentencing authority as an aggravating factor in the determination of the appropriate sentence. As in the case of laws that apply in civilian courts, this rule sends a strong message that violence based on hatred will not be tolerated. In particular, the rules provide that the sentencing authority may consider whether the offense was motivated by the victim's race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, gender, disability, or sexual orientation.

Second, the rules provide special procedures for cases in which there are allegations of child abuse and children are called to testify. The new rules allow for televised testimony from a location other than the courtroom and provide for other special procedures to make it as easy as possible for children who are witnesses to testify completely and accurately. These provisions are similar to those applied in most civilian courts.

Third, the order adds a new evidentiary rule to court-martial proceedings providing that most statements to a psychotherapist are privileged. The purpose of this change is to encourage candid confidential communications between patients and mental health professionals. It is similar to a privilege that is recognized by the Federal courts and courts of virtually all States. The privilege is not absolute, and the exceptions make clear that communications must still be disclosed when necessary for the safety and security of military personnel and in other compelling cases.

Finally, the new rules create the offense of reckless endangerment as an additional crime under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. This offense is similar to that found in most State codes.

Remarks on Departure for New York City and an Exchange With Reporters

October 7, 1999

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

The President. Good morning. All this past week a chorus of voices has been rising to urge the Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Yesterday our Nation's military leaders and our leading nuclear experts, including a large number of Nobel laureates, came here to say that we can maintain the integrity of our nuclear stockpile without testing, and that we would be safer with the test ban treaty. Today religious leaders from across the spectrum and across the Nation are urging America to seize the higher ground of leadership to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

I want to thank those who are here, including Bishop John Glynn of the U.S. Catholic Bishop's Conference, Reverend Elenora Giddings Ivory of the Presbyterian Church, Reverend Jay Lintner of the National Council of Churches of Christ, Mark Pelavin of the Religious Action Center of Reformed Judaism, Bishop Theodore Schneider of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Joe Volk of the Friends Committee, Dr. James Dunn; there are others here, as well. And I would like to say a special word of thanks to Reverend Joan Brown Campbell of the National Council of Churches, as she concludes her responsibilities, for all the support she has given to our administration over the years.

And let me express my special gratitude to Senator Jim Jeffords from Vermont and Senator Byron Dorgan of North Dakota for their presence here and for their leadership in this cause.

These Americans are telling us that the debate about this treaty ultimately comes down to a fairly straightforward question: Will we do everything in our power to reduce the likelihood that someday somewhere nuclear

weapons will fall into the hands of someone with absolutely no compunction about using them; or will we instead, send a signal to those who have nuclear weapons, or those who want them, that we won't test but that they can test now or they can test when they develop or acquire the weapons? We have a moral responsibility to future generations to answer that question correctly. And future generations won't forgive us if we fail that responsibility.

We all recognize that no treaty by itself can guarantee our security, and there is always the possibility of cheating. But this treaty, like the Chemical Weapons Convention, gives us tools to strengthen our security, a global network of sensors to detect nuclear tests by others, the right to demand inspections, the means to mobilize the whole world against potential violators. To throw away these tools will ensure more testing and more development of more sophisticated and more dangerous nuclear weapons.

This is a time to come together and do what is plainly in the best interest of our country by embracing a treaty that requires other nations to do what we have already decided to do ourselves, a treaty that will freeze the development of nuclear weapons around the world at a time when we enjoy an overwhelming advantage in military might and technology.

So I say to the Senate today, whatever political commitments you may have made, stop, listen, think about the implications of this for our children's future. You have heard from the military. I hope you will listen to them. You have heard from Nobel laureates and other experts in nuclear weapons. I hope you listen to them. You listened to our military and scientific leaders about national missile defense, listen to them about the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Listen to the religious leaders who say it is the right thing to do. Listen to our allies, including nuclear powers Britain and France, who say America must continue to lead. And listen to the American people who have been for this treaty from the very beginning. And ask yourselves, do you really want to leave our children a world in which every nation has a green light to test, develop, and deploy nuclear weapons, or a world in which we have done everything we possibly can to minimize the risks nuclear weapons pose to our children? To ratify this treaty is to answer the question right and embrace our responsibility to future generations.

Thank you.

Patients' Bill of Rights Legislation

Q. If the Patients' Bill of Rights fails today will you work with Republicans to get a more limited measure, or is it going to be your bill or no bill?

The President. Well, I believe there is a majority of support for the Norwood-Dingell bill. And the issue is not my bill or no bill. I'm not the issue here. I'm covered by the Federal plan, and I have extended by Executive order the protections of the Patients' Bill of Rights to all people covered by all Federal plans, including the Members of Congress.

The issue is whether we're going to give the American people adequate protections. The Norwood-Dingell bill does that. We've got some Republican support for it in the House. I think Congressman Norwood, who has been a loyal Republican in virtually every respect, has shown a great deal of courage here, along with the doctors in the House, who know it's the right thing to do. And we'll just hope that it works out. We've worked very hard, and they've worked very hard. And I believe we have an excellent chance to win.

Congressional Inaction

Q. Mr. President, on the treaty, on health care, on tax cuts, and even on budget matters, the Republicans up on Capitol Hill seem to be saying that they do not want to work with you; they would prefer to wait until another person is in the office. Do you get that impression?

The President. Well, on tax cuts, I vetoed their bill, and it was the right thing to do. And it's a good thing for America. They are showing us every day they can't even fund the spending that they've already voted for and that they tried to saddle America with another $800 billion worth of spending and say that somehow they could pay for it.

I think there are some of them who want to be a lame-duck Congress. They're still drawing a paycheck up there, and it's a little larger than it was before a bill that I signed.

And I don't think they ought to make themselves into a lame-duck Congress. I think they ought to show up for work, and we ought to do the people's business. There are plenty of things we disagree on, but we have proved that we can work together under adverse circumstances.

Does this year look more like 1999 than 1996, 1997, and 1998—I mean, more like 1995? It does. It looks more like 1995. And I just don't think they ought to be a lame-duck Congress. I don't think the American people will understand it if they insist on sitting around up here for 2 years and doing nothing.

Now if the Senate doesn't want to work on saving Social Security and Medicare and educating our children, then maybe they ought to take a little time and confirm our judges and do some other things. But you know, I think there are people in the Senate and in the House, on both sides, who don't want to have a lame-duck 2 years for themselves. Senator Jeffords is here on this; Congressman Norwood and a number of other Republicans are helping on the Patients' Bill of Rights. And I think that we'll find a way to get some things done.

Labor Research Association Dinner

Q. Would you be mending fences with the Teamsters if it weren't for the campaigns of the Vice President and Mrs. Clinton?

The President. Oh, absolutely. I'm not mending fences. I would have accepted this invitation to go to this event tonight under any circumstances. I have actually enjoyed a fairly constructive relationship with the Teamsters over 6½ years. I've seen all those stories, but I've been a little amused by them. I don't understand what the fence mending—we have a difference of opinion about an issue or two, but I would—if I had been invited to this under any circumstances, I would certainly have gone.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Q. Mr. President, any progress on delaying the treaty vote?

Q. [*Inaudible*]—for the Vice President.

The President. I'm sorry; I can't hear. What did you say about the treaty vote?

Q. Any progress on delaying the treaty vote?

The President. I had a dinner here the other night that had Republicans and Democrats, including Republicans who were on both sides of the issue. There seems to be, among really thoughtful people who care about this, an overwhelming consensus that not enough time has been allocated to deal with the substantive issues that have to be discussed.

So we have had conversations, obviously, with the leadership and with Members in both parties, and I think there is a chance that they will reach an accord there.

Gov. George W. Bush of Texas

Q. Governor Bush seems to have taken a page from your history on triangulation in his dealings with a Republican-led Congress. Do you have any opinion on that, sir?

The President. First of all, I think the Republican right's being too hard on Governor Bush. I mean, you know, I don't understand why they're being so mean to him about this. He has stuck with them on—he was for that tax cut that they wanted. His main health care adviser sponsored that breakfast with the House leadership yesterday designed to help kill the Patients' Bill of Rights. He stuck with them and the NRA on the gun issue. You know, he's for privatizing Social Security. I don't see why they're so hard on him, but I will say this, I personally appreciated what he said.

Raising taxes on poor people is not the way to get out of this bind we're in. But I think they're being way too hard on him and unfair.

AFL–CIO Endorsement

Q. When you talk to Mr. Hoffa about the AFL–CIO endorsement will you ask him to throw his support behind the Vice President?

The President. Well I think everybody knows where I am on that. I have met already with the executive committee of the AFL–CIO. That is not the purpose of my going there. They invited me to come by, and I was happy to accept, but I have already had a meeting with the executive committee, with all the executive committee of the AFL-CIO, in which we have discussed that issue among others. Thank you very much.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Q. What part of the test ban—a followup on the test ban, sir?

The President. You want to ask a test ban treaty——

Q. Yes, just a followup. If it looks like you're not going to get the votes, is it better tactically to go down to defeat and blame it on the Republicans or to just——

The President. I'm not interested—that's not the—that's a game, and that's wrong. I'm not interested in blaming them for this. I think the Members who committed to be against the treaty before they heard the arguments and studied the issues and listened to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Nobel laureates made a mistake. I think that was wrong.

On the other hand, there are lots of issues, complex issues, that serious people who have questions about it have raised that deserve to be answered, worked through. And there are plenty of devices to do that if there is time to do that. All I ask here is that we do what is in the national interest. Let's just do what's right for America. I am not interested in an issue to beat them up about. That would be a serious mistake. That's not the way for the United States to behave in the world. But neither should they be interested in an issue that they can sort of take off the table with a defeat. That would do terrible damage to the role of the United States, which has been, from the time of President Eisenhower, the leader through Republican and Democratic administrations alike, Republican and Democratic Congresses alike—until this moment we have been the leader in the cause of nonproliferation.

We should not either try to get an issue that will enable us to beat up on them, neither should they have an issue that enables them to show that they can just deep six this treaty. That would be a terrible mistake. Therefore, we ought to have a regular orderly substantive process that gives all the people the necessary time to consider this on the merit and that gives the people who made early commitments—I think wrongly, but they did it—the chance to move to doing the Senate's business the way the Senate should do it.

Look at what these people are saying here today. This is huge. This is bigger than party politics. This is bigger than personal politics. This is about America's future and the future of our children and the world. We have a chance to reduce the likelihood that more countries will obtain nuclear weapons. We have a chance to reduce the likelihood that countries that are now working on developing nuclear technologies will be able to convert them into usable weapons. We have a chance to reduce the likelihood that countries that now have weapons will be able to make more advanced, more sophisticated, and bigger weapons. We cannot walk away from that, and we cannot let it get caught up in the kind of debate that would be unworthy of the children and grandchildren of Republicans and Democrats.

Thank you.

I would like to ask Senator Jeffords—let me just give credit where credit is due. Senator Jeffords got this group together. And when I heard they were meeting, I invited them to come down here to stand with us. So he deserves the credit for this day, and Senator Dorgan has been perhaps our most vociferous advocate on the Democratic side of this treaty. So I would like to ask Senator Jeffords to say a few words and then invite Senator Dorgan to say a few words.

[*At this point, Senator James M. Jeffords and Senator Byron L. Dorgan made brief remarks.*]

The President. Do you want to ask either one of them any questions? Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:55 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Bishop John J. Glynn, National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Archdiocese of Military Services; Rev. Elenora Giddings Ivory, director, Washington office, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.); Rev. Jay Lintner, director, Washington office, United Church of Christ; Mark J. Pelavin, associate director, Religious Action Center of Reformed Judaism; Bishop Theodore F. Schneider, Metropolitan Washington, DC, Synod, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; Joe Volk, executive secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation; James Dunn, executive director, Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs; and Rev. Joan Brown Campbell, general secretary, National Council of Churches. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included

the remarks of Senator Jeffords and Senator Dorgan.

Interview With John Roberts of the Columbia Broadcasting System in New York City

October 7, 1999

Mr. Roberts. Mr. President, sir. Good to meet you; how are you?

The President. Good to see you.

Medicare Prescription Benefit

Mr. Roberts. So, you know the issue, sir. You've been trying to address it, the idea that there are 15 million senior citizens in this country who don't have Medicaid coverage for prescription drugs, Medicare coverage. What does it say about a country, sir, where many people have to go outside of the country to buy drugs that they can afford?

The President. Well, it's wrong, and it happens because we have about three-quarters of our senior citizens need prescription drugs that they simply can't afford. They don't have access to any coverage, or the coverage they have is too expensive and too limited. And in Canada and in many places, drugs made in America are cheaper than they are here because bigger units can buy discounts.

Now this proposal I made to reform Medicare is totally voluntary; no senior has to buy a prescription drug coverage if he or she doesn't want it. But if they do buy it, then a private group, not the Government, would be able to get the drugs at a lower cost because they would be buying them in bulk. And I think it's fair. It will not adversely affect the drug companies. It will increase their volume, even though the drugs, individually, will be cheaper. They will still come out way ahead. And our people will be treated more fairly, and they won't have to depend upon whether they're on the Canadian border to run across the line to buy drugs they can afford.

Import of Canadian Pharmaceuticals

Mr. Roberts. What do you think about the idea of allowing pharmacies to re-import drugs, parallel importing for senior citizens and allow them access to the cheaper prices that they would pay in Canada?

The President. You're the first person that ever asked me that. I don't know. But I'll look into it. It's an interesting idea. I never thought about it.

Mr. Roberts. That's Congressman Sanders' idea. He has proposed to allow pharmacies to re-import drugs from Canada or Mexico. There has been some question as to whether or not that would be legal because of FDA regulations. But that's the idea that he is proposing.

The President. Well, if you could preserve their safety and quality, that there were some assurance of that, I would think it could be done. And it might work well along the Canadian border for Vermont, where Congressman Sanders lives, and for the other States along the border.

Then the further you get away from the border, the question is, will the transportation cost back more than offset the money that you would otherwise save? I don't know the answer. You're the first person that's ever asked me that. But I'll look into it.

Domestic Price for Pharmaceuticals

Mr. Roberts. Now, the drug companies have been saying that even under your plan, which would allow Medicare to buy drugs in bulk, it would decrease the revenue stream to the point where research and development would be stifled—I mean, would you look at the profits they've been making in the last few years—is that a legitimate argument?

The President. No. No, you know, they said that over and over and over again. American drug companies charge American citizens far more money for the same pharmaceuticals than they charge Europeans, Canadians, Mexicans, anyone else.

Mr. Roberts. Does that seem right?

The President. No. They say they do it because we bear the full cost of the research and development cost, and they can't put it off on any of the others because the Government controls the prices. That's what they say.

So I think if that's true, then the United States and its people have been awfully good to our drug companies. They've been willing

to pay higher prices for drugs made in America than people in other countries do, and I think they owe it to the seniors to get off this high horse and stop trying to beat this attempt to extend medical coverage to seniors for prescription drugs.

People that live on fixed incomes ought to be able to get the benefit of discounts you get when you buy in bulk. This is not Government regulation; this is market power. A lot of these drugs they have long since recovered the research and developments cost—long since. And I just think it's wrong for our people either not to be able to get them at all or to pay so much more than others do. And this is one way to sort of split the difference between their position that they need higher profits to invest in research and development and the very low cost that they can get if they happen to live close enough to the Canadian border to cross it.

So I would like to see Medicare cover prescription drugs on a voluntary basis so our seniors can get discount prices. It's very important—

Legislative Action

Mr. Roberts. The ideas that have been floated in the Senate, which ostensibly are voucher systems, would you agree with that type of system to pay for prescription drugs?

The President. Well, it wouldn't be as effective as the proposal we've made because it would be more difficult to get the benefit of discounts. And therefore, over a few years it would be harder to keep the premiums down. But as I said, I would like to see the Members of Congress in both parties engage with us on this. Let's work it through. Let's come up with something. You've got three-quarters of our seniors in trouble out there, and we ought to do something about it.

Mr. Roberts. In terms of national priorities, how important is this?

The President. Oh, I think it's very important. The big challenges facing our country right now, at the top of those challenges are what to do about the aging of America as more of us live longer—that means we have to save Social Security and reform and modernize Medicare; and the children of America—we have to give all of our kids a world-class education with the most diverse student population ever.

Those are the big challenges we face. And to me this is a big part of it. You're going to have—the average 65-year-old person today has a life expectancy of 82. The people being born today, if the human genome project works out right, might have a life expectancy of 100. But if that's true, in order to maintain their quality of life and their health and not bankrupt the hospitals, we'll have to keep more and more of them well with the proper kind of drug treatment programs.

So you want the drug companies to be able to continue to pioneer new drugs, but they've got to be affordable, and they have to be accessible.

Mr. Roberts. Thank you for your time, sir, I appreciate it.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at approximately 3:40 p.m. at the Sheraton New York Hotel and Tower. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Remarks on House Action on Patients' Bill of Rights Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters in New York City

October 7, 1999

The President. This afternoon the House of Representatives took an important and encouraging step in the effort to give the American people a real Patients' Bill of Rights. After rejecting watered-down legislation by substantial votes, the House voted by a large margin to approve a strong bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights, sponsored by Congressmen Norwood and Dingell.

The passage of this bill represents a major victory for every family and every health plan. It says you have the right to the nearest emergency room care and the right to see a specialist. It says you have the right to know you can't be forced to switch doctors in the middle of a cancer treatment or a period of pregnancy. And it says you have the right to hold your health care plan accountable if it causes you or a loved one grave harm.

It shows that America is no longer willing to allow unfeeling practices of some health plans to add to the pain of injury or disease. It proves that America is committed to putting patients first.

But let me be clear: We still have a lot of work to do before this bill becomes the law of the land. When the House and the Senate negotiators meet, we must be sure the bill is paid for, and when they meet in conference, the Republican leaders must resist the urge to weaken the patient protections guaranteed in the Norwood-Dingell bill, and they must not undo behind closed doors what has been done in the public. They must also resist the urge to load up the final legislation with poison pill provisions that they know I can't sign.

But today, let's just congratulate the Members of both parties in the House of Representatives for making a responsible choice in the face of significant pressure to do otherwise.

I especially thank Congressman Norwood and Congressman Dingell for their leadership and for their dogged determination. We have shown once again that, when we work together across party lines, we can use this moment of prosperity to meet the greatest needs of the American people.

Thank you very much.

Q. Sir, what do you think made the difference? Yesterday you were almost conceding defeat.

The President. I think a lot of work was done by a lot of people, but I think in the end, most people just went up there and voted for what they thought was right. Now, you know, there's kind of an unusual parliamentary maneuver of which you're all aware in which they've tied another bill to it and sent them both to conference. The other bill is one I don't support. It would cost an awful lot of money and help less than one percent of the uninsured in America, most of whom can afford their own health care policies anyway. And so we have to watch things like that being done in the final legislation. But a big majority of the House did vote for this bill, just as it was written, and I'm very proud of them.

This is the sort of thing America wants us to do. We can work together across party lines; we can get things done. There will still be plenty for the two parties to argue about in good conscience in the coming election. No matter what we do—we can deal with every challenge before the Congress now, and there will still be things to debate next November.

So I would hope that this is an omen of more good things to come. And I'm certainly prepared to do my part, and I'm very grateful today. I talked to some Republican and Democratic House Members before the vote and encouraged them. And I'm very proud of all of them. And I thank them.

Meeting With Teamsters President

Q. Could you tell us about your talks with Hoffa?

The President. Excuse me?

Q. Could you tell us about your talks with Jimmy Hoffa——

The President. Oh, sure——

Q. ——and did you ask him to not stand in the way of an early endorsement of the AFL–CIO for Gore?

The President. Actually, we didn't talk much about that. We talked about—this is the first long personal visit we've had, although we've worked on a lot of things. He thanked me for the work that I'd done over the last 6½ years. We talked a little about that.

We talked about—interestingly enough, we talked about Franklin Roosevelt and Frances Perkins and the rise of the American labor movement for some good amount of time; said he was glad I was coming tonight, and that President Roosevelt was the last President to talk to the Teamsters.

And we talked quite a bit about trade and about his strong feeling that we ought to make sure that the safety provisions of NAFTA are met. And I assured him that we were doing everything we could to do just that and that we would continue to do so.

He said he was deeply concerned that, ever since the recession in Mexico and then the recession in Asia, countries with whom we had had a balance of trade or a small surplus we now seem to be running large deficits with. He was concerned about the rise of protectionism in Europe. And we talked about that.

And that was—most of our conversation was about that. We also talked about golf for probably too long. We had a good talk about golf. We didn't talk too much about other politics, and I said I look forward to seeing him tonight.

Thank you.

Patients' Bill of Rights Legislation

Q. Mr. President, do you have any reason to believe the Senate will allow the right to sue?

The President. Sure, if they listen to the American people. That's what happened today. I mean, 70 percent of our citizens want it; 70 percent of Republicans want it. And there's a way to do it. If they just look at their own estimates—not mine, the Congressional Budget Office—says it will add, at the most, $2 dollars a month a policy to have all the protections of the Patients' Bill of Rights. And that's a good investment in our future.

Thanks.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:35 p.m. at the Sheraton Towers. In his remarks, he referred to James P. Hoffa, general president, International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Statement on the Proposed "Pension Reduction Disclosure Act of 1999"

October 7, 1999

I commend Senators Moynihan, Jeffords, Leahy, Robb, Kerrey, and Rockefeller and Representatives Matsui, Weller, Andrews, Gejdenson, Pomeroy, Bentsen, and Kelly for introducing the "Pension Reduction Disclosure Act of 1999." This important new legislation, developed in partnership with my administration, will secure the "right-to-know" for American workers when changes are being made to their private pension retirement benefits. I applaud the leadership of these Members of Congress in furthering or effort to protect the retirement security of American workers and look forward to working with them to achieve speedy enactment of this legislation.

Our voluntary, employment-based pension system plays a critical role in providing income security for American workers in retirement. Increasingly, employers are converting traditional, employer-sponsored defined benefit plans to "cash balance" and other new types of pension plans. While these new types of pension plans may provide enhanced benefits for some workers, they also could result in other workers having smaller pensions at retirement than they would have if their old plan had continued.

Unfortunately, too few workers understand the effects of these conversions. Too many workers today are left in the dark about changes to their retirement plan. In fact, under some new plans, some workers may not even realize that they have temporarily stopped earnings any benefits at all. This is not right. It needs to be changed.

This legislation would ensure that all Americans have the necessary information to plan for retirement. It would provide workers with meaningful and timely notice of plan changes and clearly demonstrate the impact of those changes now and in the future. It would shine sunlight on changes in retirement benefits. And it would do this without unduly burdening employers. It is truly a smart, commonsense measure, and Congress should pass it.

The sponsoring Members and my administration worked closely together to develop this proposal. I am grateful to Labor Secretary Alexis Herman, Treasury Secretary Larry Summers, and National Economic Council Director Gene Sperling for their hard work to provide this important new protection for American workers.

Statement on Senate Action on Education Appropriations Legislation

October 7, 1999

Today the Senate passed a spending bill that woefully shortchanges America's children. The Senate Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriation bill fails to make vital investments in our Nation's children. It undermines the commitment we made last year to hire quality teachers and reduce class size in the early grades. It underfunds after-school programs and such

important efforts as the GEAR UP mentoring program.

If this bill were to come to me in its current form, I would veto it. I have already sent Congress a budget for the programs in this bill that provides for essential investments and is fully paid for. I urge Congress again to work on a bipartisan basis to develop legislation that truly strengthens public education and other key national priorities.

This bill is a catalog of missed opportunities and misguided priorities. I am particularly disappointed that the Senate defeated a commonsense measure to make schools accountable for results. The Bingaman-Reed-Kerry amendment would have set aside funds for States to turn around failing schools. By rejecting it, the Senate lost a chance to make accountability more than just a slogan. The Senate also rejected amendments to increase the number of qualified teachers in high-need districts and to help States improve the quality of their teaching forces.

The Senate properly rejected two wrong-headed amendments that would have hurt workers. One would have barred implementation of the ergonomics rule so key to safeguarding worker health. The other would have barred enforcement of the Davis-Bacon law in natural disaster areas, a law which assures workers appropriate wages.

While the Senate did make important strides by committing to increase child-care funding next year, the bill underfunds many other efforts, including public health priorities in preventive and mental health, programs that give millions of Americans better access to health care and critical social services for vulnerable families. The bill also does not provide aid to families caring for elderly or ill relatives through the family caregiver initiative. Even worse, in expressing support for an across-the-board cut in all discretionary programs, the Senate has shown its unwillingness to address America's needs in a responsible and comprehensive way.

Remarks at a Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee Reception in New York City

October 7, 1999

Thank you. Please be seated.

Let me, first of all, thank Dennis, and all of you, for this event and for your support for the Democratic Senate Campaign Committee. Senator Schumer was supposed to be here tonight, but they're voting late, so he's working for you, and I'm filling in for him. [*Laughter*] That's sort of getting prepared for my life after the Presidency. I'm sort of the stand-in speaker tonight for Chuck Schumer. [*Laughter*]

I'd like to thank you again for your support for the Senators, and I'd like to thank, as I always try to do, the people of New York City and New York State for being so very good to me and the Vice President and our whole administration over these last 6½ years.

I would like to just make a brief statement about the event that we're here for. I think all of you know that we Democrats have maintained a constant commitment to the health care of our people, and to the well-being of the health care network. We all are very well aware that, as Hillary warned us back in 1994, the number of uninsured people continues to rise and will continue to do so until we do things that cover more people and stem the hemorrhaging of loss of coverage.

I will say this: We've got some specific proposals out there that I think will begin to make a dent in that this year. This is the first year that all the States are enrolled in the Children's Health Insurance Program. Now what we have to do is go out and get the children enrolled. The States are enrolled. We have to get the children enrolled.

As all of you know—I see a lot of you nodding your heads—it's easier to say than to do; to find these people, to tell them that even though they may be Medicaid-eligible, they are eligible for this; please come enroll.

But we need to make a huge, Herculean effort over the next 6 months, to get every single eligible child in America enrolled in these programs. It will also help to alleviate the financial problems of a lot of our health care providers, and we need to do it.

The second thing I would note is that in my Medicare reform this year, I have asked the Congress to allow people between the ages of 55 and 65 to buy into the Medicare program. A lot of the people without health insurance between 55 and 65 can't get health insurance from anybody else. But they're middle-class people, and they do have the funds to afford a Medicare buy-in. We can do that with the present budget I've given the Congress, and I hope we will do it.

The third thing I would note is, I do believe that some time before the Congress goes home, they will pass what is known as the Kennedy-Jeffords bill, which will allow disabled people on Medicaid to go into the workplace and keep their Medicaid, which will put more people in the workplace and continue the flow of funds to the health care system and enables them to keep their health care.

There will doubtless be more to be debated about. Now, let me say word about what happened in 1997. I am not at all surprised that the 1997 Balanced Budget Act imposed greater burdens on the health care system than were estimated. And some of you were involved in that and know that we—we had a figure of the savings we wanted to achieve and we, in the administration, having good data from all of you, gave the Congress a set of changes we thought would be necessary to meet that figure.

The Congressional Budget Office did not believe we would achieve those savings and, therefore, said we had to do more things. So we did everything that the CBO said we had to do, and we had more savings than we needed to meet the original budget targets, and it came right out of the teaching hospitals, a lot of the therapeutic services people, a lot of—all of you know this.

We are working hard now. I've had a conversation—every time they come back from New York or anywhere else, Hillary and the Vice President ask me, "When are we going to do something about this Medicaid problem? We've got to deal with this." We understand that. I think that there is now a consensus in the Congress in both Houses and, I think, increasingly in both parties, that part of the last budget negotiations will require funds flowing back to deal with this problem, and I will do the best I can with that.

Let me just make some general points here. When I came to New York in 1992 as the nominee, with my family and my then very new Vice Presidential partner and his family, and asked the American people and the people of this State to take a chance on us because we thought we could turn the country around, and it's been so long since things were bad, people had forgotten how bad they were in 1992, but they were quite bad, indeed. I asked you to take a chance based on an argument I made. I said, "You know, I think that the politics of division in Washington are hurting America. You've either got to be pro-business or pro-labor. You've got to be pro-growth or pro-environment. All these things have to be opposed to one another. You have to be for big deficits or cutting spending on education." And I just don't believe that's the way the world works. I never have believed that. All of us in our own lives try to find ways to unify our objectives and pull things together to go forward.

And so I said to the American people, "Look, give me a chance to try to push a policy that will provide opportunity to every responsible citizen and will bring all people together in one community, that will allow us to be pro-business and pro-labor, pro-environment and pro-growth, get rid of the deficit but continue to invest in education."

And it was just an argument, but the American people decided to give us a chance, probably, frankly, because the country was in such tough shape. It was really tough.

Well, after 6 years, it's not an argument anymore. There is now evidence. And I'm very proud that with the help of the Democratic Members of the Senate, without whom none of this would have been possible, we now have the lowest unemployment rate in 29 years, the lowest welfare rolls in 32 years, the lowest poverty rates in 20 years, the highest homeownership in history, the first back-to-back balanced budget surpluses in 42

years, and the longest economic expansion in peacetime in our history, with over 19 million new jobs. It's not an argument anymore.

Now, the issue before the American people is, some say, whether we should change. That is not the question. We are going to change. This country's been changing for over 200 years; that's why we're still here. We're adaptable. We always have new challenges. We always have new opportunities. The question is not whether we'll change; the question is how we're going to change.

We can take a U-turn and go back to the policies that got us in trouble in the first place. I've tried to stop those. Some of the most important achievements of the last 6 years involved stopping the "Contract With America," stopping this ill-advised, huge tax cut that I vetoed, which, by the way, would have made it utterly impossible to do what we ought to do in Medicare.

But I would just ask you as citizens to think about the big things we can do now because of the country's prosperity. And let me just mention three. And it's time to think about the big things.

Big thing number one that all of you deal with in health care, we've got to deal with the aging of America. People are living longer, and the number of people over 65 will double in 30 years. I hope to be one of them. And we have a chance and, I would argue, and obligation to save Social Security and push the life of Social Security out beyond the life expectancy of the whole baby boom generation. We can do that now.

We have an obligation not only to properly fund Medicare but to extend the life of it and to add a prescription drug benefit. I was just asked again today about all these people who live in New York, Vermont, Maine, along the Canadian border, going across the border to Canada to buy American drugs much cheaper than they can buy them in America. If we would give people on Medicare the option, purely the option, to buy into a prescription drug program that could use market power to get discount prices, we could deal with the problems of 75 percent of the seniors in this country that don't have access to those pharmaceuticals now. I think it's important.

That's big challenge number one. Big challenge number two, as New York knows, we have the largest and most diverse student population in our schools in history. We have done everything we could with the HOPE scholarships and other aids to give everybody who can go access to college. But no one believes that we're giving a world-class education to every child in K through 12 yet.

So it's time to build them modern schools and give them more teachers and have high standards but give them access to summer school and after-school and mentoring programs, so you don't declare the kids failures when the system is failing them.

This is important. We ought to say, "We're not going to rest until the children in our public schools have the same access to quality education that children in our institutions of higher education do." That's a big idea worth fighting for.

The third thing I'd like to say is, we need to think about the 21st century economy. As you know here, from upstate New York to some neighborhoods in New York City, not everybody has participated in our prosperity. As a matter of fact, part of the problems our hospitals have today is that not everybody has participated in our prosperity. You still have a lot of poor people who can't afford to pay who have to have care.

I have offered the American people, from the empowerment zone program in 1993 to our new markets initiative now, a way to bring more people into our enterprise system. I think people with money in America ought to get the same tax breaks and other incentives to invest in poor areas in America we today give them to invest in Latin America and the Caribbean and Africa. I don't want to take those other incentives away, but I think you ought to have the same option to grow a business here you do in our poor countries to the south and around the world.

And finally, I think we ought to get this country out of debt for the first time since 1835. We can do that in 15 years. Now, anybody in this room over 40 who took economics in college was taught that a country should always be a little bit in debt, that somehow that's healthy. And when we learned it, it was true. It's not true anymore for rich countries because interest rates are set globally, and

if we can make America debt-free over the next 15 years, it means lower interest rates for business loans, for hospital construction, for college loans, for home loans, for car loans. It means more jobs and higher incomes.

It means when our friends around the world that have to buy the things we produce get in trouble, they can borrow money to get out of trouble at a lower cost. It could ensure a generation of prosperity. We can do it now. We should think big. Now, let me just mention one final issue. I can talk about this all night, because I want America to start thinking big about it.

We have the lowest crime rate in 26 years, and I'm proud of that. And it's nationwide in every big city. We're seeing—with the same strategies there that have worked here, community policing and careful targeting of certain kinds of crime in certain areas. But no one thinks it's as low as it ought to be. No one thinks America is as safe as it ought to be. So I would like to see people stand up and say, "Okay, we've got the lowest crime rate in 26 years. Now we need a real goal. Let's make America the safest big country in the world." If we're the most prosperous big country in the world, if we have more freedom than anybody else in the world, we ought to be able to make it the safest big country in the world.

We have to do more to keep guns out of the hands of criminals. We have to do more to keep guns out of the hands of children who die at an accidental rate—listen to this—accidental rate from gun deaths in America, 9 times higher than the next 25 industrial countries in the world combined. But we can do it if we make up our mind to do it.

In closing, let me say the other thing that I'm proud to be a Democrat about, besides these big ideas, is that we stand for the idea that we can be one America across all the racial, religious, gender, sexual orientation, and other lines that divide us. We believe our common humanity is more important than our differences, which make life interesting, but which are not fundamental to our common cause.

If you look at all the trouble we've had in the world in the last 20 years, just the trouble we've had in the world in the last 6½ years since I've been President, from the Middle East to Northern Ireland, to Bosnia and Kosovo, to the tribal wars in Africa, our continuing inability to get over our fear, loathing, and dehumanization of people who are different from us is the number one problem the world has. And it is quite interesting, as we deal with the miracles of modern medicine, the miracles of the modern Internet, we look forward to the Human Genome Project, giving every mother a map of her baby's life when she goes home from the hospital, we are beset by the most primitive of all human problems, the continuing fear of people who are different from us.

I can just tell you that the people that we're running and the policies that will be followed—and you know, I'm not running for anything. I'm selling this as a prospective citizen and what I want for my daughter and my grandchildren's generation. We'll stand up for one America, and we'll change. But we don't want a U-turn. We've got this country going in the right direction, and we want to reach for the stars.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:50 p.m. in the penthouse of the McGraw-Hill Building. In his remarks, he referred to Dennis Rivera, president, Local 1199 of the National Health and Human Services Employees Union. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a National Labor Research Association Dinner in New York City

October 7, 1999

Thank you for that nice, restrained welcome. [*Laughter*] It is wonderful to be here with all of you and to see your enthusiasm. And I thank you for it. I want to thank all of you for being here and for the purpose that you're here. Brian McLaughlin and Lee Saunders and Representative Loretta Sanchez is here. Basil Patterson, I was delighted to see him. Randi Weingarten and so many old friends of mine are here. I want to say a special word of congratulations to Jim Hoffa and Ed Ott on their awards.

Thank you for making New York the biggest, strongest union city in America. We can see why—[*applause*]—thank you. I also want to thank Greg Tarpinian and the Labor Research Association. You know, when people hear the words "think tank," they don't think about dinners where people behave the way you are right now. [*Laughter*] They think about really buttondown types, chewing on their pipe stems, musing about the higher things. Well, you're not in an ivory tower, and it's important that people with feet on the ground do the thinking in America. And I thank you for doing it.

I would just say one other thing about this dinner tonight, and your work and deciding to honor Jim and Ed. They represent the vitality and the strength and the intensity and the compassion and the direction of the modern labor movement in America. One of the things that I wanted to do when the Vice President and I came into office is to change the way America thought about labor. I was so sick and tired of more than a decade of people trying to make unions the whipping boy of whatever it was that was wrong with America they wanted to make right.

And when I asked—I never will forget this—when I sat around and talked to Hillary and my other close friends, and I was trying to decide—[*applause*]—well, that's good, too. We need that response in New York especially, I think. [*Laughter*]

But we were trying to decide, you know, what we ought to do with this whole Vice Presidential thing. And I said, "Look, I think I'm going with Gore, because he's the same age I am"—he's actually younger, as he never tires of telling people—[*laughter*]—"and we're from the same part of the country, and we're from the same sort of general wing of the Democratic Party." But I think that's good, because what I want to do is change the way America thinks about politics.

Because everybody in Washington had created an environment, particularly the previous two administrations, where you couldn't be pro-business if you were pro-labor. You couldn't be pro-economic growth if you thought we ought to try to preserve the environment. You couldn't be for doing something about the deficit if you wanted to invest in our children's education. And it was this kind of nutty world that didn't exist anywhere I knew in America except in Washington and in the political choices we were given.

And so we made this argument to the American people. We said, "Look, give us a chance to prove you can be pro-business and pro-labor. Give us a chance to prove you can be for protecting the environment and growing the economy. Give us a chance to get rid of this deficit and invest more in the education of our children and the future of our country."

And it was just an argument—just an argument. But the people of this great city and this wonderful State and our great country gave us a chance. And every step of the way, you were with us. And now, after 6½ years, thanks to you, those who produce ideas and those who do the work, it is not an argument anymore. The evidence is in, and we were right.

Thanks to you, we raised the minimum wage; we got family and medical leave on the books; we cut taxes for millions of low income working families by doubling the earned-income tax credit. And whenever our friends on the other side of the aisle in Congress try to roll back the rights of workers, we turn them back. And every time we did that—every time we did it, they said we were hurting the job climate in America. "If you raise the minimum wage, you'll hurt small business. If you pass family and medical leave"—after the previous administration vetoed it—"you'll hurt business. We won't have job growth. If you don't get rid of the Davis-Bacon law, you're going to hurt the business climate. If you double the earned-income tax credit that goes to people who are working their hearts out, with kids and barely above the poverty line, you know you'll waste a lot of tax money on people who will take advantage of it, weaken the economy—be hard to balance the budget."

I heard all those arguments over and over again. Well, the evidence is in. We didn't get a single vote from the other side for our economic plan in 1993 that the labor movement stood with us on. And we stayed strong for all these other things because we believed you could be pro-labor and pro-business; we believed you could be pro-family and pro-work. And after 6½ years, thanks to you

and all those who stood together, we have the lowest unemployment rate in 29 years, the lowest welfare rolls in 32 years, the lowest poverty rate in 20 years, the first back-to-back budget surpluses in 42 years, the highest homeownership in history, 19½ million new jobs, and the longest economic expansion in peacetime in the history of the United States of America.

Now, the question is, what are we going to do now? There will be a great debate across this country over the next year, between now and the next election for President, for the Senate, for the Congress, and people will say, because they know we Americans all like to hear it, "Well, we ought to have a change." And guess what? I agree with that. I agree with that. If there were any candidate for President on the horizon today who said, "Vote for me, and I'll do exactly what Bill Clinton did," I'd vote against that person. [*Laughter*] I would vote against that person, because the world is changing too fast.

We've worked hard to turn this country around and get it going in the right direction. And I believe that the changes we ought to be focused on are those which, now, we have the luxury of embracing, to just totally rewrite the future for the United States and much of the rest of the world for our children and our children's children.

Yes, we ought to change. But what we ought to do is build on what we've done to reach for the stars, not take a U-turn and get us back in the same trouble we were in 1992, when we got here. And so I say to you, now that—in the presence of a think tank—we need the best ideas to reach for the stars.

The number of people over 65 in America is going to double in the next 30 years. I sure hope I live to be one of them. [*Laughter*] And there will be two people working for every one person drawing Social Security. Social Security Trust Fund's supposed to run out of money in 2034. We have the money now. We ought to save Social Security for the baby boom generation, for their children, and their grandchildren.

The average 65-year-old American today has a life expectancy of 82. Those of you who are young enough to still be having children—when we get the Human Genome Project finished, it will be normal for young mothers to come home from the hospital with their children, with a roadmap of their children's biological future, in ways that will maybe raise their life expectancy into the high eighties or the nineties, maybe even to 100 years. Things that are unthinkable.

But today, over three-quarters of the elderly people in this country do not have the prescription drug coverage they need. So I say we ought to modernize Medicare, lengthen the life of it so it can take on the baby boomers, but give those people a chance to have affordable prescription drugs, as we should have done long ago.

We ought to raise the minimum wage again. You can't raise a family on $10,700 a year. Hallelujah, the House of Representatives, on a bipartisan vote, passed the Patient's Bill of Rights today, but we ought to make it the law of the land, and we're a long way away. We need your help on that.

We ought to bring economic opportunity to all the people in places that haven't reached it yet. You know as well as I do, there are neighborhoods in this city and communities in this State that have not participated in our prosperity. From the time I started the empowerment zone program, that the Vice President has led so ably, in 1993, to the proposal I made for new markets; from the small towns to the inner-city areas, to the Appalachians to the Mississippi Delta, to the Indian reservations of this country, I believe we ought to give people with money in this country the same incentives to invest in poor areas in America we give them to invest in poor areas in Latin America, and the Caribbean and Africa, in Asia.

I think we ought to bridge the so-called digital divide. Our administration's worked very hard to make sure we get all the classrooms in this country hooked up to the Internet and they can all afford to do it by the year 2000. But think of this: I was out in California last week, and I met with some people that work for eBay. Did you ever buy anything off eBay? I bet there are people right here who have done that.

Twenty-thousand Americans, including people who used to be on welfare, are now making a living trading on that company. But there are still a lot of people that wouldn't

know one end of a computer from another. Think about what it would be like if, for every American family, access to the Internet were as universal as access to the telephone. I don't want to see a digital divide for our kids in this country. I want every single child to have access to that high-tech future.

I think—I'll give you another example. The crime rate is at a 26-year low. In every big city in America, it's way down. And everybody involved deserves a lot of credit, including the Congress who voted for the Brady bill, the assault weapons ban, the 100,000 police, more help for the cities to prevent crime. But it's not low enough. Does anybody really think America is safe enough?

The crime rate is at a 26-year low. That's the good news. The bad news, I can't get one person out there to stand up and say, "I'm satisfied with the safety level in America." If we're the biggest and most powerful economy in the world, if we're the freest country in the world, if we have the most vibrant democracy—we now know something we didn't know in 1992; people didn't have any idea we could turn the crime rate around in '92. We know we can now. So why don't we set a real goal worthy of America? Why don't we make up our mind we're going to make this the safest big country in the world? That is a worthy goal—and come up with the resources and the plans necessary to do it.

The last thing I want to say is this. I think that the Congress ought to take one major part of my budget, which is to save enough money to pay the debt down so that in 15 years, for the first time since 1835 when Andrew Jackson was President, America can be out of debt.

And let me tell you why I think every union member ought to be for that. You know, when I studied economics in college, every professor I had said that this debt's a good thing. Every country needs a certain amount of debt. And it was good when we were borrowing money to build interstate highways; we were borrowing money to build airports; we were borrowing money to build America. But for the last 30 years we've been borrowing money to go to McDonald's at night or come to dinner here or whatever else the Government does. We're borrowing money just to get along through the day.

Meanwhile, interest rates are set in a global economy. And nobody can keep their money if somebody else will pay a higher price for it. You've seen that happen in country after country. That's what happened in Asia a couple of years ago.

But if we got the Government out of the borrowing business, it means that everybody that all of you work for could borrow money for less. It means there would be more businesses, more expansion, more jobs, higher incomes. It means that all the families in this room tonight would have lower interest rates for college loans, for home loans, for car loans, for credit card payments. It means we would be more immune to future problems around the world. And we ought to do it for our children's sake. We ought to do that.

Now, one thing I want to say in closing. You said the NAFTA thing; I'll tell you one thing I've done that the Teamsters agree with. I don't intend to allow the trucking rules to be changed until there's safety there that we can know about. That is—the big problem I have with trade is not the problem some of you have. The problem I have is that it's too hard to enforce the rules. This is a rule we still have control of, and we now have evidence that two-thirds of the trucks that come across the border are not safe. They don't meet our standards. And I intend to see that the rules are followed before I follow the rules on this. I think that's important.

I want to say something about trade. Generally, the American labor movement has supported trade with countries that are in our income groups and worried about trade when we're trading with countries that are poorer than we are because they pay lower labor costs. But it bothers me that we have 4 percent of the world's people and 22 percent of the world's income, and we're facing rising protectionism from people unwilling to buy our products around the world. We see it in Europe. We see it elsewhere.

So what I think we need to do is to come together, as I did when John Sweeney went with me to Switzerland the other day, to the International Labor Organization to call for a ban everywhere in the world on child labor.

I think what we need to do, I think we need a policy, a progressive policy, on putting a human face on globalization so we don't leave people behind, so we have rising labor standards, rising standards of living, rising environmental standards as a part of expanding trade.

If that happens, nobody will be the loser, and you can look at trade everywhere the way generally the labor movement looks at trade with Canada and Europe today. I think that we can't run away from the global economy, but we can sure put a more human face on it. And we ought to take the lead in shaping it, instead of being passive and being shaped by it.

And one final point I want to make. I am grateful to the American labor movement, in some ways more than anything else, for standing through—for decades and decades and decades—for the cause of civil rights and human rights at home and around the world.

We had a memorial service for Lane Kirkland the other day at our common alma mater; Lane and I both graduated from the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown. And Lech Walesa, the former President of Poland, came all the way from Poland to speak at his friend's memorial service, because Lane Kirkland and the American labor movement stood for the freedom of the Polish dock workers and the Polish citizens in throwing off the shackles of communism. And I have seen it here at home, where the American labor movement has always been in the forefront against discrimination.

And I just want to leave you with this thought. It's really interesting—I see more and more people in all kinds of work working with computers. Most of you, if you're like me, have got kids that know a lot more about computers than you do. We're all sort of entranced by what's happening in the modern world. I was talking to some people about the library I hope to build when I leave office, and they said, "Well, Mr. President, you need to get some virtual reality in your library." [*Laughter*] And I said, I thought that was what Washington, DC, was all about. [*Laughter*]

So I said—so, you know, I'm sort of technologically challenged. They make fun of me at the White House. I said, "Now, tell me what you mean by that." And they said, "Well, what we mean is, if you have virtual reality in your library, then instead of showing people a movie about something like the Middle East peace signing between Arafat and Rabin, people will walk into a room and everything will get dark, and they'll feel like they're there, and a part of it." That sounded pretty impressive to me.

So anyway, we're going to live in this world where we're just enthralled by all these advances. Don't you think it's interesting that in a world that will be dominated—historians will say, with the most strange of all times, we had unparalleled prosperity, unparalleled technological advances, and yet what bedeviled us the most, from Northern Ireland to the Middle East, to Bosnia and Kosovo, to the tribal wars of Africa? What bedeviled us the most from James Byrd being torn apart in Texas, to Matthew Shepard being laid out on a rack in Wyoming, to these kids being shot at at the Jewish community center and that poor Filipino postal worker being murdered, to the people in the Middle West, the basketball coach at Northwestern and the Korean guy coming out of church? What bedeviled us most, at home and abroad, in the modern world? The most primitive failing of human beings: We're afraid of people who are different from us.

It's easy to go from fear to hatred. Once you get to hating people, it's easy to dehumanize them. And before you know it, you're killing them. And I think you ought to think about that.

One of the things that is really important about the American labor movement is that you never wanted to go forward in the future leaving anybody behind. You never wanted to look down your nose at somebody because they were different. And you never wanted to forget about your neighbors around the world who were denied the right to organize, the right to vote, the right to speak, the right to live free.

So I ask you, as we look toward the future, don't forget your old mission. Because if we could all get along and treat each other as human beings, we'd be a lot better off.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:43 p.m. in the Grand Ballroom at the New York Hilton. In his remarks, he referred to Brian McLaughlin, president, and Ed Ott, director of politics, New York City Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO; Lee Saunders, district council 37 trustee, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; Basil Patterson, partner, Meyer, Suozzi, English, and Klein; Randi Weingarten, president, United Federation of Teachers; James P. Hoffa, general president, International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Greg Tarpinian, executive director, Labor Research Association; and John J. Sweeney, president, AFL–CIO.

Remarks at an Empire State Pride Gala in New York City

October 7, 1999

The President. Thank you very much for your energy and your enthusiasm, your passion, and your wonderful welcome. I want to begin by thanking Jeff, who has been a wonderful friend and adviser, a prodder and supporter to me. And I thank him so much.

Thank you, Kate Callivan, for your work tonight. Thank you, Matt Forman, for your leadership of Empire State Pride. And thank you, Chuck Schumer, for running and winning and for all you have done to make this a better State and a better country.

I'd also like to thank two other Members of the Congress who are here, Congressman Jerry Nadler and Congressman Anthony Weiner, for the work they do for you. Thank you. I'd like to thank my longtime friend, the New York public advocate, Mark Green, who is here, for his steadfast support of your agenda. Thank you, Mark.

I understand the borough president of Manhattan is here, Virginia Fields. Thank you, Virginia. We're glad to have you. There are members of the State Assembly and members of the City Council here. Emily Giske, the vice president of the State Democratic Party, is here. I thank her. And we've got all these great people from the administration. A lot of them stood up, but I want to mention their names—the two highest ranking openly gay and lesbian appointees in the house, Sean Maloney and Karen Tramontano; my good friend Richard Socarides, who is leaving; Fred Hochberg, the Deputy Administrator of SBA; and two former appointees, Roberta Eichenberg and Ginny Apuzzo are here. I thank them for what they did. I'd also like to thank Marsha Scott, who was my first liaison to the gay and lesbian community this year. And the head of our anti-HIV and AIDS efforts, Sandy Thurman, who's done a wonderful job this year. I thank her for being here.

Let me begin by saying something I need to say a lot in the time I have left as President: Thank you. Thank you for the support, the guidance, and the urging you have given to the Vice President and me and to our administration and our families. Thank you for the example you have set. Thank you for helping Chuck Schumer to get elected. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to learn and grow and do our jobs better and serve all Americans better.

Jeff said that, you know, last year the Vice President came, and this year Chuck and I are here. And you're looking for a speaker. I think, you know, you ought to invite a woman to speak next year. And if you want, I have a suggestion. [*Laughter*]

Actually I talked, as chance would have it, to both the Vice President and to Hillary this afternoon—[*laughter*]—not so I could tell you that I did, either. [*Laughter*] But they asked me what I was doing—there's a lot more attention on what they're doing than what I'm doing now, but they did ask me what I was doing, which was nice, that someone, somewhere in America still cared what I was doing. [*Laughter*] So when I told them what I was doing, they said to give you their best wishes, and they wish they were here.

Jeff mentioned that 7 years ago, when I first ran for President, I said I had a vision for America, and you were a part of it. I met with a group of activists from your community here in early 1992, and in California in late 1991. And I began to try to listen and to learn and to understand why so many of these issues have presented such big problems for America.

One couple came through to see me earlier tonight, two men; one was from Australia, the other from New Zealand, and they said that as a couple, they hadn't the same immigration rights coming into America as they did in either Canada or New Zealand. I don't

think that's right. I think that ought to be changed.

But I think the first thing I want to say to you—I want to talk more about this, but I'm obviously giving a lot of thought these days to what happens to America over the long run. We enter a new century; we enter a new millennium; the way we work and live and relate to each other and relate to people around the world is changing in profound and speedy ways. It's almost difficult to grasp. More of it is good than bad.

But we all have to be much more open to each other if we want this to work. We've got to learn to listen as well as to talk. We've got to learn to feel as well as to think. We have to learn, as we're all told we should do from childhood, to stand in the other person's shoes. We have done what we could to make the future one of equal opportunity and equal responsibility and equal membership in our American community, whether it is in fighting to pass the hate crimes law or the "Employment Non-Discrimination Act" or to invest more in research, prevention, and treatment for HIV patients.

I would like to take just a few moments tonight to try to put all the things you care about into a larger context of where America is and where I hope America will go. When I started running for President, I did so because I thought the country was in trouble and without direction and growing more divided. First, economically, unemployment was too high; job growth was too low; incomes were stagnant; inequality was increasing; and there was a sense of literal despair about it in many places.

I worried about social division. You remember, we had a riot in Los Angeles. But everywhere, there was this quiet sense of unease. And every campaign, it seemed to me, was yet another example of how we could sort of carve up the electorate and make one group resent another and hope that your group was a larger group of resenters than the other group. And it seemed to me that that was a bad way to run a country.

And it wasn't just anti-lesbian and -gay; it was tensions between the races, tensions between immigrants and citizens. And it built on this whole pattern of thought that had accumulated in Washington over decades that everything had to be divided into hostile camps. You couldn't be pro-labor if you were pro-business and vice versa. You couldn't be pro-economic growth and be in favor of improving the environment. You couldn't be pro-work and pro-family. We had to have these divided views. You couldn't have an urban policy if you really cared about what was going on on the farm.

You know, we don't think like that. None of us do, instinctively. We always try to think of how we can live an integrated life and how our minds will think in an integrated way that pulls things together and moves things forward. But everything about our politics was about how to pit us against one another.

And since we all wake up every morning—I know maybe none of you do, but some days I wake up on the wrong side of the bed, in a foul humor. [*Laughter*] I'm sure you don't ever do that, but I do sometimes. [*Laughter*] And it has occurred to me really that every one of us has this little scale inside, you know. On one side there's the light forces and the other side there's the dark forces in our psyche and our makeup and the way we look at the world. And every day we wake up and the scale is a little bit tilted one way or the other. And life is a big struggle to try to keep things in proper balance.

You don't want to have so much light that you're just a fool for whatever comes along. But if the scale tips dark even a little bit, things turn badly for people and those with whom they come in contact. And it can happen for communities and for a whole country.

So anyway, when I ran, I thought maybe I could change the way we think about politics. And if we do, maybe we can change what we do and how we do it.

And you know, there's an old adage that the Lord never gives you more than you can handle, but I have been severely tested in this resolve. [*Laughter*] But most days, you know, it's been kind of fun but bewildering. [*Laughter*]

So anyway, we came up—Al Gore and I—well, for whatever reason—and the American people took a chance on me and Al Gore in 1992. And we got the Democrats together, and we tried to reach out to the Republicans.

And usually they said no; sometimes they said—a few of them would say yes.

But we said, "Look, let's take a different direction on the economy, on crime, on welfare, on the environment. Let's try to think of a way to integrate the things that we want to achieve and build a creative tension so we could move the country forward. And let's try to build a country where everybody has a place." And we just made an argument in 1992. It was just an argument. You—no one could know for sure whether it would work.

[*At this point, a cellular telephone rang in the audience.*]

The President. You know, I'm rethinking my position about wanting everybody to have a cell phone in this country. [*Laughter*] He's a good guy. Don't worry about it.

But anyway, so we made this argument, you know, and you guys took a chance. And New York really stood behind us, gave us a chance to serve.

But it's not an argument anymore. Those of you who've been with us 6½ years, when you go out to discuss citizenship and issues and the future, say, "Look, whatever you want to say about that crowd, there are certain things that you can't dispute. We now have the lowest unemployment rate in 29 years, the lowest welfare rolls in 32 years, the lowest crime rates in 26 years, the lowest poverty rates in 20 years, the first back-to-back surpluses in 42 years, the longest peacetime expansion in history, and 19½ million new jobs." You can't argue; that happened.

And every time—every time—every time we did something that tried to reconcile our economic objectives with our other objectives—whether it was family and medical leave or vetoing the first two welfare bills because they didn't have guaranteed food and medicine coverage for poor children and enough money for child care, or trying to clean up the air and the water, or saying that the system we had for taking care of little kids and immunizing them—we were nuts, and we were determined to reach 90 percent immunization, which we did, by the way. All of these things—people would say—or raising the minimum wage, or you name it—that was always going to be something that would hurt the economy. It turned out that that was wrong, that putting things together made all of our efforts reinforce one another.

I feel even more strongly about that when it comes to putting people together. One of the things I've spent an enormous amount of time doing in the last 2 years is trying to make sure America is Y2K ready. I've even got these little things that look like beanie babies that are Y2K bugs I have around just to remind me that we don't want there to be one.

You know, to most people, that's about adjusting a computer. But if you think about it, there is a lot more than mechanics involved in being ready for the new millennium, and a lot more than economics involved in being a successful country.

When I signed the Executive order to prohibit discrimination in the Federal work force based on sexual orientation, I thought I was helping us to come together. I think "ENDA" will help us to come together.

I think the fact that we have gay and lesbian Americans, like Jim Hormel and over 200 other openly gay and lesbian people serving in appointed positions in our Government throughout the administration, doing normal jobs—I got so tickled when you were reading—you know, if you look at our people and what they do, they do real jobs. They're out there showing up. And every time they come in contact with somebody, they destroy another stereotype. They rob people of another attack.

You know, when we were in that awful battle that I waged and didn't win over the military service issue, there was a national survey run which showed that the most significant factor tilting people in favor of the so-called gays in the military policy was whether they consciously were aware that they had known a gay person. And those who said they were consciously aware that they had a personal relationship, contact with a gay person were two to one in favor of the policy.

Now, I say that because I believe that our whole society is like all of us are individually. We've got these scales always tilting back and forth between the forces of hope and the forces of fear. And what people do not know, they more easily fear. What they fear, they can easily hate. And what they hate, they

quickly dehumanize. And it is a slippery slope.

So I say to you, this hate crimes legislation is important. People say, "Well, you know, the killers of James Byrd got the death penalty in Texas, and maybe you don't need it." But we do need it, because there are 8,000 reported hate crimes in 1997 alone, about one an hour. And people need to focus on it.

When those kids got shot at the Jewish community center school, and then that Filipino postal worker got murdered, and then the former basketball coach of Northwestern, and the young Korean Christian walking out of his church got shot in the heartland of Illinois and Indiana. And all of those things happened. And all of you know that we are now observing the one-year anniversary of the death of young Matthew Shepard, and I want to say I am honored beyond words that his mother, Judy, is with us tonight. And I'd like to ask her to stand.

I thanked her tonight before I came out for her continuing work. And she looked at me, and she said, "I'm just a mom." But when I was in Los Angeles last week, speaking to the ANGLE group, a young person came up to me and said that I had given her more legitimacy and sense of security and self-worth than she had gotten in her own family. And I said to this child—I want you to know, because this is the point I'm trying to make—I'm not bragging on me, here. I'm here to make this point about our country—I said, "You've got to be patient with them. They're afraid. You've got to stay with them. They're scared."

And it is amazing to me—I have spent so much time as President, on the one hand trying to maximize your access to the wonders of the modern world—you know, we're hooking up all the classrooms to the Internet; we got this E-rate, so that the poor schools can reach across the digital divide, and all the kids can work computers in every classroom in America; we have passed the Telecommunications Act, and we've got over 300,000 new high-tech jobs just in a couple of years; and we're trying to invest in a new generation Internet; and we're about to break the human genome code, and when we do that, when mothers bring their children home from the hospital after giving birth, they'll have little genetic maps that may—some people believe literally may help to raise life expectancy for children born early in the next century to as much as 100 years.

And you know, it's all so exciting. But it is profoundly sobering to consider that at the time of greatest technological change in all of human history, we are most bedeviled at home and around the world by the most primitive of human failings, the fear of the other.

Think about what I have done as your President, how much time I've spent trying to help the Nation heal up from all these school shootings or what happened in Oklahoma City and the hate crimes I mentioned. And then think about the parallels we have—they're all individual instances; I recognize that. But think about the parallels in terms of the failings of the human heart and mind with the ongoing problems in the Middle East, in the Balkans, in Bosnia and Kosovo, in Northern Ireland, in the tribal slaughters of Rwanda and other places in Africa, where people really can't believe they matter unless they have somebody to look down on that they can dehumanize and justify killing. So that's how their life counts when we ought to be trying to tell people that they should be excited by the differences between people, secure in the knowledge that our common humanity is more important than all the differences that we have.

And somehow we have to do this. And words alone won't do it. And laws are important, but laws alone won't do it, either. And we've got to go out and confront our neighbors, including our own families. We've got to ask people to listen as well as to talk. And we have to help people to get beyond their fears.

You know, when I go and give speeches to political groups, I tell them that I want America to continue to change, that I myself would not vote for anyone who ran for President saying, "Vote for me. I'll do just what Bill Clinton did. He did a good job," because things are changing. And I talk about meeting the challenge of the aging of America and reforming Social Security and Medicare and meeting the challenge of the children

of America, the largest and most diverse group ever, and giving them all a world-class education and meeting the challenge of a 21st century economy by putting a human face on globalization and trade by investing in the markets of America that had been left behind in the poor areas, by giving everybody access to the Internet so we can fully bridge the divide and by paying the country's debt off.

I talk about these things. I talk about meeting the challenge of global warming. And it's mostly modern stuff looking to the future, and it's all profoundly important. But if you look at the journey of a country to find its true spirit, the most important thing is that we try to be one America that is a force for the common humanity of the world.

It was, I think, a very human feeling that led the Congress finally to work with us to dramatically increase funding for all elements of the AIDS fight, so that now we have continued reductions in AIDS-related deaths and a commitment to genuinely find a cure and a vaccine. I think it was a human thing. We've still got a long way to go. You know we do.

And we pick our targets when we, as a country, when we're defensive. I was outraged this week when the first African-American ever to serve on the State Supreme Court of Missouri was voted down after having been handily voted out of the Judicial Committee of the Senate with the Republicans voting for him; they voted him down on the floor of the Senate by misrepresenting his record on capital punishment so that the Republican Senator from the home State would have an issue to run against the Governor on relating to commuting the sentences to life without parole for those who murdered other people.

So who cares about the symbolism of the first African-American judge ever on the Missouri Supreme Court? You know, not many people, African-Americans, are going to vote for this guy anyway. "Throw him to the wolves. Destroy his career. Distort his record. Who cares? I need a political issue." And we all have to be afraid of that, of objectifying others for short-term gain.

On the other hand, look at the number of people who are in the Government, in all forms of our economic and social life. There's a reason the President is here, besides my heart. It is the right thing to do, and you have been heard. You have been heard. You have been heard.

There is a reason—there is a reason the Senator is here. There is a reason Al Gore came here last year, apart from his passionate conviction about the moral propriety of being here and the right thing to do. We now know that because you are willing to work and speak and stand, we can move the body politic in the right direction.

People are fundamentally good, but they're paralyzed when they're scared. And in spite of all these issues that I go around advocating, that I passionately believe in, if I were told that I was going to have to leave this old world in 72 hours and I could just do one thing for America and that was it and I just had to pick one thing, I would try to leave one America. Because if we were together, if we were willing to have all of our differences be differences of opinion and not to be afraid of one another and never to dehumanize one another, we would be not only a better country here; our influence for good abroad would be exponentially greater even than it is today. And we would have a chance—we would have a chance to give our children the millennium that they deserve.

So I say again, the most important thing I want to say to you is thank you. I'm proud of what we've done together. I wish we could have done better. I hope we can do more.

But never forget, you deserve most of the credit. And you will get more as you fight harder but also as you are human to people who do not see you. You must—you've got to believe in this great country, that this is fundamentally a good country, that Alexis de Tocqueville was right when he said, "America is great because America is good."

But you know, we've done a lot of things that were pretty lousy, starting with slavery, as Thomas Jefferson said. So we all are always in the process of learning to be better, of learning how our attitudes and our actions are in conflict with what we believe. Life is a constant struggle, therefore, for true integrity, for integrating your mind and your body and your spirit. And so is the life of a nation.

I am indebted to you because I happened to be President and to seek this job at a time when you were raising these issues, and you gave me a chance to make a contribution. You made me a better President; you made me a better person.

Don't give up, and don't you ever turn dark. Don't do it. We can still make the America of our dreams.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:56 p.m. at the Sheraton New York Hotel and Tower. In his remarks, he referred to Jeff Soref, executive director, and Kate Callivan and Matt Forman, cochairs, Empire State Pride; Mark Green, New York City public advocate; Emily Giske, vice chair, New York State Democratic Party; James C. Hormel, U.S. Ambassador to Luxembourg; and Ronnie L. White, nominee for U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri. The President also referred to ANGLE, Access Now for Gay and Lesbian Equality. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Proclamation 7235—To Delegate Authority for the Administration of the Tariff-Rate Quotas on Sugar-Containing Products and Other Agricultural Products to the United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of Agriculture

October 7, 1999

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

1. On April 15, 1994, the President entered into trade agreements resulting from the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations ("Uruguay Round Agreements"). As part of those agreements, the United States converted quotas on imports of beef, cotton, dairy products, peanuts, peanut butter and peanut paste, sugar, and sugar-containing products (as defined in additional U.S. notes 2 and 3 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States) into tariff-rate quotas. In section 101(a) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (the "URAA") (Public Law 103–465; 108 Stat. 4809), Congress approved the Uruguay Round Agreements listed in section 101(d) of that Act, including the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994.

2. On December 23, 1994, the President issued Presidential Proclamation 6763, implementing the Uruguay Round Agreements consistent with the URAA. Presidential Proclamation 6763 included a delegation of the President's authority under the statutes cited in the proclamation, including section 404(a) of the URAA, 19 U.S.C. 3601(a), to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the United States Trade Representative, as necessary to perform functions assigned to them to implement the proclamation. Section 404(a) directs the President to take such action as may be necessary in implementing the tariff-rate quotas set out in Schedule XX—United States of America, annexed to the Marrakesh Protocol to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, to ensure that imports of agricultural products do not disrupt the orderly marketing of commodities in the United States.

3. I have determined that it is necessary to delegate my authority under section 404(a) to administer the tariff-rate quotas relating to cotton, dairy products, peanuts, peanut butter and peanut paste, sugar, and sugar-containing products to the United States Trade Representative and to delegate to the Secretary of Agriculture authority to issue licenses governing the importation of such products under the applicable tariff-rate quotas. The Secretary of Agriculture shall exercise such licensing authority in consultation with the United States Trade Representative.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, acting under the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including but not limited to section 301 of title 3, United States Code, and section 404(a) of the URAA, do hereby proclaim:

(1) The United States Trade Representative is authorized to exercise my authority pursuant to section 404(a) of the URAA to take all action necessary, including the promulgation of regulations, to administer the tariff-rate quotas relating respectively, to cotton, dairy products, peanuts, peanut butter

and peanut paste, sugar, and sugar-containing products, as the latter products are defined in additional U.S. notes 2 and 3 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, is authorized to exercise my authority pursuant to section 404(a) to issue import licenses governing the importation of such products within the applicable tariff-rate quotas.

(2) All provisions of previous proclamations and Executive orders that are inconsistent with the actions taken in this proclamation are superseded to the extent of such inconsistency.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:56 a.m., October 12, 1999]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 8, and it will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 13.

Remarks at a Dedication Ceremony for the New United States Embassy in Ottawa, Canada

October 8, 1999

Thank you, and good morning. Madam Governor General, I congratulate you on your—you told me the proper word was installation. I might have said elevation, coronation. [*Laughter*] It's a wonderful thing for Canada and for us as your friends.

Mr. Prime Minister, members of the Cabinet, distinguished justices of the Supreme Court, members of Parliament, Mr. Ambassador, members of the diplomatic corps, ladies and gentlemen: I would like to begin by thanking the Canadian and American military bands, and the four young men who sang our national anthems, equally well, I thought.

I also want to thank the Prime Minister for his words and the Prime Minister and Mrs. Chretien for their friendship to us.

You know, having said all these—you're supposed to only say nice things at an event like this. But I really resent Jean Chretien. [*Laughter*] He first came to Ottawa to represent the people of Canada when President Kennedy was in the White House and I was in high school. [*Laughter*] Now I have more gray hair than he does. [*Laughter*] And he's not even term-limited. [*Laughter*]

Your wonderful Ambassador to our country, Raymond Chretien, once joked that the Prime Minister is, I quote, "the only leader in the G–7"—that includes me; therefore, it's a put-down—"the only leader in the G–7 who could still slalom on water skis with one of his grandchildren on his shoulders." [*Laughter*] It is true that even if I had grandchildren, I could not do that. [*Laughter*]

Well, Prime Minister, that's not the only way in which you carry the children of this country on your shoulders. And I thank you for being my friend and partner.

I also want to say a special word of appreciation to the men and women who serve in our Embassy here, both American and Canadian citizens, and to my good friend Ambassador Giffen, who gave me an unusually generous introduction, confirming Clinton's fourth law of politics: Whenever possible, be introduced by someone you have appointed to high office. [*Laughter*]

You know, Gordon's had an unusual life. He grew up in Canada, then moved to Georgia, where he became one of the few people in the South who had ever stood on frozen water. [*Laughter*] For years, Atlanta had no hockey team; no one there could even skate. Now they have a hockey team. The NHL announced it was awarding a new team there as soon as he came here [*Laughter*] Instead of divided loyalties, he is for both the Senators and the Atlanta Thrashers.

We even have two minor league hockey teams in my hometown of Little Rock, now, if you can believe that. The whole American South has gone hockey-mad. And since we're all dealing with global warming, it's becoming increasingly difficult to pursue the sport. [*Laughter*]

I just had the honor of touring this new building. It was nice of the Ambassador to mention that the words of four of our Presidents are on this wall—President Kennedy's very memorable description of our relationship and wonderful quotes by Presidents Eisenhower and Reagan. And this is the first time I've ever had anything I've said carved in stone. I've had one or two speeches sink like a stone over the years. [*Laughter*] I've had several audiences sit like a stone. [*Laughter*] I'm glad to be carved in stone.

As was said earlier, I'm not the first member of my family to visit here, nor is this my first visit here. Hillary was here just last week and, among other things, had the opportunity to dedicate the new sculpture out front of the Embassy. And I want to thank the renowned artist, Joel Shapiro, for honoring both our countries with such a beautiful piece of his work.

I have now been here five times. John says I must learn to speak French, so let me say, *Je suis chez moi au Canada.* He also says if I come one more time, I have to start paying taxes. [*Laughter*] I think that's more important than the French to him. I don't know. [*Laughter*]

More than a decade ago I came to Canada* with Hillary, our young daughter, and my mother-in-law. We celebrated the new year. We had a few wonderful days in Montreal. We drove to Chateau Montebello. In 1990 Hillary and Chelsea and I had a wonderful vacation in the summer in Victoria and Vancouver. And 6 years ago this month something that means a great deal to me, my mother, just 2 months before her death, took one of her last trips to Ottawa, where she spoke to the Ontario Cancer Society.

She, typically, gave a new wrinkle to American relations when she turned down a visit to the parliament or the Supreme Court so that she could visit something called "Elvis Lives Lane." [*Laughter*] My mother was always a great fan of Elvis Presley. She's convinced that he's going to appear at one of my speeches one day. [*Laughter*]

Today we add another chapter to the remarkable history of the friendship of our people. It is true, I believe, that in the 223-year history of our country, the President has never left the United States to dedicate an Embassy. If that tradition were ever to be abandoned, it would have to be here in Canada. In a world where too many regions are torn by conflicts and too many nations torn by hatred among people of different racial, ethnic, and religious groups, our two nations, the harmony we seek to promote within, and the friendship we seek to promote between us, have shown the world a better way and given ourselves a great responsibility for the new millennium.

If we took the border we share and stretched it across Europe, it would reach the combined distance from Lisbon to Moscow, Belfast to Tehran, across lands scarred by warfare for many centuries. Yet our border has been undefended for 180 years now. It's hard to believe the Rideau Canal, which passes a few blocks from here, originally was built after the War of 1812 to protect Canada from the United States. It's a sign of how far we've come that today the canal isn't a barrier, but the largest outdoor skating rink in the world.

The United States and Canada have benefited from sharing our continent. We, in particular, have learned from you—a parliamentary democracy with two official languages, many distinct cultures, an inspiring commitment to social justice and solidarity. Our culture is richer, much richer, for the writings of Robertson Davies, the photographs of Yousuf Karsh, the magnificent music of Oscar Peterson, and for those of us who are country music fans, we were thrilled when Shania Twain was named the Country Music Star of Year. And last week, of course, when number 99 was raised to the rafters in Edmonton, most people on both sides of our border agreed that Wayne Gretzky is the finest hockey player ever to be seen.

Our two nations have a wonderful tradition of standing together in moments of difficulty and need. During last year's terrible ice storm, I was proud to hear that linecrews from Vermont helped restore power to some small towns in Canada. And we in the United States will always be grateful for the way in which the people of Nova Scotia responded to the tragic crash of Swissair Flight 111.

* White House correction.

All of you know well that we share the world's largest trading relationship, with more than a billion dollars a day passing over the border. Our NAFTA partnership, together with Mexico, has resulted in a 100-percent increase in trade within North America in just 5 years and the creations of millions of new jobs in both our countries. I know Canada is looking forward to hosting the third Summit of the Americas in Quebec City in early 2001, to talk about ways to strengthen trade within our hemisphere.

We also share a responsibility to help to spread the benefits of freedom and democracy beyond our borders. That's what my quote on the wall is all about inside. It is fitting that the first American Embassy in Ottawa—the first American Embassy in Ottawa—was opened the same week that the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier was dedicated at Arlington National Cemetery in Washington.

For in this century, young Americans and young Canadians have fought side by side again and again to turn back tyranny and defend democracy. Together, we stood against mass killing and ethnic hatred in Bosnia, in Kosovo, and East Timor. Together, we have worked to build peace and democracy from the Balkans to Haiti. We have stood against aggression in the Persian Gulf. And together we must continue to work for the day when all the world can look to us and see how much stronger the bonds between nations can be when freedom and human rights and the diversity of human beings are all respected, how much richer society can be when we work to build each other up in our common humanity, rather than to acquire political advantage by putting each other down.

It is no surprise that the word "multicultural" actually comes from Canada. For two centuries, you have shown the world how people of different cultures can live and work together in peace, prosperity, and mutual respect in a country where human differences are democratically expressed, not forcefully repressed.

Earlier this year, we in the United States were pleased to see Canada's rich tradition of democracy deepen with the creation of the new territory of Nunavut. We are proud to be your partners and allies. And we deeply value our relationship with a strong, united, democratic Canada.

Of course, as any two nations as complicated as ours are, we have our differences, and we don't always see eye to eye. It's kind of interesting to watch Jean Chretien and me get in an argument. It's kind of like getting in an argument with your brother, you know? You have to do it every now and then just to keep in practice. [*Laughter*]

When we do have our differences, we try to approach them in good faith and directly, as true friends must. And we have shown that when we work together, on nearly every issue we can reach agreement.

I know that there's still one big issue out there that the Canadians are really pretty tense about. But I simply do not have the legal authority to order Doug Flutie to return to Canada. [*Laughter*]

Let me say to all of you, in closing, as we move into this new world of the 21st century; as we contemplate whether our children and grandchildren live to be 100 years or more because of the decoding of the human gene; as we imagine whether poor people across the world, from Africa to Latin America to Asia, will be able to skip 50 years of economic development because of the availability of the Internet and the cell phone and the rapid transfer of knowledge; as we imagine all the glories of modern technology in the modern world, it is well to remember that for all this race to tomorrow in technology, the deepest problem the world faces today is the most primitive problem of human nature, the fear of the other, people who are different from us.

What have we done, Jean and I, since we've been in our respective positions around the world? We tried to stop people from killing each other in Bosnia and Kosovo because of religious and ethnic differences. I spent an enormous amount of time trying to help the people in the land of my forbears in Northern Ireland get over 600 years of religious fights. And every time they make an agreement to do it, they're like a couple of drunks walking out of the bar for the last time. When they get to the swinging door they turn around and go back in and say, "I just can't quite get there."

It's hard to give up these things. Look at the Middle East—for all of our progress, it is so hard for them because of millennial differences. Why were all those people slaughtered in Rwanda?

When we have differences here in our homes, in our neighborhoods in Canada and in the United States, it is well to remember that the effort we are making to remind our own citizens that our common humanity is always more important than the things which divide us. They make life more interesting, our differences, but we must constantly reaffirm that.

Canada and the United States, I think, have a special responsibility to the new millennium. It would be tragic if all the dreams that we share for our children and our grandchildren's future, if all the potential of the modern world, were to still keep crashing on the rocks of mankind's oldest failing.

Let us show the world we don't need to be afraid of people who are different from us. We can respect them. We can differ honestly. But always—always—we must reaffirm our common humanity. That, to me, is the true story of our long friendship, which this magnificent building embodies.

And now, it is with great pride and privilege that I declare this Embassy officially open, in service to the people of the United States and in friendship to our greatest neighbor and ally, the people of Canada.

May God bless the people of Canada and the United States of America. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. at the McKenzie Street entrance at the U.S. Embassy. In his remarks, he referred to Governor General Adrienne Clarkson of Canada; Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien and his wife, Aline; U.S. Ambassador to Canada Gordon Giffen; and NFL Buffalo Bills quarterback Doug Flutie.

The President's News Conference With Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien in Ottawa

October 8, 1999

Prime Minister Chretien. *Mesdames et monsieurs,* ladies and gentlemen, it's a great pleasure for me to receive the President of the United States in Canada for this occasion of opening the new Embassy and for the President to come and make a speech in Mont-Tremblant on federalism.

As you know, the relations between Canada and the U.S. are excellent, and the President is here for his fifth visit to Canada since he started in office. And when I asked him to come to the conference at Mont-Tremblant, I had to call upon our longstanding friendship. And everyone is very pleased that you, the leader of the greatest democracy and the greatest federation, should come to give your point of view.

[*Inaudible*]—the President of the United States to come and make this statement, the speech in Mont-Tremblant, because he has been—he is in a very privileged position. He has been the Governor of a State, of Arkansas, and he has been the president of the conference of the Governors, and he as been, on the other side, the President of the United States. So he knows the functioning of a federal system inside out. And I'm sure that the people coming from around the world will benefit very strongly from his experience. And I want to say thank you very much. And I take it as a great sign of friendship for Canada and for myself that you have accepted to be with us today.

If you want to say a few words.

President Clinton. Thank you. First of all, Prime Minister, thank you for welcoming me back for my fifth trip to Canada since I've been President.

I would like to be very brief, and then we'll open it to questions. I'm here today to dedicate our Embassy, to speak at the Prime Minister's federalism conference, and to have the chance to meet with Prime Minister Chretien. I want to just mention two or three issues.

First of all, I'm profoundly grateful for the leadership shown by Canada in our common efforts to promote world peace, the work we've done together in Haiti, the work we did together in Bosnia, the work we did together in Kosovo with NATO, and the efforts that we're all making in East Timor, which is still a difficult situation, where we've got to get all the refugees home and safe and where we strongly support Secretary-General

Annan's efforts to establish a United Nations program there.

One of the things that we have worked on together is our efforts in nonproliferation. And Canada and the United States agree with all of our NATO Allies that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is the right thing to do, it's in the interest of the United States.

There has been far more controversy about it in our country than in other countries, including other nuclear powers who are our allies. And I was—we've been trying to have a debate on this for 2 years, but it is clear now that the level of opposition to the treaty and the time it would take to craft the necessary safeguards to get the necessary votes are simply not there. So I hope that the Senate will reach an agreement to delay the vote and to establish an orderly process, a nonpolitical orderly process, to systematically deal with all the issues that are out there and to take whatever time is necessary to do it.

With this treaty other nations will find it harder to acquire or to modernize nuclear weapons, and we will gain the means to detect and deter. If we don't have the treaty, the United States will continue to refrain from testing, and we'll give a green light to every other country in the world to test, to develop, to modernize nuclear weapons.

I think it's clear what we ought to do, but it's also clear that we ought not to rush this vote until there has been an appropriate process in the Senate.

So those are the major foreign policy issues I wanted to mention. The other thing I wanted to say is, I think Canada and the United States will be working very closely to try to reinvigorate the movement to expanded trade around the world. If we're going to really see the rest of the world's economy pick up and enjoy the kind of prosperity we have enjoyed in the last few years, we've got to make the most of this WTO ministerial. We've got to make the most of Canada's hosting the Free Trade Area of the Americas ministerial. And I think that's important.

Now, as to our bilateral relations, I wanted to mention one thing that we talked about in our meeting. We have agreed to have a more intensive dialog on border issues, through a new forum we creatively called the Canada-United States Partnership, or CUSP. This will enable us to have local businesses, local communities, talk about managing border issues, and figure out how we can resolve some of the hassles people have with the vast volume of goods that go back and forth across the border and the vast number of people. So, I thank you.

And you've already said why you invited me to the federalism conference. And I can tell you, I was a Governor for 12 years, and no matter how hard you try, you will never solve all the problems of federalism. So the best thing you can do is to paraphrase Winston Churchill and say it is the worst form of government, except for all the others.

Thank you very much.

Prime Minister Chretien. Thank you, sir. Now, we'll take questions.

Sir?

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Q. Mr. President, the Senate majority leader has stated that he would consider taking the test ban treaty off the table, withdrawing it from consideration under the caveat that it would not be reintroduced in the 106th Congress. Would you, sir, in order to preserve this treaty, be willing to give up ownership of it to the next Congress and the next administration?

President Clinton. First of all, I don't own it. And insofar as I do, we always will, since we negotiated it and the United States was the first to sign it. But it isn't mine. It belongs to the world. And I think the whole nature of your question shows what's wrong with the way the Senate has treated this.

They've treated this like a political document. They've treated this whole issue like a political issue. They went out and got people committed to vote against the treaty before they knew the first thing about it. And what I have said is—I don't understand what he's worried about. This thing could never have come up in the first place if he hadn't agreed to it. And I wouldn't bring it up unless I thought we could ratify it, because I won't treat it politically.

So this whole thing is about politics. It's about: Burn us in 1999 because we're against the treaty that 80 percent of the American people support, but please don't burn us

again in 2000. It's political. This treaty is not going to come up until we think we can pass it, and it won't come up until they treat it seriously.

Every serious American treaty, for example, has the legislative language attached as safeguards, just like we did in the chemical weapons treaty, so that everyone understands exactly what it means. In this treaty they actually went out of their way to try to keep safeguards from being attached to it so that they could have the maximum number of votes against it.

So I will give you a nonpolitical answer. I will say again, they should put if off, and then they should agree to a legitimate process where Republican and Democratic Senators think about the national interest. They have total control over when it comes up, not me. If it had been up to me we'd have started on this 2 years ago. We'd have had 6 months of hearings, 2 weeks of debate, lots of negotiations, and this whole thing would have been out of the way a year and a half ago.

It was not out of the way because that's the decision they made not to bring it up. They control when it comes up. So you're asking the wrong person whether it would come up next year. You should turn around and ask Senator Lott whether it would come up next year.

What I want to do—I don't care when it comes up, except when it comes up, I want it to come up as soon as we can, pass it, with a legitimate process. As messy as this has been, this has illustrated to the American people, beyond any question, that this whole deal has been about politics so far.

Now, there are some people who are honestly against this treaty. But we haven't been able to hear from them for 2 years, and we haven't been able to answer them, and we haven't been able to work on it. So I think it's been a very healthy thing to bring it up. But now we ought to do what's right for America, take it out of politics. This is not going to be a huge issue next year in the election, one way or the other. We should deal with this on the merits. They should agree to a process, and they control when it comes up.

Prime Minister Chretien. And I would like to add that we all have an interest in that. And all your allies to Americans will want this process to be terminated as quickly as possible, because there's a lot of other nations that have to live with the consequences of what the American Congress will do. And peace in the world is extremely important for our neighbors, too.

Canadian Defense Industries Licenses

Q. Prime Minister, did you discuss the concerns that Canada's defense industries have had with having to get licenses? And did you get any answer from the President?

Prime Minister Chretien. Yes, we discussed and we have found an agreement. And the agreement will be in details made public by Madam Albright and Mr. Axworthy.

Q. Was it important to get an agreement? Why?

Prime Minister Chretien. But, yes. It's always important when you have a problem to find a solution. And we found a solution. That's all. [*Laughter*]

Next. Next.

U.S. Documents on Augusto Pinochet

Q. Mr. President, today a London magistrate ruled that former Chilean dictator Pinochet be extradited for trial in Spain. The CIA has been accused of withholding documents that are said to show that the United States encouraged the coup which installed Pinochet in power and that the CIA maintained close ties to Pinochet's repressive security forces. Will you order that the release of those documents be sped up?

President Clinton. Well, I believe we've released some documents and my understanding—before I came out here, I was told that we're about to release some more. So I think we ought to just keep releasing documents until we—I think you're entitled to know what happened back then and how it happened.

And obviously, the Governments of Spain and the United Kingdom are following their own legal systems. I would point out, in defense of the people of Chile, is that they actually succeeded in moving away from the

Pinochet dictatorship and solving the problem they had in a way that allowed them to make a transition to parliamentary democracy. And I think even the people that spent their whole lives opposed to Pinochet, they have some—they're trying to figure out, now, what the impact on their democracy will be of all these actions.

But the United States has supported the legal process, and we continue to do so. And we support releasing the documents in an appropriate fashion. And we support the democracy which now exists in Chile.

Paul?

Prime Minister Chretien. Okay, *en Français.*

President Clinton. I've got to take a couple of the Americans—go ahead. France, yes, go ahead.

Q. Monsieur Clinton——

Prime Minister Chretien. Oh, the question is for Clinton. [*Laughter*]

President's Meeting With Premier Lucien Bouchard of Quebec

Q. Mr. Clinton, I want to know if your meeting with Mr. Bouchard today is an indication of any change in U.S. policy towards Quebec sovereignty? And secondly, if Mr. Chretien asked you anything about that meeting today?

President Clinton. No, and, no. That's the short answer.

Prime Minister Chretien. Thank you. Next. [*Laughter*]

President Clinton. The short answer, no and no. I did meet with him when he was in opposition about 4 years ago. He is the Premier of the Province. We're going there. He's the host. It's a courtesy, and I think I should do it. But there has been no change in our policy, whatsoever.

Prime Minister Chretien. American.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Q. First of all, Mr. President, are you going to meet Senator Helms' demand that you actually submit what you announced here today in writing? How badly has this hurt the United States——

President Clinton. I'm sorry, what——

Q. Senator Helms' demand that you submit it in writing to him.

President Clinton. Submit what?

Q. The CTBT—I'm sorry—the CTBT, the withdrawal of it in writing. He's asked for that. How badly has that hurt U.S. leadership role in arms control? And what's the message from India where the world's largest democracy just overwhelmingly reelected the Government that you criticized heavily for conducting nuclear tests?

President Clinton. Well, I think, first of all, if you look at India, you have to see the people voted for that Government for all kinds of reasons. And what I believe is—look, France conducted a nuclear test before they signed the treaty. What I believe is that the United States does not sign the treaty and show a little leadership here, why should the Pakistanis and the Indians do it?

Ever since the end of World War II and beginning with the election of Dwight Eisenhower, we have had a bipartisan commitment to leading the world away from proliferation. It has never been called into question until the present day. Never.

Now, we had to work for a very long time to get the Chemical Weapons Convention passed, which is very important. But Senator Helms and the others followed a legitimate process. I never had a doubt that the objections that they raised and the safeguards they wanted were absolutely heartfelt and serious. This treaty was never treated seriously. They took 2 years, had no time for hearings, said, "I'll give you 8 days," and later we discovered—after they said that, that that was offered only after they had 43 commitments on a party-line vote to vote against the treaty from people who hadn't heard a hearing and hadn't even thought about it, most of them.

So they want me to give them a letter to cover the political decision they have made that does severe damage to the interest of the United States and the interest of nonproliferation in the world? I don't think so. That's not what this is about. They have to take responsibility for whether they want to reverse 50 years of American leadership in nonproliferation that the Republicans have been just as involved in as the Democrats, to their everlasting credit.

Now, they have to make that decision. I cannot bring this treaty up again unless they

want to. I have asked them to put it off because we don't have the votes. I have talked to enough Republicans to know that some of them have honest, genuine reservations about this treaty, and they ought to have the opportunity to have them resolved, instead of being told that they owe it to their party to vote against the treaty and that the leadership of their party will do everything they can to keep us from writing safeguards into the treaty which answer their reservations, which is what we do on every other thing.

So I don't want to get into making this political. But they shouldn't tie the Senate up or themselves up in knots thinking that some letter from me will somehow obscure from the American people next year the reality that they have run the risk of putting America on the wrong side of the proliferation issue for the first time in 50 years. And they want to do it, and then they don't want to get up and defend it before the American people in an election year. That's what this whole thing is about. That is the wrong thing to do.

We don't have the votes. I'm not going to try to bring it up without the votes. Let them take it down but also agree on a legitimate process to take this out of politics. I will not criticize them as long as they are genuinely working through the issues, the way we did in the chemical weapons treaty.

They're entitled to advise and consent. They're entitled to take all the time they want. But nobody hit a lick at this for 2 years. And then they tried to get it up and down on grounds that were other than substantive, and that's wrong. And it's bad for America. It has nothing to do with me and my administration. I wouldn't care who got the thing ratified, as long as we did it in the right way.

Canada in the New Millennium

Q. On your throne speech next week, sir—on your throne speech next week, do you see it as charting some kind of grand new course for the millennium? Or is it just more of the same? [*Laughter*]

Prime Minister Chretien. Yes, it will be—if Canada is considered as the best country in the world. [*Laughter*]

President Clinton. Are you sure he's not one of ours? [*Laughter*]

Prime Minister Chretien. You know, they're complaining because I keep telling them that Canada's been considered, Mr. President, as the best country in the world to live in. I'm sorry to tell you to that. [*Laughter*] And I want to carry on in the 21st century with the same thing, and they say I have no vision. Imagine if I had a vision. [*Laughter*] So you will see.

Q. Mr. Chretien? Mr. Chretien?

President Clinton. Go ahead. [*Laughter*] I'm sorry. That was great.

Oil Prices

Q. You've been asked to sell oil from the U.S. Strategic Petroleum Reserve to fight rising heating oil prices as the winter comes. Do you think this is a good idea, and do you agree with Senator Schumer that OPEC has been engaged in price gouging, to raise the prices?

President Clinton. I think we should look at the reserve and the question of whether, if we released some oil from it for sales, we could moderate the price some.

I think that the States in the Northeast, as you know, are unusually dependent upon home heating oil and, therefore, are the most sensitive to oil prices. But it's also true that the price of oil was historically low for a good long time. And it's made a modest rebound, now.

I'm grateful that it hasn't put any inflation in our economy and so far we can manage it. But we have to be sensitive to the people who are disproportionately affected by it. And I have not reached a decision yet, because I haven't been given a recommendation yet, about whether we could have any appreciable impact on the Americans that are most disproportionately affected.

One of the reasons we always fight hard for the LIHEAP program, apart from what the summertime can do to people all over America, is that we know these people in the Northeast have a problem that no other Americans have, with the impact of the oil prices. It hits them much, much harder. So we're looking at it.

Prime Minister Chretien. Thank you.

Madam?

Quebec

Q. This morning you talked about rule of law, respect for rule of law being one of the fundamental principles Canada and the U.S. share. I am wondering, in that context, if the President could tell us what he thinks of Mr. Bouchard saying that Quebec could secede without regard to the Canadian Constitution, or the Supreme Court ruling last year, which said they must have a clear majority vote, yes, and a clear question. Would the U.S. ever recognize a sovereign Quebec under those circumstances?

Prime Minister Chretien. I think that it's for me to reply. I think that the rule of law will apply to Canada. We have a judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, which said very clearly that the question has to be clear and the majority has to be clear. And if there is a clear will expressed, that only after that, that negotiations could start.

So the rule of law will be applied. The question will have to be clear, and the majority will have to be clear. And I know that if they have a clear question, the President of the United States will never have to make a decision on that.

Natural Disasters

Q. Excuse me. I would like to say something. You've had a lot of disasters lately, and so has the world. And I'm with Christian News, and I would like to ask you, have you thought that possibly this is a message from above that there is moral decay, that there is abortion, that there is violence? I was wondering if you had given it some thought.

President Clinton. Actually, I have. You know, we—particularly because of all the millennial predictions. But I think the fact is that some of these natural disasters are part of predictable weather patterns, and the others have been predicted for more than a decade now by people who tell us that the climate is warming up. And I think that the real moral message here is that as we all get richer and use more of the resources God has given us, we're being called upon to take greater care of them. And I think that we have to deal seriously with the impact of the changing climate.

I was just in New Zealand at the jumping-off place for 70 percent of our operations in Antarctica, the South Pole, talking about the thinning of the polar ice cap there and the consequences it could bring to the whole world.

So I believe that insofar as these natural disasters are greater in intensity or number than previous ones, the primary warning we're getting from on high is that we have to keep—to use the phrase of a person I know reasonably well—we have to keep Earth in the balance. We have to respond to this in an appropriate way.

Yes.

Prime Minister Chretien Okay. And that will be the last one.

President Clinton. Go ahead.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Q. Sir, you talked about the Republicans playing politics with this arms ban treaty or weapons testing ban treaty. Are you talking about normal partisan politics, just Republicans versus Democrats? Are you talking about the kind of politics where some Republicans—maybe not a lot of them, but some will say, "I'm sorry, Bill Clinton is for it. I feel so viscerally that I despise Bill Clinton, I'm not going to go along with something that he wants that much, and I'm not going to give him a victory during his administration on something this important"?

President Clinton. I don't think that's what's going on. I mean, it might be, but I don't think so. That sounds like Wile E. Coyote and the Roadrunner, you know? [*Laughter*] But I don't think that's what's going on.

I think you have the following things. I think you have—I will say again—you have some Republicans who have thought about this and listened to people who aren't for it and really believe it's not the right thing to do. I hate it when we have fights. We're always questioning other people's motives. There are people who genuinely aren't for this. I think they're dead wrong, and I think it would be a disaster if their view prevailed, but I believe that's what they think.

Now, in addition to that, however, this process—the Democrats were frustrated because for 2 years—that's why I don't think the second part of your thing is right—for 2 years they've been trying to bring this treaty

up for a hearing, during which time we did ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention. And they could never even get hearings. So there was something about this thing that they didn't want to give hearings on.

So then the Democrats agreed to what they knew was a truncated hearing schedule—almost no hearings—and debate schedule, only to find that basically a sufficient number of votes in the Republican caucus had been locked down for reasons of party loyalty, whatever their motives were, from people who couldn't possibly know enough about the treaty right now to know they were against it on the merits. Now, maybe it's they don't want some alleged victory to come to the administration during the pendency of the political season. Maybe that's it, maybe not. My point is, I don't care about that. I don't care who gets credit for it. If they adopted it, I'd be glad to say it was Trent Lott's triumph. It's six and one-half dozen of the other to me. What I want to do is to leave this country with a framework—my country—with a framework for dealing with the major security problems of the 21st century.

I believe that there will still be rogue states that want nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. I, furthermore, believe that there will be enemies of all nation states—terrorist groups, organized criminals, drug runners—who will be increasingly likely to have access to miniaturized, but powerful weapons of mass destruction. And what I would like to leave office doing is not getting credit for anything—I don't give a rip who gets the credit for it. What I want is the Chemical Weapons Convention to be enforced, the Biological Weapons Convention to have teeth added to it so it actually means something, and this Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to be in place so at least we have a shot to reduce the number of nuclear states and the sophistication of their weapons and their ability to use them. That's the whole deal with me.

Because I think that our successors are going to have a whole lot of headaches from all these groups, and we need to minimize risk because as societies grow more open they'll be more vulnerable to being terrorized by people who have access to this. That's the whole deal with me. I don't care who gets credit for it; I just want there to be a framework for dealing with it.

So if they take more than a year to deal with this, if there is a legitimate process of working through, that's okay with me. If there is an emergency in the world where the rest of the world—it looks like we're going to have 10 other people try to become nuclear powers, and they've had 2 months of hearings or 3 months of hearings, and I think there's some reason we ought to vote—that goes back to your question—I don't want to say on the front end, "Yes, I'll play the same political game, and no matter what, we won't vote next year, no matter what other developments we see on the Indian subcontinent or in other places."

But this thing can't come up for a vote if they don't bring it up. And I'm not going to willfully try to get it up if I think it's going to get beat. That's the only thing I want to—I'm sorry to bore our Canadian friends with a discourse to American politics. And the other thing, the United States cannot afford to relinquish the leadership of the world in the cause of nonproliferation.

So if they want to strengthen the treaty, there are all kinds of vehicles through which we can do it. We do it on every other treaty. And if they want to take months, if they want to take a year—whatever they need to take—just play this straight. I'm not going to be out there—there's no downside for them to playing it straight.

But I will not say in advance, no matter what—no matter what happens in the world, no matter what unforeseeable development there is, no matter what other countries are about to do—no matter what, I would not ask you to deal with this next year, because on the merits there might be a reason. If it's just politics, we won't, because I'm not going to bring it up if we can't win.

Prime Minister Chretien. Perhaps, Mr. President, I would like to add that when we were at the summit in Birmingham, and it was at the moment that India was about to do the experiment and Pakistan was to follow, we were all extremely preoccupied about it. And it is a problem that concerns the world. And it's not only the United

States; everybody around the globe has a stake into that.

And for me, I cannot agree more than the President that the leadership of the United States for the allies is extremely important. And keep up the good fight.

And unfortunately, we have to go. *Merci beaucoup*. Thank you.

President Clinton. Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 181st news conference began at 12:05 p.m. in the Parliament Building. In his remarks, he referred to United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan and Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy of Canada. The President also referred to LIHEAP, the Low Income Housing Energy Assistance Program. A portion of this news conference could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Statement on an Inappropriate Metaphor Used in Discussing the Irish Peace Process

October 8, 1999

Earlier today, in a discussion of the Irish peace process, I used a metaphor that was inappropriate. I want to express my regret for any offense my remark caused.

Proclamation 7236—Leif Erikson Day, 1999

October 8, 1999

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

In preparing for the new millennium, Americans have become increasingly aware of the richness of our Nation's history and heritage and of the generations of men and women whose contributions have brought us safely to this moment in our American journey.

One of those remarkable individuals was Leif Erikson, who led a small, intrepid band on a voyage of discovery across the North Atlantic from Greenland, arriving on the coast of North America almost a thousand years ago. The courage, resourcefulness, and fortitude of Leif Erikson and the other Viking seafarers foreshadowed the strength and character of the many Nordic pioneers who would make their own voyage to America centuries later. Building new lives through hard work, they also helped build our Nation and sustain our fundamental values of freedom, justice, and democracy.

The millions of Nordic Americans who have contributed so much to our peace and prosperity through the decades have also strengthened the bonds of friendship between the United States and the people Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden, and Norway. With a shared past and common ideals, we have worked in partnership to promote democracy and opportunity around the world. Through our Northern European Initiative, the Nordic countries and the United States continue to promote our common values in the region and to facilitate Baltic and Russian integration into Western institutions.

The next millennium will hold great challenge and great promise for our Nation and for the people of the Nordic countries. We have only to look back on the achievements of Leif Erikson to rekindle our spirit of adventure and to inspire us as we embark on our own exploration of the uncharted territory of the future.

In honor of Leif Erikson, son of Iceland, grandson of Norway, the Congress, by joint resolution approved on September 2, 1964 (Public Law 88–566), has authorized and requested the President to proclaim October 9 of each year as "Leif Erikson Day."

Now Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 9, 1999, as Leif Erikson Day. I encourage the people of the United States to observe this occasion with appropriate ceremonies and activities commemorating our rich Nordic American heritage.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:56 a.m., October 12, 1999]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 13.

Proclamation 7237—National School Lunch Week, 1999

October 8, 1999

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

For more than 50 years, the National School Lunch Program has been at the forefront of our Nation's effort to promote the health and well-being of our children. Created to ensure that all children in our Nation receive the nourishment they need to develop into healthy and productive adults, the program provides nutritious lunches to more than 26 million children each day in 95,000 schools and residential child care institutions across the country. For many children, this free or reduced-price meal is often the most nutritious meal of their day.

Equally important, the National School Lunch Program provides our children with the fuel they need to remain alert and attentive in the classroom. Common sense tells us—and scientific research confirms—that a hungry child cannot focus on learning and that a child who does not eat properly is more likely to be sick and absent from school. Day in and day out, school lunches give our children the energy to learn today, while helping them prepare for the challenges of the future.

An array of nutrition programs now supplements the National School Lunch Program. Whether providing schoolchildren with a good breakfast or a healthy afternoon snack, the School Breakfast Program, the Summer School Food Service Program, the Special Milk Program, and the Child and Adult Care Food Program help ensure that our children eat nutritious and healthy meals throughout the day. As we observe this special week, let us reaffirm the belief of President Harry Truman, founder of the school lunch program, that "Nothing is more important in our national life than the welfare of our children, and proper nourishment comes first in attaining this welfare."

In recognition of the contributions of the National School Lunch Program to the health, education, and well-being of our Nation's children, the Congress, by joint resolution of October 9, 1962 (Public Law 87–780), has designated the week beginning on the second Sunday in October of each year as "National School Lunch Week" and has requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this week.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 10 through October 16, 1999, as National School Lunch Week. I call upon all Americans to recognize all those individuals whose efforts contribute so much to the success of our national child nutrition programs, whether at the Federal, State, or local level.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 13, 1999]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 14.

Proclamation 7238—National Children's Day, 1999

October 8, 1999

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

The children of America are our most precious gift and our greatest responsibility. Their well-being is one of the greatest measures of our success as a society, and our ability to provide them with a loving, safe, and supportive environment will help determine the character of our Nation.

We can be proud of the progress we have made in creating such environments. To

strengthen families and homes, we have provided tax relief to working families, raised the minimum wage, and enacted the Family and Medical Leave Act so that parents can take time off to be with a sick child or new baby without putting their jobs at risk. To give more children a healthy start in life, we have extended health care coverage to millions of previously uninsured children. To help America's youth reach their full potential, my Administration has urged the Congress to pass legislation to provide our students with a first-rate education by ensuring that they are educated by well-prepared teachers, in smaller classes, in modern and safe buildings, and with the latest in information technology.

On National Children's Day, however, we must also reflect soberly on how far we still have to go to make our communities safe and nurturing places for our children. One of our greatest challenges is to provide health coverage for the almost 11 million American children who are still uninsured. Many of these children are eligible for Medicaid or qualify for coverage under the Children's Health Insurance Programs that are now operating in every State across our Nation. Educators, policymakers, health care professionals, and business, community, and media leaders have a vital role to play in raising parents' awareness of their children's eligibility for this important coverage and making sure that these children are enrolled.

America must also confront the recent senseless acts of violence that have taken the lives and the innocence of so many young people. Places where they once felt safe—schools and churches and day care facilities—have been shaken by violence. Addressing this assault on our society's values and our children's future is a top priority of my Administration. We must work together—parents, students, educators, public officials, and religious, community, and industry leaders—to instill in our youth a sense of compassion, tolerance, and self-respect, so that they may find their way in a troubled world. We must also help them develop the strength to express their own anger and alienation with words, not weapons.

One of the most powerful tools we have in this endeavor is youth mentoring. A recent Department of Justice study showed that mentoring programs help young people resist violence and substance abuse, perform better academically, and interact more positively with their families and with other youth. Recognizing the value of mentoring programs, particularly to the well-being of millions of at-risk youth, my Administration announced earlier this year several public and private initiatives to encourage mentoring, and we set aside $14 million in grants for the Justice Department's Juvenile Mentoring Program.

Children bring so much hope, joy, and love to our lives; in return, we owe them our time, our attention, the power of our example, and the comfort of our concern. It is a fair trade, and one that enriches the lives of 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 October 10, 1999, as National Children's Day. I urge all Americans to express their love and appreciation for the children of our Nation on this day and on every day throughout the year. I invite Federal officials, local governments, communities, and all American families to join in observing this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities. I also urge all Americans to reflect upon the importance of children to our families, the importance of strong families to our children, and the importance of both to America.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 13, 1999]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 14.

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.

October 2

In the afternoon, the President traveled from Palo Alto, CA, to Beverly Hills, CA, and in the evening, he traveled to Brentwood, CA.

October 3

In the morning, the President traveled to Beverly Hills, CA, and in the evening, he returned to Washington, DC, arriving the following morning.

October 4

The President announced his intention to nominate Alphonso Maldon, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Management Policy.

The President announced his intention to nominate Cornelius P. O'Leary to be a member of the National Security Education Board.

The President announced his intention to nominate John K. Veroneau to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs.

The President announced his intention to nominate Roy E. Barnes to be a member of the National Drought Policy Commission.

October 5

The White House announced that the President met with Senate Finance Committee Chairman William V. Roth, Jr., and ranking Democratic Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan in the Oval Office to discuss Medicare reform.

October 6

The President announced his intention to nominate Donald Stuart Hays to be U.S. Representative to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, with the rank of Ambassador.

October 7

In the morning, the President traveled to New York City, and in the evening, he traveled to Ottawa, Canada.

The President announced his intention to appoint Jeanne P. Nathan to the President's Advisory Committee on the Arts of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

October 8

In the afternoon, the President traveled to Mont-Tremblant, Canada, where he addressed the Forum of Federations Conference in the Mali Ballroom at the Chateau Mont-Tremblant. Later, the President met with Premier Lucien Bouchard of Quebec.

The President announced his intention to nominate Alan P. Larson to be Under Secretary for Economic, Business, and Agricultural Affairs at the Department of State.

The President announced his intention to nominate Carol Moseley-Braun to be U.S. Ambassador to New Zealand.

The President announced his intention to nominate Amy L. Comstock to be Director of the Office of Government Ethics.

The President announced his intention to appoint Marc H. Morial as a member of the Twenty-First Century Workforce Commission.

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 October 4

Alphonso Maldon, Jr.,
of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Frederick F. Y. Pang, resigned.

Bill Richardson,
of New Mexico, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the Forty-third Session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

John K. Veroneau,
of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Sandra Kaplan Stuart.

Submitted October 6

Daniel J. French,
of New York, to be U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of New York for the term of 4 years, vice Thomas Joseph Maroney, term expired.

Donald Stuart Hays,
of Virginia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, with the rank of Ambassador.

Cornelius P. O'Leary,
of Connecticut, to be a member of the National Security Education Board for a term of 4 years, vice Roger Hilsman, term expired.

Submitted October 8

Amy L. Comstock,
of Maryland, to be Director of the Office of Government Ethics for a term of 5 years, vice Stephen D. Potts.

Alan Phillip Larson,
of Iowa, to be Under Secretary of State (Economic, Business, and Agricultural Affairs), vice Stuart E. Eizenstat.

Carol Moseley-Braun,
of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

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 October 4

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Joe Lockhart

Released October 5

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Joe Lockhart

Transcript of a press briefing by Under Secretary of State for Arms Control John Holum, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Strategy and Requirements Ted Warner, Under Secretary of Energy Ernie Moniz, and Former NSC Senior Director for Defense and Arms Control Policy Bob Bell on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Statement by the Press Secretary: President Clinton Meets With Senate Finance Committee Chairman Roth and Ranking Member Moynihan To Discuss Medicare Reform

Fact sheet: National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000

Released October 6

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Joe Lockhart

Announcement of nomination for U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of New York

Released October 7

Announcement: Official Delegation to Canada

Announcement: President Clinton's Special Envoy for the Americas To Attend Hispanic Conference in Chicago

Released October 8

Statement by the Press Secretary on the release by the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the National Archives and Records Administration of newly declassified and other documents related to events in Chile from 1968–1978

Acts Approved by the President

Approved October 5

H.R. 2981 / Public Law 106–64
To extend energy conservation programs under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act through March 31, 2000

S. 1059 / Public Law 106–65
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000

Approved October 6

S. 293 / Public Law 106–66
To direct the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to convey certain lands in San Juan County, New Mexico, to San Juan College

S. 944 / Public Law 106–67
To amend Public Law 105–188 to provide for the mineral leasing of certain Indian lands in Oklahoma

S. 1072 / Public Law 106–68
To make certain technical and other corrections relating to the Centennial of Flight Commemoration Act (36 U.S.C. 143 note; 112 Stat. 3486 *et seq.*)