Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, December 11, 2000
Volume 36—Number 49
Pages 2961–3039

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

Eleanor Roosevelt Award for Human Rights and the Presidential Medal of Freedom—2984
Federal Aviation Administration's Air Traffic Organization, establishment—3019
Kennedy Center Honors reception—2964
Nebraska, University of Nebraska at Kearney—3028
Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve—2967
Radio address—2964
Team Harmony Rally VII, satellite remarks and a question-and-answer session—2979

Communications to Congress

Generalized System of Preferences, letter on modifications to the list of beneficiary developing countries—2963

Executive Orders

Air Traffic Performance-Based Organization—3021
National Commission on the Use of Offsets in Defense Trade and President's Council on the Use of Offsets in Commercial Trade—2977
Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve—2969
Providing Compensation to America's Nuclear Weapons Workers—3025

Interviews With the News Media

Interviews with Jann Wenner of Rolling Stone Magazine—2989, 3001

Proclamations

National Drunk and Drugged Driving Prevention Month—2976
National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day—2988
To Implement Title V of the Trade and Development Act of 2000 and To Modify the Generalized System of Preferences—2961

Statements by the President

Child care funding, need for congressional action—2988
Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Act of 2000, action to implement—3024
Ethiopia-Eritrea final peace agreement—3023
Execution of Juan Raul Garza, decision to stay—3023
Interagency Task Force on Nonprofits and Government, report—2983
Pathways to College Network—2987

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—3039
Checklist of White House press releases—3038
Digest of other White House announcements—3038
Nominations submitted to the Senate—3038

Editor's Note: The President was in Omaha, NE, on December 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.*

Proclamation 7383—To Implement Title V of the Trade and Development Act of 2000 and to Modify the Generalized System of Preferences

December 1, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

1. Title V of the Trade and Development Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–200) (the "Act") modifies the tariff treatment of certain imported wool articles.

2. Section 501(a)(1) of the Act amends the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) to create a new heading, 9902.51.11, for imports of certain worsted wool fabrics with average fiber diameters greater than 18.5 microns. Section 501(d) of the Act limits the quantity of imports under heading 9902.51.11, on an annual basis, to 2,500,000 square meter equivalents or such other quantity proclaimed by the President pursuant to section 504(b)(3) of the Act.

3. Section 501(b)(1) of the Act amends the HTS to create a new heading, 9902.51.12, for imports of certain worsted wool fabrics with average fiber diameters of 18.5 microns or less. Section 501(d) of the Act limits the quantity of imports under heading 9902.51.12, on an annual basis, to 1,500,000 square meter equivalents or such other quantity proclaimed by the President pursuant to section 504(b)(3) of the Act.

4. Section 501(b)(2) of the Act authorizes the President to proclaim a reduction in the rate of duty applicable to imports of worsted wool fabrics classified under heading 9902.51.12 of the HTS that is necessary to equalize such rate of duty with the most favored nation rate of duty applicable to imports of such worsted wool fabrics into Canada.

5. Section 501(e) of the Act provides that in implementing the limitation on the quantity of imports of worsted wool fabrics under headings 9902.51.11 and 9902.51.12 of the HTS, the President, consistent with U.S. international obligations, shall take such action as he determines appropriate to ensure that such fabrics are fairly allocated to persons who cut and sew men's and boys' worsted wool suits and suit-type jackets and trousers in the United States and who apply for an allocation based on the amount of such suits cut and sewn during the prior calendar year.

6. Section 503(a) of the Act requires the President to proclaim 8-digit tariff categories for certain wool yarn and wool fabrics with an average fiber diameter of 18.5 microns or less, and men's or boys' suits, suit-type jackets, and trousers of worsted wool fabric, made of wool yarn with an average diameter of 18.5 microns or less. Section 503(b) of the Act authorizes the President to make conforming changes in the HTS to take into account the new tariff categories proclaimed under section 503(a).

7. Section 504(a) of the Act requires the President to monitor market conditions in the United States, including domestic demand, domestic supply, and increases in domestic production, of worsted wool fabrics and their components in the market for (i) men's or boys' worsted wool suits, suit-type jackets, and trousers, (ii) worsted wool fabrics and yarn used in the manufacture of such apparel articles, and (iii) wool used in the production of such fabrics and yarn.

8. Section 504(b)(1) requires the President, on an annual basis, to consider requests from domestic manufacturers of apparel products made of worsted wool fabrics described in section 504(a) to modify the limitation on the quantity of imports of worsted wool fabrics under headings 9902.51.11 and 9902.51.12 of the HTS.

9. Section 504(b)(3) of the Act authorizes the President, after taking into account the market conditions set forth in section 504(b)(2) of the Act, to modify the limitation on the quantity of imports of worsted wool fabrics under headings 9902.51.11 and 9902.51.12 of the HTS, provided that any such modification shall not exceed 1,000,000 square meter equivalents annually for each heading, and to proclaim any such modifications.

10. Section 504(c) requires the President to issue regulations to implement the provisions of section 504.

11. I have determined that it is appropriate to authorize the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) to perform certain functions specified in sections 501(e) and 504(b) of the Act.

12. I have determined that it is appropriate to authorize the United States Trade Representative (USTR) to perform certain functions specified in section 504(a) of the Act.

13. Sections 501 and 502 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the "1974 Act") (19 U.S.C. 2461 and 2462), authorize the President to designate countries as beneficiary developing countries and as least-developed beneficiary developing countries for purposes of the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP).

14. Pursuant to Executive Order 11888 of November 24, 1975, Western Samoa was designated as a beneficiary developing country for purposes of the GSP. I have determined that the designation of Western Samoa as a beneficiary developing country under the GSP should be modified so that the designation applies to Samoa. Furthermore, pursuant to section 502 of the 1974 Act, and having due regard for the eligibility criteria set forth therein, I have determined that it is appropriate to designate Samoa as a least-developed beneficiary developing country for purposes of the GSP.

15. Proclamation 6425 of April 29, 1992, suspended the application of duty-free treatment under the GSP for certain handloomed cotton fabrics imported from India. On September 14, 2000, the United States Government and the Government of India entered into a Memorandum of Understanding in which the United States agreed to restore GSP treatment for certain handloomed cotton fabrics. Pursuant to section 501 of the 1974 Act, I have determined that it is appropriate to restore GSP treatment for these articles to give effect to the Memorandum of Understanding.

16. Section 604 of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2483) authorizes the President to embody in the HTS the substance of the relevant provisions of that Act, and of other acts affecting import treatment, and actions thereunder, including the removal, modification, continuance, or imposition of any rate of duty or other import restriction.

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 section 301 of title 3, United States Code, title V of the Act, and sections 501, 502, and 604 of the 1974 Act, do proclaim that:

(1) In order to provide separate tariff treatment for the articles specified in section 503(a) of the Act, the HTS is modified as provided in section A of the Annex to this proclamation.

(2) In order to make conforming changes to take into account the new permanent tariff categories established in section A of the Annex to this proclamation, the HTS is further modified as provided in section B of the Annex to this proclamation.

(3) The Secretary is authorized to exercise the authority set forth in section 501(e) of the Act to allocate the quantity of imports of worsted wool fabrics under headings 9902.51.11 and 9902.51.12. Any determination by the Secretary under this paragraph shall be set forth in a notice or notices that the Secretary shall cause to be published in the *Federal Register*.

(4) The Secretary is authorized to monitor the most favored nation rate of duty applicable to imports into Canada of worsted wool fabrics of the kind classified under heading 9902.51.12 of the HTS and shall notify the President of any reduction, effective on or after May 18, 2000, in the Canadian most favored nation rate of duty on such imports. The Secretary shall cause to be published in the *Federal Register* a notice describing any such reduction.

(5) The Secretary is authorized to exercise the authority set forth in section 504(b)(1) of the Act to consider, on an annual basis, requests from domestic manufacturers of apparel products made of worsted wool fabrics described in section 504(a) to modify the limitation on the quantity of imports of worsted wool fabrics under headings 9902.51.11 and 9902.51.12 of the HTS.

(6) The Secretary is authorized to determine, under section 504(b)(3) of the Act, whether the limitation on the quantity of imports of worsted wool fabrics under headings 9902.51.11 and 9902.51.12 of the HTS should be modified and to recommend to the President that appropriate modifications be made.

(7) The Secretary is authorized to issue regulations to implement the provisions of sections 501 and 504(b) of the Act, the implementation of which have been delegated to the Secretary pursuant to paragraphs 3, 4, 5, and 6 of this proclamation.

(8) The USTR is authorized to exercise the authority set forth in section 504(a) of the Act to monitor market conditions in the United States for the worsted wool articles specified in that section.

(9) In order to reflect a change in the name of a designated beneficiary developing country for purposes of the GSP, general note 4(a) to the HTS is modified by striking "Western Samoa" and by inserting in alphabetical sequence in lieu thereof "Samoa" in the enumeration of independent beneficiary developing countries.

(10) Samoa is designated as a least-developed beneficiary developing country for purposes of the GSP and title V of the 1974 Act. In order to reflect such designation, general note 4(b)(i) to the HTS, enumerating those countries designated as least-developed beneficiary developing countries for purposes of the GSP, is modified by inserting in alphabetical sequence "Samoa."

(11) In order to provide that India is again treated as a beneficiary developing country with respect to certain certified handloomed cotton fabrics for purposes of the GSP program, the HTS is modified as provided in section C of the Annex to this proclamation.

(12) Any 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.

(13) This proclamation is effective on the date of signature of this proclamation, except that the designation of Samoa as a least-developed beneficiary developing country shall be effective with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that is 60 days from the date of publication of this proclamation in the *Federal Register*.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this first day of December, in the year of our Lord two thousand, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-fifth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., December 5, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation and the attached annexes were published in the *Federal Register* on December 6. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Modifications to the List of Beneficiary Developing Countries Under the Generalized System of Preferences

December 1, 2000

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

I hereby notify you of my intent to modify the list of beneficiary developing countries under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), which offers duty-free access to the U.S. market for eligible products imported from designated beneficiary developing countries. Specifically, I intend to change the designation of "Western Samoa" to "Samoa," to reflect this nation's current name, in the list of beneficiary developing countries and to designate Samoa as a least-developed beneficiary developing country under the GSP. I have carefully considered the criteria in sections 501 and 502 of the Trade Act of 1974 and have determined that it is appropriate to designate Samoa as such.

This notice is submitted in accordance with section 502(f) of the Trade Act of 1974.

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

The President's Radio Address

December 2, 2000

Good morning. Congress is on its way back to Washington after an extended break. It is very important that we get right back to business and fulfill our responsibility to give our children a world-class education.

Earlier this year I sent Congress a budget that would make vital investments in education, a budget that puts our children first by investing more in our schools and demanding more from them; by modernizing old schools, building new ones, reducing class sizes; by hiring more well-prepared teachers, expanding after-school programs, and turning around failing schools. That was way back in February. Ten months have passed since then; three seasons have turned; and Congress decided to break for the election without passing an education budget.

But this week Congress returns to session with still time to get the job done. Congress should pass the education budget as its first order of business. Fortunately, we're already standing on common ground. When Congress left town, we had already reached an historic agreement with members of both parties. A broad, bipartisan coalition has pledged to provide much-needed funding to reduce class size, to provide crucial repairs for crumbling schools, to improve teacher quality, to expand Head Start, after-school programs, Pell grants, and support for students with disabilities. I hope when Congress comes back, these commitments to our children will be kept.

Even in the final days of this session, Congress should remember those first, fundamental obligations. Now is not the time to walk away from the agreement we made, especially so close to the finish line.

A lot is at stake here—the condition of our schools, the quality of our teachers, most important, the education of our children. Today I'm releasing a report that shows exactly what's at stake for the children in all 50 states. If Congress fails to pass the bipartisan education budget, California, for example, stands to lose almost three-quarters of a billion dollars in additional funds. New York could lose more than $40 million for more after-school and summer school programs alone. Illinois could lose nearly $70 million in added support for students with disabilities.

With America facing the largest student enrollment in history and with an historic agreement so close to conclusion, there's no reason why we shouldn't work together across party lines to get this job done. If we do, we can complete this year's unfinished business and continue the work of preparing our Nation to meet the challenges of the years to come.

We can also meet our other pressing priorities, from the health of our families to the safety of our neighborhoods, and ensure that we continue to expand the circle of opportunity until it embraces Americans from every corner of our country and every walk of life.

The holiday season is the perfect time to reflect on the values that unite us. As families, there's nothing we hold more dear than our children. As a nation, there is nothing more important to our future than our children and their education. As every parent knows, a good education is a gift that keeps on giving for a lifetime. So let's join together, two parties but one country, to give our children the schools, the teachers, and the future they deserve.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House.

Remarks at the Kennedy Center Honors Reception

December 3, 2000

Thank you very much. Thank you, Senator. [*Laughter*] I'm trying to get used to that. I want to—[*laughter*]—look, I've got to take

every opportunity I can to practice here. [*Laughter*]

I want to welcome you all here, especially, of course, our honorees and other artists and former honorees; Members of Congress who are here—Senator and Mrs. Lott, welcome; we're glad to see you—and to all our other distinguished guests.

As Hillary said, it has been a profound honor for us and a great joy to do these Kennedy Center Honors for 8 years in a row now. We thank the people we honor tonight and their predecessors for lifting our spirits and broadening our horizons.

Thirty-eight years ago, President Kennedy wrote that "art means more than a resuscitation of the past. It means the free and unconfined search for new ways of expressing the experience of the present and the vision of the future." Each in their own way, tonight's honorees have brought to a venerable art form a spark of the new and unexpected. And each has left it more modern, more brilliant, and forever changed for the better. Now, let me present them.

Very few people visit the East Room, where we now are, and find themselves in danger of striking the 20-foot ceiling. [*Laughter*] But that is exactly what happened to Mikhail Baryshnikov when he arrived to rehearse for a White House performance in 1979. With a portable stage set up, even this stately ceiling was too low for his trademark soaring leaps. No ceiling or boundary, not even the Iron Curtain, has ever held him back for long.

His successful performance of that night was televised for millions of Americans as "Baryshnikov at the White House," another step towards cementing his reputation as the greatest male classical dancer of our time. With his daring leap to freedom in 1974, he also inspired millions with the idea of liberty, and he used his freedom to move beyond classical ballet to movies and to Broadway and, in 1976, to fulfill a lifelong dream by bounding onto the stage of American modern dance. And it has never been the same since.

From "Push Comes To Shove" to his pathbreaking White Oak Dance Project, Mikhail Baryshnikov has pushed the boundaries of a challenging art form even as he has broadened its audience. He continues to give brilliant performances at an age when most of us are, frankly, being told to get our exercise in private. [*Laughter*]

So tonight America says, thank you, Mikhail Baryshnikov, for the heights to which you have lifted the art of dance and the heights to which you have lifted all of us. Thank you.

No less an authority than John Lennon once said, "If you tried to give rock and roll another name, you might call it Chuck Berry." [*Laughter*] The Beatles, the Beach Boys, the Rolling Stones all copied him, but Chuck Berry was the original. He fused country and blues into a new sound that was distinctly American and utterly new. And 40 years later, the Chuck Berry sound still blazes across our stages and from our radios.

He is, quite simply, one of the 20th century's most influential musicians. His guitar riffs were some of rock's first, and they're still some of its greatest. His stage moves, especially the duckwalk, which he invented, are often imitated, sometimes intentionally—[*laughter*]—but never equalled. His fresh and vivid lyrics captured American life, whether you're rich or poor, young or not so young, and they suggested the rhythms of a new and better day for black and white Americans alike. NASA even sent Chuck Berry's music on a space probe searching for intelligent life in outer space. [*Laughter*] Well, now, if they're out there, they're duckwalking. [*Laughter*]

It was my great honor to invite Chuck to play at both my inaugurals and my 25th reunion at Georgetown University, which we held here on the White House grounds. I, too, have loved him for more than 40 years. So we say, thank you, Chuck Berry, for making us laugh, making us shout, making us dance, and making us happy together. Thank you.

These days you hear a lot of people saying we need to change the tenor here in Washington. [*Laughter*] They are not talking about Placido Domingo. [*Laughter*] We are truly blessed to have him as artistic director, as a conductor, and still performing as one of the greatest operatic tenors of all time.

It is almost now impossible to imagine opera without him. He has performed 118 roles, probably more than any other tenor

ever. He is still adding new ones. He has set new standards, and he has worked unceasingly to bring opera to a wider audience through movies, television, and live concerts, and of course, especially as one of the famed Three Tenors. Their concerts have brought operatic singing to an audience of one billion people across the globe. Think about it: one in six people has thrilled to the sound of this man's voice.

But he has always been more than a voice. As a young man, he prepared for later life in Washington as an amateur bullfighter. [*Laughter*] Now, instead of a cape, however, he waves the baton, which means that he is the only person in Washington who gets at least a finite group of people to do what he tells them to do. [*Laughter*]

As a visionary artistic director of opera here in Washington and in Los Angeles, a frequent performer around our Nation, he has truly sparked the rebirth of American opera. And he has shared his prodigious gifts wider, in support of disaster relief efforts from Armenia to Acapulco. Through his annual vocal competition he has championed young singers all over the world and has worked to bring opera to places it has never before been heard.

So we say thank you—thank you, Placido Domingo, for sharing with us your matchless artistry and for being a true citizen of the world.

For more than 35 years now, Clint Eastwood has been one of America's favorite movie stars. Of course, he's also an Oscar-winning director. He's actually done pretty well for a former elected official. [*Laughter*] I hope I am half as successful. [*Laughter*]

I think he didn't keep running for office because he realized once you get in politics, you can't do what he did in most of his movies to your adversaries—[*laughter*]—although you can wish to do it, from time to time. [*Laughter*]

His path to stardom began with bit parts in movies that starred a tarantula and a talking mule. His break came in the spaghetti western "A Fistful of Dollars," an Italian movie filmed in Spain, based on a classic Japanese film. [*Laughter*] But the rest is history for the Italians, the Spanish, the Japanese, and most of all, for the Americans.

"The Man With No Last Name" has truly become a household name. His characters have ranged the peaks and valleys of human experience, from urban vigilantes to mythical cowboys, from troubled artists to Secret Service agents. And while he keeps making top-grossing movies, Clint Eastwood also keeps taking risks, playing against type, making small, thoughtful films that no one else would, quietly building a second career as one of our best directors, composing songs for five of his movies, and turning his lifelong love of jazz into a movie about the legendary saxophonist Charlie Parker.

Like the strong, silent cowboy he so often played, Clint Eastwood has become a quiet force in American film and a star for the ages. We thank you, Clint Eastwood, for giving us a lot to cheer about and lately, a lot to think about. Thank you very much.

Earlier this decade, TV Guide gave Angela Lansbury a perfect 100 on its lovability index. [*Laughter*] Now, that's what we need more of in Washington. [*Laughter*] There's no mystery why. She's known and adored by tens of millions of viewers as Jessica Fletcher on "Murder She Wrote." But fans who have followed her remarkable career know her just as well as Broadway's greatest stage mother of them all, Gypsy Rose Lee. And everyone who loves movies about politics remembers her brilliant performances in "The Manchurian Candidate" and "State of the Union."

The United States was lucky to welcome Angela Lansbury to our shores as a child refugee from the Nazi bombing of London in 1940. Just 4 years later, she made her first movie and won her first Oscar nomination. She went on to earn two more and became an acclaimed actress in an impressive variety of roles.

Hollywood alone couldn't hold her. She conquered Broadway in "Mame" and went on to win four Tony Awards. Then she found television, and "Murder She Wrote," which began in 1984, continued for 12 successful seasons.

Over her career her acting has given us a window into the full range of human emotion and experience. Her inventiveness and courage have inspired her colleagues, and her commitment to charity, especially the fight against AIDS, should inspire us all.

Well, Angela, you earned your perfect score. And we thank you for a wonderful lifetime of gifts.

Well, there they are, ladies and gentlemen: Mikhail Baryshnikov, who soared out of the Soviet Union and into our hearts; Chuck Berry, who rock-and-rolled his way from segregated St. Louis into the American mainstream; Placido Domingo, who brought the songs from Spain and changed the tenor of America's music; Clint Eastwood, who rose out of Depression-era California to earn a place on the Hollywood Walk of Fame; and Angela Lansbury, who left her childhood home in England to become American royalty.

Each one has given us something unique and enriched us beyond measure. Together they bring us closer to President Kennedy's vision of art as a great unifying and humanizing experience. Their triumphs have lifted our Nation and left us a better and richer place.

Again let me say to all of you, this night and every night before it has been a profound honor for Hillary and me. You may find people who do this night better in the future; you will never find anybody who loves it as much.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Patricia Thompson Lott, wife of Senator Trent Lott.

Remarks on the Establishment of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve

December 4, 2000

Good morning, and thank you, President Fahey, for making us feel so welcome at National Geographic; Secretary Mineta; Under Secretary of NOAA Baker. To all the members of the Coral Reef Task Force and the Ocean Exploration Panel, I welcome you.

I want to say a special word of appreciation to Peter Benchley for the work that he has done for nearly a lifetime now and for the remarks he made. And I thank our two native Hawaiians who are here, Tammy Leilani Harp, who spoke before me, and our Hawaiian elder, who's affectionately known as Uncle Buzzy. Thank you very much for being here.

I want to thank the National Geographic for giving us a place to make this announcement and for all the years of helping people to understand the universe and this small planet. We are fortunate to live in an age of unprecedented discovery, most of it in the biological sciences. It seems that almost every day there is another unlocking of a secret of subatomic particles or the complexities of the human genome. But we're also discovering more and more evidence every day that our human activity is profoundly affecting and, in some cases overwhelming, the natural systems that surround and sustain us on our planet.

For 8 years now we have worked to act on this understanding to better protect our natural resources for future generations. We have created and expanded national parks, established 11 national monuments, saved the California redwoods, protected the Yellowstone National Park from gold mining. We're restoring the Florida Everglades and preserving vistas of the Grand Canyon, and we are setting aside over 40 million roadless acres in our national forests. All together, this amounts to more land protection in the 48 continental States than any administration since that of Teddy Roosevelt a century ago.

But we must recognize that, just as land is an important part of our legacy in the preservation of our ecosystem, so, too, is our water. We launched a nationwide effort to clean up polluted rivers, lakes, and streams. We created new marine sanctuaries, in Michigan, Massachusetts, Florida, Washington, and Hawaii. We also organized the first National Oceans Conference to develop a strategy to protect the seas. Today the Department of Commerce—and, Secretary Mineta, I thank you for your leadership on this—is releasing a comprehensive report, "Discovering Earth's Final Frontier." It charts a bold course for U.S. ocean exploration in the 21st century. And I want to thank Secretary Mineta, Dr. Marcia McNutt, and the other members of the Ocean Exploration Panel for their work.

We have a lot of work to do. Many, many important ecosystems are disappearing just

as we begin to grasp their unique significance, their role in regulating our climate, their potential for producing lifesaving medicines. A lot of people are most familiar with the destruction of the rain forests and worldwide efforts to save them. Today I want to focus on what we're doing with the people of Hawaii to save the rainforests of the sea, our coral reefs.

These remarkable living structures, built cell by cell over millions of years, are at once irreplaceable and valuable. Coral reefs are beautiful, but more than that, they're home to thousands of species of fish and wildlife found nowhere else on Earth. Worldwide reefs generate millions of dollars through fishing and tourism, putting food on our tables and sustaining coastal communities. Coral reefs also protect these same communities from the pounding waves of fierce storms. And like the rain forests, they're providing us new hope for medical breakthroughs.

Unfortunately, the world's reefs are in peril. Pollution, damage from dynamite fishing, coral poachers, unwise coastal development, and global warming already have killed over 25 percent of the world's reefs. In some areas, such as the Central Indian Ocean, 90 percent of the coral reefs have died, bleached as white as dead bone.

Now, this is not an isolated problem. Scientists at last month's International Coral Reef Symposium presented strong evidence that unless we take action now, half the world's coral reefs will disappear within 25 years. Recently, scientists have shown a strong correlation between global warming and the rising ocean temperatures that contribute to reef destruction.

Recognizing the urgency of this challenge, we remain committed to reaching an international agreement to implement the Kyoto Protocol and to cut the production of greenhouse gases. And despite the recent delays, I still believe that we will get a good agreement. The stakes are too high to let this imperative slip away.

We have reached the crossroads in the development of our natural world. How many times in our lives, each of us, have we dismissed something that went wrong, or that we did wrong, with the phrase, ''It's just a drop in the ocean''? Now we have solid proof that millions, even billions of these drops in the ocean are having a profound, lasting, and destructive impact on the oceans and the world around us. So we act now to hopefully save our seas and our reefs so that we do not lose their beauty, their bounty, and their protective qualities forever.

What can we do to turn the tide? What steps can we take? Well, at my direction, the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior have been working closely with the scientific, environmental, fishing, and native communities in Hawaii to determine what can be done to save the vast majority of our remaining coral reefs. At the same time, they solicited public comment and received over a thousand comments from concerned citizens. Ultimately, this unprecedented coalition has recommended a bold and visionary initiative. Today I am proud to protect America's greatest unspoiled reefs by creating the single largest nature preserve ever established in the United States, the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Coral Reef Reserve. [*Applause*] Thank you.

This pristine, largely uninhabited archipelago covers more area than Florida and Georgia combined. Integrated into our National Marine Sanctuary Program, the new reserve will encompass nearly 70 percent of our Nation's coral reefs. This area is a special place where the sea is a living rainbow. The only voices, those of half the world's last remaining monk seals and the cry of sea birds wheeling in the sky.

In creating this unique preserve, we're establishing the strongest level of protection for oceans ever enacted and setting a new global standard for reef and marine wildlife protection. Together, we will safeguard the most sensitive areas, permit sustainable fishing and eco-tourism and others, and enable native Hawaiians to honor their age-old traditions.

The islands and reefs we're protecting today have long played an important role in the history of the Pacific. Archaeologists tell us that more than a thousand years ago, local islanders drew sustenance from their brilliant turquoise waters. Centuries later, Charles Darwin marveled at the wildlife there during his historic voyage. And none of us can ever forget, for 4 bloody days in 1942, America's

bravest heroes drew a line in the sand there, winning the Battle of Midway and changing the course of World War II and history.

Today we renew our commitment to winning the battle to protect our global environment, preserving this natural heritage for a long time—I hope forever.

Let me say, it was nearly a century ago, ironically, when President Roosevelt recognized the same imperative and created the Hawaiian Islands National Wildlife Refuge. He knew then that our natural wonders, on land or sea, form an integral part of who we are as a people and that every generation of Americans must do its part to sustain and strengthen this legacy. Today we do just that, incorporating the refuge he created into a new, vast, and wonderful "Yellowstone of the Sea."

By any measure, creating this coral reserve is a big step forward, not just for marine conservation in the United States but for the health of oceans and reefs around the world.

For thousands of years, people have risked their lives to master the ocean. Now, suddenly, the ocean's life is at risk. We have the resources and responsibility to rescue the sea, to renew the very oceans that give us life, and thereby to renew ourselves. Today is an important step on that road.

But there is much, much more to be done in the years ahead. And I hope that no matter who becomes President—[*laughter*]—no matter what the partisan divide of Congress, that those of you who are here in this room will continue this work for the rest of your lives. It is profoundly important, and how our grandchildren live depends upon how well we do this work.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:20 a.m. in the Grosvenor Auditorium at the National Geographic Museum. In his remarks, he referred to John M. Fahey, Jr., president and chief executive officer, National Geographic Society; author Peter Benchley; Tammy Leilani Harp, member, Native and Indigenous Rights Advisory Panel to the Western Pacific Region Fishery Management Council; Louis (Uncle Buzzy) Agard, board member, Native Hawaiian Advisory Council; and Marcia K. McNutt, president and chief executive officer, Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute.

Executive Order 13178—Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve

December 4, 2000

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, (16 U.S.C. 1431 *et seq.*), and the National Marine Sanctuaries Amendments Act of 2000, Public Law 106–513, and in furtherance of the purposes of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (33 U.S.C. 1401 *et seq.*), Coastal Zone Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1451 *et seq.*), Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1362 *et seq.*), Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 *et seq.*), National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 *et seq.*), National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act (16 U.S.C. 668dd–ee), and other pertinent statutes, it is ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Preamble.* The world's coral reefs—the rain forests of the sea—are in serious decline. These important and sensitive areas of biodiversity warrant special protection. While United States waters contain approximately 3 percent of the world's coral reefs, approximately 70 percent of U.S. coral reefs are in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. The 3.5 million acres of coral reefs around the remote, mostly uninhabited Northwestern Hawaiian Islands are spectacular and almost undisturbed by humans. The approximately 1,200 mile stretch of coral islands, seamounts, banks, and shoals are unquestionably some of the healthiest and most extensive coral reefs in the United States. In their own right, the spectacular coral reefs and lands provide an amazing geological record of volcanic and erosive powers that have shaped this area. This vast area supports a dynamic reef ecosystem that supports more than 7,000 marine species, of which approximately half are unique to the Hawaiian Island chain. This incredibly diverse ecosystem is home to many species of coral, fish, birds, marine mammals, and other flora and fauna including the endangered Hawaiian monk

seal, the threatened green sea turtle, and the endangered leatherback and hawksbill sea turtles. In addition, this area has great cultural significance to Native Hawaiians as well as linkages to early Polynesian culture—making it additionally worthy of protection and understanding. This is truly a unique and special place, a coral reef ecosystem like no place on earth, and a source of pride, inspiration, and satisfaction for all Americans, especially the people of Hawaii. It is fully worthy of our best efforts to preserve a legacy of America's natural wonders for future generations. Due to the special significance of this area, I have determined that it is in the best interest of our Nation, and of future generations, to provide strong and lasting protection for the coral reef ecosystem of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands.

On May 26, 2000, I directed the Secretaries of Commerce and the Interior, working cooperatively with the State of Hawaii and consulting with the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council, to develop recommendations for a new, coordinated management regime to increase protection of the coral reef ecosystem of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands and provide for sustainable use of the area. Upon consideration of their recommendations and comments received during the public visioning process on this initiative, and based on the statutory authorities set forth above, I am issuing this Executive Order.

Sec. 2. *Purpose.* The purpose of this Executive Order is to ensure the comprehensive, strong, and lasting protection of the coral reef ecosystem and related marine resources and species (resources) of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands.

Sec. 3. *Establishment of Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve.* There is hereby established in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands a coral reef ecosystem reserve to be known as the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve (Reserve). The Reserve shall include submerged lands and waters of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, extending approximately 1,200 nautical miles (nm) long and 100nm wide. The Reserve shall be adjacent to and seaward of the seaward boundaries of the State of Hawaii and the Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuge, and shall overlay the Hawaiian Islands National Wildlife Refuge to the extent that it extends beyond the seaward boundaries of the State of Hawaii. The boundaries of the Reserve are described in section 6 of this order.

Sec. 4. *Management Principles.* The Secretary of Commerce, or his designee, (hereafter "Secretary") shall, subject to section 10(b) of this order, manage the Reserve in accordance with the following principles:

(a) The principal purpose of the Reserve is the long-term conservation and protection of the coral reef ecosystem and related marine resources and species of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands in their natural character;

(b) The Reserve shall be managed using available science and applying a precautionary approach with resource protection favored when there is a lack of information regarding any given activity, to the extent not contrary to law;

(c) Culturally significant, noncommercial subsistence, cultural, and religious uses by Native Hawaiians should be allowed within the Reserve, consistent with applicable law and the long-term conservation and protection of Reserve resources;

(d) The Reserve shall be managed using, when appropriate, geographical zoning and innovative management techniques to ensure that the Reserve resources are protected from degradation or harm;

(e) To the extent consistent with the primary purpose of the Reserve, the Reserve shall be managed to support, promote, and coordinate appropriate scientific research and assessment, and long-term monitoring of Reserve resources, and the impacts or threats thereto from human and other activities, to help better understand, protect, and conserve these resources and species for future generations;

(f) To the extent consistent with the primary purpose of the Reserve, the Reserve shall be managed to enhance public awareness, understanding, and appreciation of Reserve resources, and the impacts or threats thereto from human and other activities;

(g) The Reserve shall be managed to further restoration and remediation of degraded or injured Reserve resources; and

(h) The Reserve shall be managed to facilitate coordinated management among Federal and State agencies and other entities, as appropriate, to provide comprehensive (looking beyond jurisdictional boundaries) conservation of the coral reef ecosystem and related marine resources and species throughout the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, consistent with applicable authorities and the Management Principles of this section.

Sec. 5. *Implementation.* (a) Management of the Reserve. The Secretary shall manage the Reserve under the National Marine Sanctuaries Act and in accordance with this order.

(b) *Reserve Operations Plan.* The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Hawaii, shall develop an operations plan to govern the management of the Reserve. In developing the Reserve Operations Plan the Secretary shall consider the advice and recommendations of the Reserve Council established pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section. The Reserve Operations Plan shall be directed at priority issues and actions that, at a minimum, provide for:

(1) Coordinated management among the Reserve, Hawaiian Islands National Wildlife Refuge, Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuge, and the State of Hawaii, consistent with relevant authorities;

(2) Coordination among Federal agencies and the Director of the National Science Foundation to make vessels and other resources available for conservation and research activities for the Reserve;

(3) The cleanup and prevention of marine debris in the Reserve;

(4) The restoration or remediation of any degraded or injured resources of the Reserve;

(5) Research, monitoring, and assessment of the Reserve;

(6) Education and outreach about the Reserve and its resources and efforts to conserve them;

(7) Enforcement and surveillance for the Reserve, including the use of new technologies and coordination with the United States Coast Guard and other relevant agencies;

(8) Identification and coordination with Native Hawaiian interests, regarding culturally significant, noncommercial subsistence, cultural, and religious uses and locations within the Reserve;

(9) Identification of potential tourism, recreational, and commercial activities within the Reserve and actions necessary to ensure that these activities do not degrade the Reserve's resources or diminish the Reserve's natural character;

(10) Use of vessel monitoring systems for any vessel entering or transiting the Reserve, if warranted. To this end, the Secretary in consultation with the Department of State, United States Coast Guard, and the Department of Defense, shall evaluate the need for the establishment of vessel monitoring systems and, if warranted, shall initiate the steps necessary to have the appropriate domestic agencies, and request that the International Maritime Organization, adopt a vessel monitoring system requirement for the Reserve;

(11) Any regulations, in addition to the conservation measures and Reserve Preservation Areas established under this order, that the Secretary determines are necessary to manage the Reserve in accordance with this order; and

(12) Coordination of all relevant activities with the process to designate the Reserve as a National Marine Sanctuary, as provided under paragraph (f) of this section.

(c) *Conservation Measures.* The Reserve Operations Plan shall also include the conservation measures in section 7 of this order and the Reserve Preservation Areas in section 8 of this order.

(d) *Memorandum of Agreement.* To further paragraph (b)(1) of this section, and subject to section 10(b) of this order, and in particular to promote coordinated management of the entirety of the shallow areas of the coral reef ecosystem throughout the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, the Secretary shall

work with the Secretary of the Interior and Governor of the State of Hawaii to enter into one or more memoranda of agreement for the coordinated conservation and management of the Reserve, Midway Atoll and Hawaiian Islands National Wildlife Refuges, and State of Hawaii submerged lands and waters within the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands.

(e) *National Marine Sanctuary.* The Secretary shall initiate the process to designate the Reserve as a national marine sanctuary pursuant to sections 303 and 304 of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 U.S.C. 1433, 1434). In doing so the Secretary shall supplement or complement the existing Reserve. The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Governor of the State of Hawaii, determine whether State submerged lands and waters should be included as part of the sanctuary. In designating and managing the sanctuary, the Secretary shall consider the advice and recommendations of the Reserve Council established pursuant to paragraph (f) of this section.

(f) *Council.* After considering input from the Secretary of the Interior and Governor of the State of Hawaii, the Secretary shall establish a Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve Council pursuant to section 315 of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 U.S.C. 1445a) to provide advice and recommendations on the Reserve Operations Plan and designation and management of any sanctuary. The Council shall include:

(1) Three Native Hawaiian representatives, including one Native Hawaiian elder, with experience or knowledge regarding Native Hawaiian subsistence, cultural, religious, or other activities in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands.

(2) Three representatives from the non-Federal science community with experience specific to the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands and with expertise in at least one of the following areas:

(A) Marine mammal science.

(B) Coral reef ecology.

(C) Native marine flora and fauna of the Hawaiian Islands.

(D) Oceanography.

(E) Any other scientific discipline the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(3) Three representatives from non-governmental wildlife/marine life, environmental, and/or conservation organizations.

(4) One representative from the commercial fishing industry that conducts activities in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands.

(5) One representative from the recreational fishing industry that conducts activities in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands.

(6) One representative from the ocean-related tourism industry.

(7) One representative from the non-Federal community with experience in education and outreach regarding marine conservation issues.

(8) One citizen-at-large representative.

(9) One representative from the State of Hawaii as appointed by the Governor.

(10) One representative each, as non-voting, *ex officio* members, from the Department of the Interior, United States Coast Guard, Department of Defense, Department of State, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary, National Science Foundation, Marine Mammal Commission, and Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council.

(g) *Report.* The Secretary shall provide a progress report on the implementation of this order to the Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality within 1 year from the date of this order.

Sec. 6. *Area of the Reserve.* The Reserve includes the waters and submerged lands of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands as follows:

(a) The seaward boundary of the Reserve is 50nm from the approximate center geographical positions of Nihoa Island, Necker Island, French Frigate Shoals, Gardner Pinnacles, Maro Reef, Laysan Island, Lisianski Island, Pearl and Hermes Reef, Midway Atoll, and Kure Island. Where the areas are not contiguous, parallel lines drawn tangent

to and connecting those semi-circles of the 50nm areas that lie around such areas shall delimit the remainder of the Reserve.

(b) The inland boundary of the Reserve around each of the areas named in subparagraph (a) of this section is the seaward boundary of Hawaii State waters and submerged lands, and the seaward boundary of the Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuge, as appropriate.

(c) The Reserve boundary is generally depicted on the map attached to this order. The Secretary, after consultation with the Governor of the State of Hawaii, may make technical modifications to the boundary of the Reserve, including providing straight-line boundaries for the Reserve for clarity and ease of identification, as appropriate.

Sec. 7. *Protection and Conservation Measures.* The conservation measures in this section apply throughout the Reserve.

(a) (1) *Commercial Fishing.* All currently existing commercial Federal fishing permits and current levels of fishing effort and take, as determined by the Secretary and pursuant to regulations in effect on the date of this order, shall be capped as follows:

(A) No commercial fishing may occur in Reserve Preservation Areas pursuant to section 8 of this order;

(B) There shall be no increase in the number of permits of any particular type of fishing (such as for bottomfishing) beyond the number of permits of that type in effect the year preceding the date of this order;

(C) The annual level of aggregate take under all permits of any particular type of fishing may not exceed the aggregate level of take under all permits of that type of fishing in the years preceding the date of this order, as determined by the Secretary, provided that the Secretary shall equitably divide the aggregate level into individual levels per permit, and further provided that the Secretary may make a one-time reasonable increase to the total aggregate to allow for the use of two Native Hawaiian bottomfishing permits;

(D) There shall be no permits issued for any particular type of fishing for which there were no permits issued in the year preceding the date of this order; and

(E) The type of fishing gear used by any permit holder may not be changed except with the permission of the Secretary, as provided under paragraph 3 of this section.

(2) *Recreational Fishing.* All currently existing (preceding the date of this order) levels of recreational fishing effort, as determined by the Secretary and pursuant to regulations in effect on the day of this order, shall be capped (i.e., no increase of take levels or levels of fishing effort, species targeted, or change in gear types) throughout the Reserve. However, fishing is further restricted as provided in section 8 of this order.

(3) The Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and Governor of the State of Hawaii, and after public review and comment and consideration of any advice or recommendations of the Reserve Council and Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, may further restrict the fishing activities under subparagraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this section if necessary to protect Reserve resources, or may authorize or require alternate gear types if such gear would offer equal or greater protection for Reserve resources.

(b) In addition to the conservation measures in paragraph (a) of this section, the following activities are prohibited throughout the Reserve:

(1) Exploring for, developing, or producing oil, gas, or minerals;

(2) Having a vessel anchored on any living or dead coral with an anchor, an anchor chain, or an anchor rope when visibility is such that the seabed can be seen;

(3) Drilling into, dredging, or otherwise altering the seabed; or constructing, placing, or abandoning any structure, material, or other matter on the seabed, except as an incidental result of anchoring vessels;

(4) Discharging or depositing any material or other matter into the Reserve, or discharging or depositing any material or other matter outside the Reserve that subsequently enters the

Reserve and injures any resource of the Reserve, except fish parts (i.e., chumming material or bait) used in and during authorized fishing operations, or discharges incidental to vessel use such as deck wash, approved marine sanitation device effluent, cooling water, and engine exhaust; and

(5) Removal, moving, taking, harvesting, or damaging any living or nonliving Reserve resources, except as provided under paragraph (a) of this section and sections 8(a) and 9 of this order.

(c) The Secretary may conduct, or authorize by permit the activities listed in subparagraphs (b)(3)–(5) of this section to the extent that they are necessary for research, monitoring, education, or management activities that further the Management Principles of section 4 of this order.

Sec. 8. *Reserve Preservation Areas.*

(a) To further protect Reserve resources, the following areas are hereby established as Reserve Preservation Areas until some or all are made permanent after adequate public review and comment, within which all activities referred to in paragraph (b) of this section are prohibited.

(1) From the seaward boundary of Hawaii State waters and submerged lands to a mean depth of 100 fathoms (fm) around:

(A) Nihoa Island, provided that bottomfishing in accordance with the requirements of section 7(a)(1) of this order shall be allowed to continue seaward of a mean depth of 10fm, unless and until the Secretary determines otherwise after adequate public review and comment;

(B) Necker Island, provided that bottomfishing in accordance with the requirements of section 7(a)(1) of this order shall be allowed to continue seaward of a mean depth of 20fm, unless and until the Secretary determines otherwise after adequate public review and comment;

(C) French Frigate Shoals;

(D) Gardner Pinnacles, provided that bottomfishing in accordance with the requirements of section 7(a)(1) of this order shall be allowed to continue seaward of a mean depth of 10fm, unless and until the Secretary determines otherwise after adequate public review and comment;

(E) Maro Reef, provided that bottomfishing in accordance with the requirements of section 7(a)(1) of this order shall be allowed to continue seaward of a mean depth of 20fm, unless and until the Secretary determines otherwise after adequate public review and comment;

(F) Laysan Island, provided that bottomfishing in accordance with the requirements of section 7(a)(1) of this order shall be allowed to continue seaward of a mean depth of 50fm, unless and until the Secretary determines otherwise after adequate public review and comment;

(G) Lisianski Island, provided that bottomfishing in accordance with the requirements of section 7(a)(1) of this order shall be allowed to continue seaward of a mean depth of 50fm, unless and until the Secretary determines otherwise after adequate public review and comment;

(H) Pearl and Hermes Atoll; and

(I) Kure Island.

(2) Twelve nautical miles around the approximate geographical centers of:

(A) The first bank immediately east of French Frigate Shoals;

(B) Southeast Brooks Bank, which is the first bank immediately west of French Frigate Shoals, provided that the closure area shall not be closer than approximately 3nm of the next bank immediately west;

(C) St. Rogatien Bank, provided that the closure area shall not be closer than approximately 3nm of the next bank immediately east, provided further that bottomfishing in accordance with the requirements of section

7(a)(1) of this order shall be allowed to continue, unless and until the Secretary determines otherwise after adequate public review and comment;

(D) The first bank west of St. Rogatien Bank, east of Gardner Pinnacles;

(E) Raita Bank; and

(F) Pioneer Bank, provided that bottomfishing in accordance with the requirements of section 7(a)(1) of this order shall be allowed to continue, unless and until the Secretary determines otherwise after adequate public review and comment.

(b) Activities Prohibited Within Reserve Preservation Areas.

(1) In addition to the conservation measures in section 7 of this order, which are applicable to the entire Reserve, the following activities are prohibited within the Reserve Preservation Areas listed in paragraph (a) of this section, except as expressly otherwise stated in this paragraph and sections (8)(a) and 9 of this order:

(A) Commercial and recreational fishing;

(B) Anchoring in any area that contains available mooring buoys, or anchoring outside an available anchoring area when such area has been designated by the Secretary;

(C) Any type of touching or taking of living or dead coral;

(D) Discharging or depositing any material or other matter except cooling water or engine exhaust; and

(E) Such other activities that the Secretary identifies after adequate public review and comment, and after consideration of any advice and recommendations of the Reserve Council.

(2) Notwithstanding the prohibitions in this paragraph, the Secretary may conduct, or authorize by permit, research, monitoring, education, or management activities within any Reserve Preservation Area that further the Management Principles of section 4 of this order.

(3) The Reserve Preservation Areas in this section are approximated using fathoms. The Secretary will develop straight line boundaries based on longitude and latitude coordinates to encompass each Reserve Preservation Area, to provide for clarity and ease of identification. The Secretary may make technical modifications to any such boundaries.

Sec. 9. *Native Hawaiian Uses.* Native Hawaiian noncommercial subsistence, cultural, or religious uses may continue, to the extent consistent with existing law, within the Reserve and Reserve Preservation Areas identified under section 8 of this order. The Secretary shall work with Native Hawaiian interests to identify those areas where such Native Hawaiian uses of the Reserve's resources may be conducted without injury to the Reserve's coral reef ecosystem and related marine resources and species, and may revise the areas where such activities may occur after public review and comment, and consideration of any advice and recommendations of the Reserve Council.

Sec. 10. *National Wildlife Refuges.*

(a) The Secretary of the Interior, in managing, through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service the Hawaiian Islands and Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuges pursuant to the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act (16 U.S.C. 668dd–668ee) and other applicable laws, shall follow the Management Principles of section 4 of this order, to the extent consistent with applicable law.

(b) Wherever the Reserve overlaps the Hawaiian Islands National Wildlife Refuge, the Reserve shall be managed to supplement and complement management of the Refuge to ensure coordinated conservation and management of the Reserve and the Refuge, consistent with the purposes and policies of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, the National Marine Sanctuaries Amendments Act of 2000, and this order, and the authorities of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act (16 U.S.C. 668dd–668ee) and other laws with respect to management of the Refuge. Nothing in this order shall enlarge or diminish the jurisdiction or authority of the Secretary or Secretary of the Interior

in managing the Reserve or Refuge, respectively.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior, through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, shall coordinate with the Secretary and the Governor of the State of Hawaii, as provided under section 5(b) of this order, to ensure coordinated protection and management among the Reserve, Refuges, and State, consistent with relevant authorities.

Sec. 11. *Administration and Judicial Review.*

(a) *International Law.* Management of the Reserve and any regulations issued pursuant thereto and all other provisions of this order shall be applied consistently with the 1983 Presidential Proclamation on the Exclusive Economic Zone, the 1988 Presidential Proclamation on the Territorial Sea, and the 1999 Presidential Proclamation on Contiguous Zone and in accordance with generally recognized principles of international law, and with the treaties, conventions, and other agreements to which the United States is a party. The Secretary shall consult with the Department of State in implementing this order.

(b) *Agency Responsibilities.* All Federal agencies whose actions may affect the Reserve and any National Marine Sanctuary established by the Secretary pursuant to this order shall carry out such actions in accordance with applicable laws, regulations and Executive Orders, including Executive Orders 13089 of June 11, 1998, and 13158 of May 26, 2000.

(c) *National Security and Emergency Actions.* Consistent with applicable law, nothing in this order is intended to apply to military activities (including those carried out by the United States Coast Guard), including military exercises, conducted within or in the vicinity of the Reserve, consistent with the requirements of Executive Orders 13089 of June 11, 1998, and 13158 of May 26, 2000. Further, nothing in this order is intended to restrict the Department of Defense from conducting activities necessary during time of war or national emergency, or when necessary for reasons of national security as determined by the Secretary of Defense, consistent with applicable law. In addition, consistent with applicable law, nothing in this order shall limit agency actions to respond to emergencies posing an unacceptable threat to human health or safety or to the marine environment and admitting of no other feasible solution.

(d) *United States Coast Guard.* Nothing in this order is intended to limit the authority of the United States Coast Guard to enforce any Federal law, or install or maintain aids to navigation.

(e) *Funding.* This order shall be carried out subject to the availability of appropriated funds and to the extent permitted by law.

(f) *Territorial Waters.* Nothing in this order shall enlarge or diminish the jurisdiction or authority of the State of Hawaii or the United States over submerged or other lands within the territorial waters off the coast of Hawaii.

(g) *Judicial Review.* This order does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable in law or equity by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any person.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
December 4, 2000.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., December 6, 2000]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on December 7.

Proclamation 7384—National Drunk and Drugged Driving Prevention Month, 2000

December 4, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Driving is an integral part of American culture and daily living; but it is also a privilege that carries great responsibility. To protect ourselves and others, we must always be safe, sober, and drug-free behind the wheel.

As a Nation, we have made steady progress in reducing alcohol-related deaths through stronger laws, tougher enforcement, and increased public awareness. Last year, alcohol-

related traffic fatalities reached a historic low. But even one death is still one too many; that is why I was pleased to sign into law this October a nationwide impaired-driving standard of .08 blood alcohol content (BAC). Once all 50 States set their BAC limits to .08, we can save hundreds of lives and prevent thousands of injuries each year on America's streets and highways.

There are other measures we are taking to reduce the incidence of drunk driving. Last December, the Department of Transportation unveiled the "You Drink and Drive. You Lose." campaign, an effort to promote greater public awareness of the dangers of impaired driving. In just 1 year, hundreds of communities and law enforcement agencies have joined the campaign, helping to reach nearly 100 million Americans with this simple but lifesaving message.

In memory of the thousands of victims who have lost their lives to alcohol- and drug-impaired drivers, I ask all motorists to participate in "National Lights On for Life Day" on December 15, 2000, by driving with their vehicle headlights illuminated. By doing so, we will call attention to this devastating national problem and remind others on the road of their responsibility to drive sober and drug-free.

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 December 2000 as National Drunk and Drugged Driving Prevention Month. I urge all Americans to acknowledge the dangers of impaired driving, to make the right choice by designating a sober driver, to prevent impaired family members and friends from getting behind the wheel, and to help teach our young drivers the importance of alcohol- and drug-free driving. I also call on all State, county, and local leaders to make safety a top priority and to work together to make our Nation's transportation system the safest it can be.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., December 6, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on December 7.

Executive Order 13177—National Commission on the Use of Offsets in Defense Trade and President's Council on the Use of Offsets in Commercial Trade

December 4, 2000

By the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including Public Law 106-113 and the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 2), and in order to implement section 1247 of Public Law 106-113 (113 Stat. 1501A-502) and to create a parallel "President's Council on the Use of Offsets in Commercial Trade," it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Membership.* Pursuant to Public Law 106-113, the "National Commission on the Use of Offsets in Defense Trade" (Commission) comprises 11 members appointed by the President with the concurrence of the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate and the Speaker and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives. The Commission membership includes: (a) representatives from the private sector, including one each from (i) a labor organization, (ii) a United States defense manufacturing company dependent on foreign sales, (iii) a United States company dependent on foreign sales that is not a defense manufacturer, and (iv) a United States company that specializes in international investment; (b) two members from academia with widely recognized expertise in international economics; and (c) five members from the executive branch, including a member from the: (i) Office of Management and Budget, (ii) Department of Commerce, (iii) Department of Defense, (iv) Department of State, and (v) Department of Labor. The member from the Office of Management and Budget will serve as Chairperson of the Commission and will appoint, and fix the compensation of, the Executive Director of the Commission.

Sec. 2. *Duties.* The Commission will be responsible for reviewing and reporting on: (a) current practices by foreign governments in requiring offsets in purchasing agreements and the extent and nature of offsets offered by United States and foreign defense industry contractors; (b) the impact of the use of offsets on defense subcontractors and non-defense industrial sectors affected by indirect offsets; and (c) the role of offsets, both direct and indirect, on domestic industry stability, United States trade competitiveness, and national security.

Sec. 3. *Commission Report.* Not later than 12 months after the Commission is established, it will report to the appropriate congressional committees. In addition to the items described in section 2 of this order, the report will include: (a) an analysis of (i) the collateral impact of offsets on industry sectors that may be different than those of the contractor paying offsets, including estimates of contracts and jobs lost as well as an assessment of damage to industrial sectors; (ii) the role of offsets with respect to competitiveness of the United States defense industry in international trade and the potential damage to the ability of United States contractors to compete if offsets were prohibited or limited; and (iii) the impact on United States national security, and upon United States nonproliferation objectives, of the use of co-production, subcontracting, and technology transfer with foreign governments or companies, that results from fulfilling offset requirements, with particular emphasis on the question of dependency upon foreign nations for the supply of critical components or technology; (b) proposals for unilateral, bilateral, or multilateral measures aimed at reducing any detrimental effects of offsets; and (c) an identification of the appropriate executive branch agencies to be responsible for monitoring the use of offsets in international defense trade.

Sec. 4. *Administration, Compensation, and Termination.* (a) The Department of Defense will provide administrative support and funding for the Commission and Federal Government employees may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement.

(b) Members of the Commission who are not officers or employees of the Federal Government will be compensated at a rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in performance of the duties of the Commission. Members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the Federal Government will serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the Federal Government.

(c) Members of the Commission will be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, under subchapter 1 of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while on business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(d) The Commission will terminate 30 days after transmitting the report required in section 1248(b) of Public Law 106-113 (113 Stat. 1501A-505).

Sec. 5. *Establishment and Membership.* (a) There is established, pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), the "President's Council on the Use of Offsets in Commercial Trade" (Council).

(b) The Council shall be composed of the appointed members of the Commission or their designees.

Sec. 6. *Duties and Report of the Council.* The Council shall review and report to the President, through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, on the use of offsets in commercial trade, including their impact on the United States defense and commercial industrial base. The Council shall consult with and, as appropriate, provide information to the Commission.

Sec. 7. *Administration.* (a) The Department of Defense shall provide administrative support and funding for the Council.

(b) The heads of executive departments and agencies shall, to the extent permitted by law, provide to the Council such information as it may require for the purpose of carrying out its duties.

(c) Members of the Council shall serve without compensation.

Sec. 8. *General.* (a) Notwithstanding any other Executive Order, the functions of the

President under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, except that of reporting to the Congress, that are applicable to the Council, shall be performed by the Department of Defense in accordance with guidelines that have been issued by the Administrator of General Services.

(b) The Council shall terminate on the date of the transmission of the report required by section 1248(b) of Public Law 106-113 (113 Stat. 1501A-505).

William J. Clinton

The White House,
December 4, 2000.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., December 5, 2000]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on December 6.

Satellite Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With Team Harmony Rally VII

December 5, 2000

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you, Josh, for that introduction. Your father would be very proud. I also want to thank Jon Jennings, Donna Harris-Lewis, and Joyce Zakim. To Rick Rendon, thank you for helping to organize Team Harmony VII. I also want to send you Hillary's best wishes. As Josh said, she's a big fan of Team Harmony and the great work you do.

And finally, I'd like to thank all the students from throughout New England for taking part in what I am told is the largest gathering of young people against racism, hatred, and bigotry. And of course, I welcome our friends from Belfast and Johannesburg.

The great thing about this modern world we live in is that we can have a conversation like this across the oceans and continents, and it's just the beginning. When I look ahead to your future, I see a time when we'll have unbelievable scientific discoveries. I believe your children will be born, literally, with a life expectancy of about 100 years. We're unlocking the secrets of the human genes. You will be citizens of the world in ways that no one else has ever been because of the way the Internet is bringing us together.

But even though we live in the most modern of worlds, the biggest problem we face, as all of you have been discussing, is perhaps the oldest problem of human society: People are afraid of those who are different from them because of things like race, religion, or sexual orientation. And they go from fear to distrust; then it's easy to slip from distrust into dehumanization and from dehumanization into violence.

I saw all this when I was a child. I grew up in the southern part of the United States when it was completely segregated and where racial differences meant everything. I went to a segregated school. It was common to sit at segregated lunch counters, to ride even in segregated sections of the bus, to go to movies where the seating sections were divided, black and white.

But lucky for me, when I was a little child, I lived for a while with my grandparents and then spent a lot of time with them afterward, and my grandfather did not believe in this. He was a small grocery store owner. Most of his customers were African-Americans. He taught me, through his example—and my grandmother, as well—that segregation and discrimination were wrong, and it was important that all people be able to live in dignity and respect. There is no greater lesson in life.

I think we can figure out how to solve all our other challenges as people if we can only work this one big challenge out, establishing the right kind of relationships with one another. That's why in the years I've been President, I've worked so very hard to bring us together as one America and to work throughout the world to help ensure that all people have dignity and an equal shot at life, to work against racial and ethnic and religious discrimination, from Northern Ireland to the Balkans to the Middle East. We've come a long way on our journey toward reconciliation and understanding and mutual respect, but we've still got a long way to go. And young people, like you, have a very big role to play.

What is the heart of the challenge? I think it's pretty simple. I think we have to do a better job of teaching young people to value

themselves as inherently worthy and good but not to value themselves by comparison to others. Of course, we all belong to groups and cliques and organizations. That's a good thing, not a bad thing. Everybody wants to belong to some group or another. But it is very important that young people be taught, and then that young people teach, that God did not create any of us better than any others.

There are people in life, unfortunately, who just can't feel good about themselves, unless they've got somebody else to look down on. It is our responsibility to confront this and to stand against it. The life we live today is far more interesting, because our societies are more diverse. Differences make life exciting. All our nations are richer, our future will be more exciting because of our differences, as long as we understand clearly that the most important thing we share is our common humanity.

Now, that's what Team Harmony is all about. So I wanted to take a few minutes and speak with you, listen to you, and urge you to keep talking and listening and reaching out to people who are different from you. You may be surprised by what you learn, but you will be confirmed in your instinct that our common humanity is the most important thing.

Not long ago, Hillary sponsored one of our millennial events at the White House, and we invited one of America's top scientists involved in unlocking the mysteries of the human genome. He told us that all humans, genetically, are 99.9 percent the same. Then he said that the genetic differences among people of the same racial groups are greater than the differences between different racial groups. So, we're getting a message here. Science is reaffirming what our faith and our values tell us: We do have more in common than that which divides us.

So if you can do something about violence and fear among young people, if you can deal with this oldest problem of human society, if you can make sure diversity is our greatest strength, then your generation will have the brightest future in all human history. You'll have the chance to solve age-old problems, to cure diseases, to give people opportunities they never could have had before. And we must do our part. We're very proud of your leadership in doing yours.

Again, I thank you for Team Harmony. I thank you for your care and concern. I thank you for giving me a chance to come by and visit for a few minutes. And now I'll be glad to take your questions. Thank you very much.

Mr. Jose Masso. Mr. President, thank you so much for joining us this afternoon with Team Harmony. My name is Jose Masso. We have a young woman here who would like to ask a question of you, Mr. President.

One America

Q. Hello, Mr. President. My name is Rachel—[*inaudible*]—and my question is, what advice can you give to the youth of Team Harmony on continuing all the work you have done towards creating one America?

The President. I'm sorry, but I couldn't hear the question.

Q. What advice can you give to the youth of Team Harmony on continuing all the work you have done towards creating one America?

The President. Thank you very much. Well, first let me say that I think that the middle school and high school years, in some ways, are the most important time to do the work that Team Harmony advocates and celebrates.

You know, even though I'm not young anymore, I can still remember when I was your age. I can remember the kinds of things young people worry about. But I'm very grateful that because of my parents and grandparents, I never felt that for me to be okay, I had to think that someone else wasn't okay; for me to feel important, I had to believe someone else was not important or was insignificant. I'm very grateful to my family for teaching me that, and I think that is the central message that young people have to teach each other. You've got to reinforce the idea that everybody counts, that everybody deserves a chance, and that we all do better when we help each other.

And the other point I want to make about that is that in middle school and high school, peers have such an enormous influence over their fellow students. If you're here at this conference and you believe in what you all are talking about, I hope, when you go back

home, you will make sure that in your school there is a systematic effort to share these ideas and values with other young people, because so many of you can have more influence on your friends and classmates than just about anybody, even the President of the United States.

And the most important thing of all is still to get people to be proud of their own racial, ethnic, religious heritage, and at the same time, being absolutely convinced that other people's different heritage is worthy of respect, because the most important thing is our common humanity.

There ought to be a systematic effort to do that in every school in America and in every school in Northern Ireland and in every school in South Africa and wherever else in the world this is an issue.

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Mr. Barry Tatelman. Thank you, President Clinton. My name is Barry Tatelman, and I'm a supporter of Team Harmony. We're now going to go to Belfast for a question for President Clinton.

Q. Hello, Mr. President. My name is Gary—[*inaudible*]. I'm a 17-year-old student at—[*inaudible*]—College in Belfast. My question for you today is, you're going to be in Northern Ireland next week. What do you hope you will accomplish by a visit?

The President. I think you asked me what I hope will come out of my visit to Northern Ireland. And what I hope will happen is that it will encourage the political leaders and the people of Northern Ireland to continue working to overcome their differences and to keep moving forward on the Good Friday accord.

So much has already been accomplished. A local government is in place that represents all the people; cease-fires are holding; progress is made in putting the paramilitary arms beyond use. Significant work is being done in the vital areas of human rights, police, and judicial reform. We're seeing a lot more investment from America and other countries in helping to create good new jobs.

But if this momentum is not maintained, then the gains would be put at risk. The peace process everywhere is a bit like riding a bicycle: Both legs have to keep pedaling to keep moving forward and straight, and if they don't, then the bicycle could veer off course. And that's not in anyone's interest.

So let me say, we've all got to realize what's at stake here. It's easy to just focus on one part of this process, or one issue, and to complain. The difficult but far more important task is for everyone to keep his or her eyes on the big picture and to work through the issues. The hard way offers the hope of peace and progress for all sides. The easy way could lead to a cycle of recrimination and potentially even to a return of violence and the Troubles.

Now, I hold no illusion that my visit is going to solve all the problems. That is something the parties and the governments have to do. But I have taken a deep and genuine interest in supporting the peace process since before I took office. And when Prime Minister Blair and Prime Minister Ahern and the First Minister and Deputy First Minister all told me that if I were to visit, it might help, I said, "Sure, I'll do whatever I can." I have worked on this now for 8 years. I care about it deeply.

But I would just say to all of you who are watching, we have come so far. In a troubled world, the progress in Ireland has been a beacon of hope, and we have got to finish the job.

Mr. Eliot Tatelman. Thank you very much, Mr. President. My name is Eliot Tatelman, and we're now going to take you to South Africa and ask South Africa what questions they would have for the President.

South Africa

Q. My name is Hloni Mongola. I am 15 years of age. It's an honor to speak to you, Mr. President, and I hope that you answer our question in a positive and a significant way. I'd like to ask you two questions; that's if you don't mind. You know that South African youth struggled against apartheid, and they won, which we are appreciative of that. Now, we suddenly found out that there are no jobs, and AIDS is killing our people. We want to find out how you advise us, the youth of Africa, on solving this problem.

And the second question is this: You realize that most of the youth in Africa admires

you. We would like you to give us three of your best—[*inaudible*].

The President. I can't hear you, but I think you asked me a question about South Africa and the AIDS issue. So I hope you can hear me. Let me talk first about AIDS.

I am very concerned about what it could do to South Africa and, indeed, to many other countries throughout the African continent. We have to work together to fight this epidemic. It threatens all South Africans, Americans, the young, the old, black, and white. We are working hard here to support your efforts in South Africa with a dramatic increase in funding for international AIDS programs.

But frankly, the youth of South Africa have a critical role, as well. First, you have to remember that AIDS is 100 percent preventable. You must educate yourselves and educate others and talk about this disease no matter how hard it is. If you and all your classmates do this, you can protect yourselves and an entire generation. Meanwhile, we have to keep working on care, making the medicine more affordable, on prevention, on a cure. We have to work on all that. But don't forget, before medicine, this is still 100 percent preventable. And that's something that those of you involved in this conference in South Africa could have a big impact on.

South Africa's new political freedom is an inspiration to all of us in America and, indeed, to people throughout the world. And I know that the economic challenges are enormous, especially in terms of unemployment. There are differences between what the Government can do and what you can do.

What I would urge all of you to do is to concentrate on getting a good education and learning skills that can increase your country's productivity. You're the first generation to really understand computers, to have access to learning how to run the small enterprises needed to build South Africa's rural economy, to have access to the language skills needed to help your country trade with the rest of the world. If you take advantage of these opportunities, you will take South Africa a long way toward being a stronger country with a better economy, with more opportunities for young people, and a greater chance to prosper in the global economy. I also think you should do whatever you can to encourage all the other young people you know to stay in school.

And finally, let me just say one thing. The AIDS issue and the economic issue are related. Money the Government has to spend on AIDS is money that can't be spent on education and economic development. And if you lose large numbers of a whole generation, they won't be out there in their working years contributing to the wealth and strength of your country.

So again I implore you—we'll do what we can to help, but you make sure that every young person—every young person—is committed to doing what it takes to avoid HIV and AIDS. You make sure that you stay in school as long as you can and to keep your friends in school. And if you do that, then we'll do what we can to work with your Government to create economic opportunity and to bring whatever miracles modern medicine can produce to deal with the terrible horrors of AIDS. We'll get through this, but you have to do your part, as well.

Thank you very much.

Let me say to all of you, I want to thank you for the honor of addressing you, but I want to thank you even more for the work you're doing and the great spirit with which you're doing it. Nothing is more important to our future. I intend to keep working with you in the years to come. Even though I won't be President, there still may be a thing I can do to help you along the way.

And to all my friends in Belfast, I look forward to visiting you very soon. Keep up the work toward peace. Thank you very much.

Q. Mr. President, before you go, we would like to make a special presentation to you. On behalf of the Team Harmony Foundation, I'd like to thank you for being a part of today and for your lifelong commitment and leadership.

The President. Thank you. Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, for all you have done, to further race relations here in the United States through your initiative, One America, we would like to thank you.

Q. And now we have someone in Belfast, correct?

Q. President Clinton, for all you have done to promote peace amongst the people of Northern Ireland, we thank you.

Q. And now, our friends in South Africa.

Q. President Clinton, for being a friend to South Africa and for your commitment to our freedom and our future, we would like to thank you very much. Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, we proudly present you with the Team Harmony lifetime achievement award.

Q. Here it is. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you. Bye, Jon.

NOTE: The President spoke by satellite at 12:14 p.m. from Room 459 in the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building to the rally meeting at the Fleet Center in Boston, MA. The President's remarks were also transmitted to participants in Northern Ireland and South Africa. In his remarks, he referred to Josh Zakim, son of the late Team Harmony cofounder Lenny P. Zakim; Donna Harris-Lewis and Joyce Zakim, members, board of advisors, Team Harmony; Deputy Assistant Attorney General for the Department of Justice Jon Jennings and Richard H. (Rick) Rendon, cofounders, Team Harmony; Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom; Prime Minister Bertie Ahern of Ireland; and First Minister David Trimble and Deputy First Minister Seamus Mallon of Northern Ireland.

Statement on the Report of the Interagency Task Force on Nonprofits and Government

December 5, 2000

Today I am pleased to announce the release of a report by the Interagency Task Force on Nonprofits and Government identifying exemplary partnerships between Federal agencies and private nonprofit organizations, highlighting best practices, and providing recommendations for further Federal efforts to support and expand these partnerships.

When Vice President Gore and I were elected 8 years ago, one of our key priorities was to shape a new model for the Federal Government, one that neither made Government responsible for meeting all of society's needs nor took a hands-off approach, leaving charitable organizations alone to address the challenges faced in so many communities. Instead, we sought a third way—a smaller Government committed to giving people the tools they need to make the most of their lives, while working in partnership with its citizens and living within its means.

For this kind of Government to work, we must have a strong civil society with a thriving network of national and community-based nonprofit organizations that can marshal the resources of the American people to meet the challenges before us. We had this in mind when the First Lady and I hosted the first-ever White House Conference on Philanthropy in October 1999. There I named an interagency task force made up of my White House staff and representatives of 19 Federal agencies to examine one important facet of the Third Way: partnerships between the Federal Government and nonprofit organizations. I directed members of the task force to identify the best examples of these private/public partnerships and evaluate the ways in which they could be improved and replicated.

In thousands of instances large and small, Government agencies are working with national, State, community, and faith-based nonprofit organizations, and in the process, are redefining the role of Government in the 21st century. From AmeriCorps to the Welfare to Work Partnership, from environmental protection to national immunization programs, nonprofit partnerships are improving the lives of citizens from Florida to Alaska, Hawaii to Maine.

The role that nonprofit/government partnerships play cannot be overstated: They make Government work better, and in turn, nonprofits are strengthened by these relationships. As a result, they are an essential part of our safety net for citizens in need, and when all else fails, nourish and protect the youngest and most vulnerable among us. These partnerships help ensure that the arts and humanities flourish, work to protect our environment and other national treasures, and help foster a community where neighbors can gather and support one another. In these ways and many more, they strengthen and sustain our civil society.

Remarks on Presenting the Eleanor Roosevelt Award for Human Rights and the Presidential Medal of Freedom

December 6, 2000

The President. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, and good morning. Let me begin by thanking Secretary Albright for her remarks and her 8 years of leadership, first at the United Nations and then at the State Department, always standing up and speaking out for human rights.

And my friend of so many years John Lewis, whom I knew before I ever decided to run for President, who started with me, and as you can hear, is going out with me, finishing. [*Laughter*] In my private office on the second floor of the White House Residence, I have a picture of a very young John Lewis being beaten at the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, that I was given when we went back there on the 35th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act. And he has worked now for more than 35 years. I can't help noting that he's still at it. He had a piece in the New York Times the other day making the simple but apparently controversial point that the right to vote includes not only the right to cast the vote but the right to have it counted. Thank you, John.

I also want to welcome James Roosevelt and his wife, Ann, here, and Members of the Congress, Congressman Ben Gilman, Donald Payne, and Ed Pastor. I want to thank Sandy Berger and Eric Schwartz, who have worked at the White House on human rights since the day we got here in 1993. I want to thank, in his absence, Assistant Secretary of State Harold Koh, who tried to come back from Africa today to be here but couldn't make it, and our Ambassador to the U.N. Human Rights Commission, Nancy Rubin.

We're here today to honor six extraordinary people. Like Madeleine, I also want to say that I wish Hillary could be here, but she's at Senator school today. [*Laughter*] It's been a great 2 days at our house, going to Senator school. I had to make sure that—I said yesterday, I said, "This is your first day of school, and so you have to go to bed early. Get a good night's sleep"—[*laughter*]—"Wear a nice dress. It's the first day of school." So today is the second day of school, and I'm sorry she couldn't be here.

But I will always be grateful that part of our service involved the opportunity she had to go to Beijing 5 years ago, to say that women's rights are human rights. And I'm grateful that she'll have a chance to continue that fight in the United States Senate.

I'd also like to thank Melanne Verveer, who worked with us every day for 8 years, and for Bonnie Campbell at the Department of Justice and Theresa Loar at the Department of State.

Thanks to so many of you in this room, for 8 years I've had the privilege of trying to bring Americans' actions more in line with America's beliefs. Secretary Albright and John Lewis both said we have made support for democracy and freedom of religion an important part of our foreign policy. We stood up for civil rights and against discrimination at home and abroad and made it clear that America cannot simply stand by when human rights are trampled.

Dr. King once said, "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." This is a lesson we can never afford to forget, especially in this fast-forward century, when satellites, E-mail, and jet planes expand the frontiers of human contact and human awareness and bring pain and suffering instantly home to us. Globalization is bringing us closer together, with many benefits, but as with all new benefits, new responsibilities accompany them. And we have both the moral imperative and a practical incentive to do even more to recognize the rights and dignity of every person, everywhere.

In spite of what we have accomplished, which the Secretary of State articulated so clearly, major challenges lie ahead. We can never stop striving at home to become the more perfect Union of our Founders' dreams. That means we cannot abandon the struggle against discrimination and injustice here.

Specifically, let me say, I hope that in this abbreviated session of the Congress, that Congress will send me the hate crimes legislation that we worked so hard for, and which both Houses have voted for, but which a minority may yet be able to prevent. If we don't

get it, I certainly hope it's one of the first pieces of legislation the next administration will ask for and sign into law.

We also must continue to support emerging democracies abroad. That means, of course, support for free and fair elections but also support for strong democratic institutions, good governance in the fight against corruption, speaking out when the progress of democracy or the most basic human rights are under threat, whether it's the scourge of slavery in Sudan, the denial of rights to women and girls in Afghanistan, curtailing religious freedom in China.

And let me say especially to the students, religious communities, and human rights activists who have done so much to publicize the atrocities of Sudan, America must continue to press for an end to these egregious practices and make clear that the Sudanese Government cannot join the community of nations until fundamental changes are made on these fronts.

Ultimately, support for human rights means preparing to act to stop suffering and violence when our values and our interests demand it. We cannot right every wrong, of course, but we cannot choose inaction, either. I have been reminded again and again that much of the best work in promoting human rights and defending freedom is done by people outside Government, students, activists, religious leaders from all walks of life, sharing an unshakable belief in the simple message of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that all humans are free and equal in dignity and rights.

Ten years after the signing of the Universal Declaration, Eleanor Roosevelt reminded us that the destiny of human rights is in the hands of all our citizens and all our communities. I established the Eleanor Roosevelt Human Rights Awards to honor men and women who have taken the future of human rights into their committed hands. I have had the honor of working closely with several of this year's honorees and the equal honor of receiving advice and, on occasion, criticism from them, as well. So I would like to say a few words about each.

To the Lakota Sioux, the birth of a white buffalo calf is a sign of peace and harmony to come, a prophecy of the end of war and, especially, of the suffering of children. When Tillie Black Bear founded the White Buffalo Calf Women's Society more than 20 years ago, she sought to end the suffering of women and children who were victims of domestic violence. She founded the first women's shelter on an Indian reservation and then went on to help found two more.

A survivor of domestic violence herself, she has taught and counseled victims, batterers, and law enforcement officials alike. She is a founder and former president of the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault and known around the Nation as a leading advocate for battered women.

I want to add that, fittingly, Tillie was born on Human Rights Day, December the 10th. We thank her for her courage and a lifetime of commitment.

From the tall tales he loved to tell, to the size of his ambitions, Fred Cuny was larger than life in every sense. But the biggest thing about him was his heart and his devotion to saving lives anywhere he could. He participated in more than 70 relief missions to some of the world's most desolate places. And wherever he went, he made a lasting difference.

In Bosnia, he smuggled in enough equipment to build two water purification plants under snipers' noses, providing clean drinking water for 60 percent of the city during the worst days of the siege. General Shalikashvili called him "the hero" of our operations to help starving Kurds in Northern Iraq.

His last mission, like so many others, was to a remote and dangerous place where outsiders rarely go but where help was desperately needed. That place was Chechnya, and Fred Cuny was killed there 5 years ago. His son, Craig, is here today to accept his father's award. And we thank him and all the Cuny family—and there are lots of them here, thank goodness—for the life of one of America's and the world's great humanitarians. Thank you.

The story I am about to tell will not surprise anyone who has ever had any contact with Elaine Jones. She argued her first court case at the tender age of 11. She visited a

dentist without getting her parents' permission, and when she couldn't pay the bill, the dentist decided to sue. Her parents had to work, so Elaine went to court alone and convinced the judge to dismiss the case. I wonder what the argument was? [*Laughter*]

That's when she decided she wanted to be a lawyer, and she's been speaking truth to power ever since. She was the first African-American woman to graduate from the University of Virginia Law School; later, the first African-American to sit on the American Bar Association board of governors. With a brief interruption for Government service, she's been a leader in the NAACP's fight for equal justice for almost 25 years now. She is an ardent advocate before Congress, a skillful litigator before the Supreme Court, a constant voice for people in need.

Thank you, Elaine, for being a champion of human rights for all Americans.

In the spring of 1954, a young Army Lieutenant named Norman Dorsen found himself on the front lines of justice in his very first job out of law school, defending civil liberties from the attacks of Senator Joe McCarthy. Now, Norman has had other jobs and responsibilities, but he never abandoned his post in the struggle to preserve the rights and liberties of every American.

He argued and prepared briefs for landmark Supreme Court cases, such as *Gideon* v. *Wainright,* which established an accused person's right to legal counsel. He was, for 15 years, the President of the American Civil Liberties Union. He is now chairman of the board of the Lawyers' Committee for Human Rights. For almost 40 years, he's inspired law students as a professor at New York University Law School and director of its programs in civil liberties.

I've gotten to know him through our discussions of a political Third Way, but today we thank him for reminding us that in every age, respect for civil liberties is the American way. Thank you, Norman.

In tough places, where civilians are struggling to get out, chances are you will find Archbishop Theodore McCarrick working hard to get in and to help them. The litany of countries he has visited sounds more suited to a diplomat than an archbishop: the former Soviet Union, the Balkans, the countries devastated by Hurricane Mitch, East Timor, Ethiopia, Burundi, Cuba, Haiti, Colombia.

Two years ago I was honored to send him as one of my representatives on a groundbreaking trip to discuss religious freedom with China's leaders. This year, he has been a tireless and effective leader in promoting debt relief for poor countries—I might say, one of the truly outstanding accomplishments that we have achieved in a bipartisan fashion in this town in the last 5 years. It's an amazing thing.

At the same time, the Archbishop is much beloved for practicing at home what he preaches around the world. This year, as he pressed the United States to fund debt relief, he forgave the $10 million in debts of poor parishes in his Newark diocese.

Archbishop, we thank you for your devotion to all God's children, and we welcome you to your new home in the diocese of Washington, DC.

These five Americans have made our Nation and the world a better place. May they continue to inspire and guide us all for years to come.

Major, read the citations.

[*At this point, Maj. William F. Mullen III, USMC, Marine Corps Aide to the President, read the citations, and the President presented the Eleanor Roosevelt Awards for Human Rights.*]

The President. Do you want to know what Elaine said to me? [*Laughter*] So I said, "Well, what argument did you make when you were 11 years old?" She said, "I said he didn't have permission to take all those X rays. I mean, I was just 11 years old." [*Laughter*] So this guy was supposed to be the only person on Earth who could have said no to her. [*Laughter*] We need you now, girl. That's good. That's good. [*Laughter*]

The Presidential Medal of Freedom was created by President Truman to honor noble service in times of war. It was expanded by President Kennedy to honor service in times of peace. I have been privileged to award the medal to many champions of liberty.

Today we continue that tradition with a difference. The person we honor, Aung San Suu Kyi of Burma, cannot be with us. In fact,

she doesn't even know we're here today, thinking of her and her struggle in her country. She sits confined, as we speak here, in her home in Rangoon, unable to speak to her people or the world. But her struggle continues, and her spirit still inspires us.

Twelve years ago she went home to Burma to visit her ailing mother and found herself at the helm of a popular movement for democracy and human rights. A decade ago, she led her persecuted party in parliamentary elections that were neither free nor fair; yet they still won 80 percent of the seats. Her victory has never been recognized by the Government of Burma, but her hold on the hearts of the people in Burma has never been broken.

In the years since, she had seen her supporters beaten, tortured, and killed, yet she has never responded to hatred and violence in kind. All she has ever asked for is peaceful dialog. She has been treated without mercy, yet she has preached forgiveness, promising that in a democratic Burma there will be no retribution and nothing but honor and respect for the military.

No one has done more than she to teach us that the desire for liberty is universal, that it is a matter of conscience, not culture. When her son, Alexander, accepted her Nobel Peace Prize, he said she would never accept such an honor in her name, but only in the name of all the people of Burma. I imagine she would say the same thing today—that she would tell us that for all she has suffered, the separation from her family, the loss of her beloved husband, nothing compares to what the Burmese people, themselves, have endured, years of tyranny and poverty in a land of such inherent promise.

Our thoughts are with them. This medal stands for our determination to help them see a better day. The only weapons the Burmese people have are words, reason, and the example of this astonishing, brave woman. Let us add our voices to their peaceful arsenal. Keep using every instrument of influence to support Aung San Suu Kyi's quest for democracy through dialog.

Those who rule Burma should know that they can regain their place in the world only when they regain the trust of their own people and respect their chosen leaders. And the woman we honor today should know, America will always be a friend to freedom in Burma—a friend for as long as it takes to reach the goal for which she has sacrificed so very much.

I would like to ask Alexander to come up here, and I'd like to ask the major to read the citation.

[*At this point, Major Mullen read the citation, and the President presented the Presidential Medal of Freedom.*]

The President. Thank you all for coming today. We are adjourned.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:13 a.m. in Presidential Hall in the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building. The President presented the awards and medal a part of the observance of Human Rights Day. In his remarks, he referred to James Roosevelt, grandson of Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt, and his wife, Ann; Eric P. Schwartz, Senior Director, Multilateral and Humanitarian Affairs, National Security Council; Melanne Verveer, Chief of Staff to the First Lady; Bonnie J. Campbell, Director, Violence Against Women Office, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice; Theresa Loar, Senior Coordinator for International Women's Issues, Department of State; and Gen. John M. Shalikashvili, USA, (Ret.), former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Statement on the Pathways to College Network

December 6, 2000

I applaud today's announcement of the Pathways to College Network, an important partnership that will complement our GEAR UP and TRIO initiatives by helping to put disadvantaged students on track to a college education. While more and more Americans are enrolling in college, too many disadvantaged students in America still lack the support, resources, motivation, and high expectations that they need to succeed.

In today's information economy, education may be the best investment of a lifetime. Over the past 8 years, we have made the largest investment in higher education since the GI bill by increasing Pell grants and creating the HOPE scholarship, the lifetime learning

tax credit, and direct student loans. To help more disadvantaged students get on track for college success, we created the GEAR UP initiative and expanded resources for TRIO.

The Pathways to College Network will build on our effort to expand college opportunities by researching successful programs and using the results to help students across the country. I salute the commitment made by six prominent foundations including the Ford and Gates Foundations, leading nonprofit groups dedicated to college opportunity, and Secretary of Education Riley. The network recognizes that elementary and secondary schools, colleges, universities, and communities must work together if we are to successfully address this issue. There is no higher priority than continuing to work to ensure that all Americans have access to a quality education.

Statement on the Need for Congressional Action on Funding for Child Care

December 6, 2000

Today the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services is releasing an important report showing that in 1999, States were able to provide child care assistance to only 12 percent of all federally eligible low-income working families. Also today, the Children's Defense Fund is releasing a report showing that the cost of child care is the greatest barrier low-income families face in finding quality care for their children. These new findings demonstrate that too many working families are still struggling with the high cost of child care, and we must ensure America's families have access to affordable, quality child care so they can balance their responsibilities both at work and at home. Under my administration, Federal funding for child care has more than doubled, and the 1996 welfare reform law increased child care funding by $4 billion to provide child care assistance to families moving from welfare to work and to other low-income families, but we can do more.

Two months ago we reached a bipartisan agreement with Congress to provide an $817 million increase for the child care and development block grant program, bringing funding to $2 billion. In 2001 this increase would enable the program to provide child care subsidies for nearly 200,000 more children. With these new resources, combined with the child care funds provided as part of welfare reform, the program could serve more than 2.1 million children in 2001, an increase of nearly one million since 1997. We are still meeting only a fraction of the need, but this is a critical step forward. I urge Congress to complete the work it has left undone for more than 2 months and heed the message of these reports by increasing funding for affordable, quality child care. America's working families should not have to wait any longer.

Proclamation 7385—National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day, 2000

December 6, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

While the bitter winds of war raged across much of the world on the morning of December 7, 1941, the United States was still at peace. At Pearl Harbor, the 130 vessels of the U.S. Pacific Fleet lay tranquil in the Sunday silence. Then, at 7:55 a.m., that silence was shattered by the sound of falling bombs and the rattle of machine-gun fire, as the war came home to America.

In making such a devastating preemptive strike, the forces of Imperial Japan sought to weaken our national spirit and cripple our military might. But our attackers would soon learn that they had seriously misjudged the character of the American people and the strength of our democracy. Though 21 ships were sunk or badly damaged, 347 aircraft destroyed or in need of significant repair, and some 3,500 Americans dead or injured, the attack on Pearl Harbor galvanized our Nation into action, reaffirmed our commitment to freedom, and strengthened our resolve to prevail.

Following the attack on Pearl Harbor, millions of Americans volunteered to serve in the Armed Forces. Millions of others filled

factories and shipyards as the great industrial engine of our free enterprise system was harnessed to produce the planes, tanks, ships, and guns that armed the forces of freedom. Many of the ships sunk during the attack on Pearl Harbor were raised and repaired to sail once again with the U.S. Pacific Fleet—the same fleet that in September of 1945 would witness the surrender of Imperial Japan.

On Veterans Day this year, America celebrated the groundbreaking for a memorial in our Nation's capital dedicated to our World War II veterans. This memorial will stand as a testament to the countless brave Americans who responded to the attack on Pearl Harbor and the threat to our freedom by answering the call to service; both at home and overseas. It will also stand as testament to the spirit of a Nation that believes profoundly in the ideals upon which it was founded, and it will serve as an enduring reminder of what Americans can accomplish when we work together to achieve our common goals.

The outpouring of support for this memorial, from young and old alike, shows that the American people's deep conviction in our Nation's values has not diminished in the intervening years. We will never forget the men and women who took up arms in the greatest struggle humanity has ever known; nor will we forget the lessons they taught us: that we must remain ever vigilant, determined, and ready to advance the cause of freedom whenever and wherever it is threatened.

The Congress, by Public Law 103–308, has designated December 7, 2000, as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim December 7, 2000, as National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day. I urge all Americans to observe this day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities in honor of the Americans who served at Pearl Harbor. I also ask all Federal departments and agencies, organizations, and individuals to fly the flag of the United States at half- staff on this day in honor of those Americans who died as a result of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this sixth day of December, in the year of our Lord two thousand, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-fifth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., December 11, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on December 12.

Interview With Jann Wenner of Rolling Stone Magazine

October 10, 2000

Situation in the Middle East

Mr. Wenner. Last time I sat down with you here in the White House and had a long conversation, it was just right after Wye, and you were feeling real good and real happy and really accomplished and, today, considerably different. How are you feeling? You must be exhausted.

The President. Well, one night about 3—when did I stay up all night?

Press Secretary Jake Siewert. It was Friday night.

The President. Yes, Friday night I was up all night talking to them. That's not quite true. I slept an hour, and then maybe I slept another 30 or 40 minutes in different snippets. I'd just fall asleep. But I've been working this hard now.

Today I feel pretty good because the violence has gone down considerably. Prime Minister Barak had a Cabinet meeting that lasted almost all night last night. It did last all night. It broke up about 5 a.m. this morning. And in the middle of it, he came out and announced that the Israelis would suspend their ultimatum because they had some encouragement, and there was so much effort being made by the world diplomatic community.

Mr. Wenner. What are you doing from here, in Washington, at your desk talking on the phone with these guys? I mean, how are you able to effect this, and what do you see your role as now?

The President. Well, I've spent so much time with both of them, and I know quite

a bit about what makes them tick. And I think I understand the pressures they're both under, and I believe I understand what happened here, how they both came to see themselves and their people as victims in this. So I've tried to do what I could to help.

I think that they both became concerned about 24 hours ago, maybe a little more, that this thing could really slide into a much deeper conflict. So at least today we've pulled back from the precipice. Kofi Annan is out there, and I think he's doing some good work there. And of course, there are any number of other people out there trying to make diplomatic efforts to kind of end the violence.

So I feel good today, as compared with yesterday. And I'm sorry that the peace process has been temporarily derailed. Although, if we can end the violence and if we can get agreement between the two sides on some sort of factfinding commission to figure out how this happened and how to keep it from happening again—which was the thing that the U.N. resolution called for, that, in fact, Barak and Arafat had agreed to in Paris. Although they hadn't agreed to the composition of the commission, they had agreed that it ought to be done. If we can do that, the next big step is to begin the negotiations, the peace negotiations, as immediately as possible, because otherwise the sort of public pressures, both within the Middle East and beyond, will get worse.

Mr. Wenner. Were you shocked by what happened? Were you surprised?

The President. Yes, a little bit. I was surprised it spread as quickly as it did. I was surprised that the feelings on both sides could be stripped to the core as quickly as they did, because they've made so much progress and they got so close.

But in a funny way, I think that from the Israeli point of view, Camp David made them feel even more vulnerable because Barak, at Camp David and since, went further by far than any Israeli Prime Minister had gone before. And I think the Palestinians, number one, really thought it wasn't enough to make a peace agreement but also have a different strategy since basically the physical concessions have to be made by Israel—except for what the Palestinians have to agree on security, in terms of joint security presence in what would become a Palestinian area in the West Bank. They have to make agreements on the West Bank territory, on the right-of-return language in the U.N. resolutions, who gets to come back, and if they don't come back, what is their compensation. They have to resolve Jerusalem, and they have to deal with security.

Interestingly enough, because it was the most concrete with the fewest number of unpredictable consequences in the future, they made more progress at Camp David on security than anything else. They also had a habit of working together on security and getting along. But I think that the Israelis sort of felt aggrieved that they didn't get more done, because they offered so much. Then the Palestinians felt provoked by what happened on the Temple Mount with——

Mr. Wenner. Sharon?

The President. Yes.

Mr. Wenner. Let's not get too far into this——

The President. We don't have to get into the weeds, but the point is that then a whole series of events happened where each side began—with each successive event it seemed that each side misunderstood the other more.

Mr. Wenner. Does any of it tend to piss you off about the relationships that you formed with—you formed a very strong relationship with Arafat and also Barak. Did it change your mind any, when you get into this—goddammit, Yasser—you have the same interpreter, right, that you used to share?

The President. Yes.

Mr. Wenner. So you've got a close relationship. Doesn't that——

The President. Well, it's frustrating.

Mr. Wenner. This will all be settled by the time this comes out, so just speak your mind. [*Laughter*]

The President. It will all be settled, or it won't by the time this comes out.

The whole thing is frustrating, but you've got to realize we're dealing with fundamental questions of identity. What Jack Lew was saying at Rosh Hashanah, though—the Jews go back and read the story of Abraham and Sarah giving birth to Isaac. I was thinking it's interesting how the circumstances under which the sons of Abraham were born and

became separated. And it sounds like sort of epic family tragedy, and they just sort of keep replaying it down through the years.

That's the thing that bothers me. I just hope that somehow, you know, at this moment, however long it takes, we'll get beyond that. To the outsider who cares about them both, it seems so self-evident that the only acceptable answer is for them to find a way to live together in peace.

President's Future Plans

Mr. Wenner. Changing the subject a little bit. When you're out of office, what are the three or four issues you think you're going to want to most focus on and be most concerned with?

The President. Well, first of all, I haven't quite figured out what to do and how to do it, because I'm so into what I've been doing. I've laid the basic plans for my library and policy center. And I know I'm going to have an office in New York, because I'll be there, as well. And I've talked to a lot of people in general terms about it.

But I decided that I would try to be effective in this job right up until the end. And in order to do it, I can't be spending vast amounts of time kind of planning out my next step. I also think I probably need a couple months to kind of just rest, relax, sleep—rest, get a little perspective.

I've thought a lot about ex-Presidencies. There have been two really great ones in history, John Quincy Adams and Jimmy Carter, and they were very different. Quincy Adams went back to the House of Representatives and became the leading spokesman for abolition. *

You see the Washington Monument right behind us that actually, in his last term in Congress, was Abraham Lincoln's only term in the House, and they stood together on that mound when the Washington Monument was dedicated.

But Jimmy Carter used the Carter Center to do very specific things. He works on human rights, election monitoring, getting rid of river blindness in Africa, agricultural self-sufficiency. From time to time, he's engaged in various peace issues, primarily in Africa. And he works here at home on Habitat for Humanity, which is now, by the way, the third-biggest home-builder in America—stunning thing—and also involved all over the world. I've been to Habitat sites in Africa, or one in Africa, but there are more than one. There are lots of them over there.

So the challenge is to trade power and authority broadly spread for influence and impact tightly concentrated. That's basically the challenge. And I'm sure I'll be interested; I'll try to do a lot on the areas that I've always been involved in, this whole area of racial and religious reconciliation at home and around the world, economic empowerment of poor people, something I'm very interested in here and around the world.

As we speak, I still don't know for sure whether the new markets initiative that the Speaker of the House and I have built such a broad bipartisan coalition for will pass. We've got 300-some votes for it in the House. It's really got a chance to be one of the signature achievements of this Congress, and it is something that Republicans ought to like, because it basically involves getting private capital into poor areas in America.

And then I've got a big initiative to relieve the debt of the world's poorest countries that will put the money into education, health care, and development back home, if they get the debt relief. So that's something that I've always been very interested in. We make 2 million microcredit loans a year around the world, under AID in my administration. We set up——

Mr. Wenner. The Grameen Bank model.

The President. The what?

Mr. Wenner. The model of the Grameen Bank.

The President. Grameen Bank—Grameen Bank in Bangladesh and in America, the South Shore Bank. We set up a community development financial institution program here in America, and we fund those here in America, as well. So we've done a lot of work on that.

And I'm very interested in this whole idea of the relationship of energy to economic growth and the challenge of global warming, which I believe is real. And I believe we can break the iron link between how nations get rich and how they deal with the environment.

* White House correction.

I don't think—I think the energy realities of the world have changed drastically in the last 10 years, and they're about to really change with the development of fuel cell engines, alternative fuels. And there's also—we've funded a lot of research on biofuels—not just ethanol from corn, but you can make biofuels out of grass. You can cut the grass out here and make fuel out of it.

But the conversion is not good. It takes about 7 gallons of gasoline to make about 8 gallons of biofuel. But they're working on research which would lead to one gallon of gasoline making 8 gallons. So I'm interested in all that.

I'm interested in the breakdown of public health systems around the world. AIDS, TB, and malaria kill one in every four people that die every year now, those three diseases.

Mr. Wenner. So you would set up something like—you're very mindful of the Carter Center.

The President. I don't know. I don't know how I'm going to do it. I'm thinking about it. I've explored a lot of ideas, but I'm going to take some time when I get out to think about it. I also want to make sure that whatever I do, I give the next President time to be President, and whatever I do, I don't get in the way of the next President, because a country can only have one President at a time, and I want to be supportive of that.

Theodore Roosevelt

Mr. Wenner. Well, you must have obviously thought a lot about Teddy Roosevelt. I mean, you are—or he—are the youngest—you're the youngest President since Teddy Roosevelt, to come out of a successful Presidency, and be in your midfifties, because of your powers, really, and energy. Do you compare yourself much to him? Have you thought much about him?

The President. Well, I think the time in which I served was very much like the time in which he served. And I think the job I had to do was quite a lot like—there are some interesting historical parallels with the job he had to do, because he basically was—his job was to manage the transition of America from an agricultural to an industrial power, and from essentially an isolationist to an international nation. In my time, we were managing the transition from an industrial to an information age, and from a cold-war world to a multipolar, more interdependent world. And so I've always thought these periods had a lot in common.

But when Teddy Roosevelt left, he served almost 8 full years, because McKinley was killed in 1901, shortly after he was inaugurated. But he thought he really should observe the two-term tradition that George Washington had established—that his cousin would later break in the war—before, the election was right before the war. But World War II was already going on when Franklin Roosevelt was—but anyway, Roosevelt, when he got out, then he felt Taft had betrayed his progressive legacy. So he spent a lot of the rest of his life—he built a whole third-party-new-political movement and promoted what he called the New Nationalism around America. And he was a very important political force.

But I think in some ways the impact he might have had was a little tempered by his evident disappointment at not being President anymore. And I think—that's not an option for me, because I can't run again, because now there's the 22d amendment. Roosevelt didn't have the 22d amendment. So it's not a real issue for me. So I've got to try to use whatever influence and networks and friendships and support I've built up around the world and here at home just to have a positive impact, to be an effective citizen. And I think I'll find a way to do it.

22d Amendment

Mr. Wenner. If there wasn't the 22d amendment, would you run again?

The President. Oh, I probably would have run again.

Mr. Wenner. Do you think you would have won?

The President. Yes. I do.

Press Secretary Siewert. That was an "if." [*Laughter*]

The President. But it's hard to say because it's entirely academic. It's such a——

Mr. Wenner. On the other hand, you've got the advantages of the incumbency; you've got the highest popularity rating of any President; the economy is doing good. It looks like you would have won in a walk. Do you

think the 22d amendment is such a good idea? Is it really consistent with democracy, to have this kind of term limit on a President?

The President. I think the arguments for executive term limits are better than the arguments for——

Mr. Wenner. Congressional?

The President. ——all legislative term limits. I've never supported legislative term limits. I don't think they're good ideas. But I think the arguments for executive term limits, on balance, are pretty compelling. I mean, I have an extra amount of energy, and I love this job, and I love the nature of this work. But maybe it's better to leave when you're in pretty good shape, too. Better to leave when you're in good shape.

I think maybe they should—maybe they should put "consecutive" there. Maybe they should limit it to two consecutive terms. Because now what's going to happen is—see, Teddy Roosevelt was young but not so young for his time. He was the youngest person to have been President, but he died at 61. Now, anybody that lives to be 65 has a life expectancy of 82. So you're going to see people who—most people mature, politically—and it's like all different activities have—gymnasts are tops at 14 or 15, basketball players at 25 or 28.

Mr. Wenner. Presidents?

The President. Presidents normally about 50, 51. Roosevelt was 51 when he was elected. Lincoln was 51 when he was elected. In their early fifties, most Presidents do their best.

Mr. Wenner. Retirement is functionally the early fifties.

The President. Yes. And now you're going to have more and more people, particularly that come after me, living much longer lives. So we might decide——

Mr. Wenner. Is that enough time to repeal the 22d amendment, get that through?

The President. No. This is not really about me, because my time is up. But I think that if—you can't predict all the challenges the country will face in the future and whether someone uniquely suited to a given moment will be there. So maybe they should—but I'm just saying, you may have people operating at a very high level of efficiency, in politics, from age 50 to age 80 in the future, because of the changes in the human life cycle that are going to come about as a result of the human genome and pharmaceutical developments and all kind of other things we're learning. We may be able to reverse Parkinson's. We may be able to reverse Alzheimer's. So there's going to be a lot of things that are different about aging in the future. We're going to have to totally rethink it in ways we can't imagine.

And if it seems appropriate, then I think some future Congress may give the States a chance to at least limit the President to two consecutive terms, and then if the people need a person, a man or a woman, to come back in the future, they can bring them back. That might happen. It may take decades, but it wouldn't surprise me if it happened simply because of the lifestyle, the length of life we're looking at.

Mr. Wenner. Not to drag this out—people say that you love campaigning. I mean, that you don't stop campaigning in all aspects. I mean, how are you going to sort of withdraw from that in the next couple of years? How do you stop campaigning?

The President. I don't know. I do like politics. But I like governance, too. I like policy. I liked it all. That's one of the reasons why I've been so fortunate in my life; I got to do something that was basically about politics and policy and governing, and in executive positions, being a Governor for a dozen years and President for 8. I got to deal with politics, policy, and governing, the three things that I really loved. And I think I got better at it all as I went along.

I'm very interested—I think I'll spend a lot of time helping other people. I'm thrilled about Hillary running as we do this interview. I believe she will win. I hope she will, and I believe she will. I have worked very hard with Tony Blair to try to build this network around the world of kind of likeminded political leaders, and if I can be helpful to them, I want to be. So I'm sure that, from time to time, I'll get a chance to do a little politics after I leave here.

But I'm also looking forward to a different chapter in my life. I mean, this is an interesting challenge. I'm still young enough to learn how to do new and different things. And it's exciting to me. There's never been

a period in my life that I didn't enjoy and find challenging and rewarding. And so I just need a little time to get my bearings and hope I'm not too old to change.

Gays in the Military

Mr. Wenner. Going back to the beginning, one of the first things you did in your earlier term was trying to overthrow the military ban on gay people. Why did this backfire, and what did you learn from that?

The President. Well, I think it backfired partly because the people that were against it were clever enough to force it, force the pace of it. I tried to slow it down, but the first week I was President, Senator Dole, who saw it as, I think, an opportunity, pushed a vote in the Senate disapproving of it. And I tried to put it off for 6 months, and the Joint Chiefs came down and raised hell about it. And I wanted to do it the way Harry Truman—Harry Truman issued an order saying, "Integrate the military. Come back in 3 years or 2 years, whatever, and tell me how you're going to do it." And a lot of the gay groups wanted it done right away and had no earthly idea of what kind of—I think they were shocked by the amount of congressional opposition.

So a lot of people think I just sort of compromised with the military because they asked me to. That's not what happened. A lot of people have forgotten that. We knew that there were—at least 75 percent of the House would vote against my policy. So if I were going to sustain a different policy and have it withstand congressional action, I had to have a veto-proof minority in one House or another. But what happened was, the Senate voted 68–32 against my policy, which meant that I could not sustain my policy in either House, which meant they were going to enact it over my—they were going to, in a sense, ratify the status quo in law.

And it was only at that time that I worked out with Colin Powell this "don't ask, don't tell" thing, went to the War College, and explained what the policy was going to be based on, what we had agreed—the agreement we had reached together. And then they wrote that into law. And then we had several years of problems where it was not being implemented in any way consistent with my speech at the War College, which General Powell agreed with every word of, which we'd worked out.

So Bill Cohen has now changed the training and a lot of the other elements that contributed to the fact that this policy continued to have a lot of abuse in it, and I think it's better now. But I still don't think it's the right policy. I think the policy I implemented originally, that I wanted to implement was the right policy.

Mr. Wenner. Would you do it any differently? Do you wish you could have done it differently?

The President. I don't know. I think that what I would like to do, what I wish I had been able to do, is to get an agreement on the part of everybody involved to take this out of politics and look at it.

But the Republicans decided that they didn't want me to have a honeymoon, that they wanted to make me the first President without one, that we were living in a 24-hour news cycle and that the press would happily go along with my not getting a honeymoon and that they would make this the opening salvo.

And they understood—and I didn't understand exactly what I know now about how what we do here plays out in the country. Because they've added up, first—but because it was one of my campaign commitments and I refused to back off of it, the message out in the country was, "We elected this guy to turn the economy around, and his top priority is gays in the military." That's not true. It was Bob Dole's top priority.

Bob Dole's top priority was making this the controversy that would consume the early days of my Presidency, and it was a brilliant political move by him, because at the time I was not experienced enough in the ways of Washington to know how to explain to the American people what was going on. If it happened to me again, I would say, "Why is this the Republicans' top priority? I don't want to deal with this now. This is their top priority. We can deal with this in 6 months when the study is done; let's take care of the American people now."

And if it happened now, all the gay groups, who are now much more sophisticated about dealing in Washington than they were then,

would come in and say, "That's absolutely right. Why is he doing this? We don't want this dealt with now. We want to deal with"—and we would put it back on them. They would be in the hot box, and we could win it.

But the country has come a long way on gay rights issues since '93. Because keep in mind, we did drop the ban on gays in security positions, national security positions. We had done a whole lot of other things to advance a lot of the causes that the gay rights community wanted. So we have made a lot of progress there—plus all the people I've appointed.

And I think the country has moved on that issue. The country is overwhelmingly for hate crimes legislation. The country supports employment nondiscrimination legislation. The only reason that we can't get those through the Congress is that the leadership of the Republican Party is way to the right of the country.

Mr. Wenner. You know, historically, politicians have never, ever done much for gay rights. But gay issues are in the mainstream—certainly, for instance, Reagan, who was very funny with gay people and had lots of experience in Hollywood. Why did you take it upon yourself, particularly in light of the political heat, to advance the causes of gay people?

The President. I believed in it. It's not very complicated. I just said, from the time I was a kid, I had known people who were gay, and I believed that their lives were hard enough without having to be hassled about it. I saw it as a civil rights issue.

I also didn't buy the kind of conservative attack on them, that this was sort of a conscious choice to have a depraved lifestyle. I had had enough gay friends since I was a young man to know that—to believe, at least, that that's not the case. So I saw it as a civil rights issue. I believed in it.

I also thought that as a white southern Protestant, who could obviously talk to a lot of the so-called Reagan Democrats, the people we had lost that came back, that I was in a unique position to do it. And Al Gore, I must say, reinforced that, because he felt it at least as strongly as I did, and he wanted to do something about it. And we thought that we could do that for the same reason we thought we ought to take on the NRA. You know, that if we couldn't do it, coming from where we came from with our backgrounds and kind of out of the culture we came from, and understanding that opposing elements, who could do it? When would it ever get done? And so we did.

Mr. Wenner. Congratulations. The climate is 1,000 percent different than it was.

The President. You know, if that whole gays in the military thing came up today, I don't think it would be handled in the same way. It might not be that we could win it today, but today we would get a civilized response, and we'd have a long study. There would be hearings. People would handle this straight. It wouldn't just be a—it would be handled in a whole different way today. The climate has changed, I think, rather dramatically.

Boy Scouts

Mr. Wenner. What about what's going on with the Boy Scouts? Were you disappointed with the Supreme Court decision, and what do you think you, as President, can do about that?

The President. Well, I can't do anything as President about the Supreme Court decision.

Mr. Wenner. Were you disappointed with it—not about the decision but about the Boy Scouts?

The President. I think the Boy Scouts were wrong. I think what the Boy Scouts were reacting to was one of these stereotypes for which there is no evidence whatever, which is that adult—gay adults are more likely to abuse children than straight adults, sexually. I think that's what was going on. It's a stereotype. It's not true. There is no evidence to support it. But I think that—I think that's what was behind that. The Scouts were scared. Now, apparently, the Girl Scouts have no such prohibitions and have had no known problems.

Mr. Wenner. Well, there are less gay girls than there are gay guys—Girl Scouts.

The President. I'm not sure about that.

Mr. Wenner. I don't know. I'm just bullshitting. [*Laughter*]

The President. I doubt that. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Wenner. You're smart. You are smart, Mr. President. [*Laughter*]

Is there something—doesn't the President have an official capacity with the Boy Scouts as, like, an honorary chairperson or something like that?

The President. Oh, yes. And the gay groups asked me—not the gay groups, the press asked me if I would—whether I should resign from that. The President is always the honorary chairman of the Boy Scouts. And it's going to be interesting when we have our first woman President, if they make her the honorary chair of the Girl Scouts, or she gets to be the honorary chair of the Boy Scouts. [*Laughter*] That will be a kick. [*Laughter*]

Anyway, and I decided I shouldn't, and I think that's right. Because I think that—first, I think the Scouts do a world of good, and in our time they have begun to be more active in the cities, which I think is really important, to go into a lot of these places where the kids don't have a lot of family or community support. And I think that it's near the end of my term, so it would just be like a symbolic thing that would, in my view, probably cause more harm than good.

And I think it's better for me to say I disagree with the position they took and try to persuade them to change their position, which I hope they will do, because I think——

Mr. Wenner. It seems like there are so many States and communities that are moving to pressure them.

The President. To change?

Mr. Wenner. Yes.

The President. Yes, I think there should be a lot of grassroots pressure on them to change. But that's where they will change.

Mr. Wenner. That's a surprise.

The President. That's where they'll change. They'll change at the grassroots level. But what's happening is—look, the overwhelming thing which changes people's attitudes on these issues is personal contact, personal experience.

I'll tell you a little story. When we did the gays in the military thing, I got—not my pollster, another guy that I knew sent me a poll he had done saying this is a political disaster for you, and here's why—but that's not the reason, the point I'm telling you. The polls showed by 48 to 45, people agreed with my position in 1993.

But when asked, do you strongly—so I won it, 48–45. But among those who felt intensely, I lost it 36–18 or 15—36–15.

Mr. Wenner. Not a single-cause vote at all.

The President. No, but for the antis, it was a single-issue vote. For the pros, it was, "You know, I'm broadminded; I've got a lot of other things on my mind."

Press Secretary Siewert. They're still mad at Cheney for what he said the other day.

The President. Yes. What did Cheney say?

Press Secretary Siewert. He wasn't hard over against—he wasn't hard enough over against gay marriage or civil unions.

The President. Let me make the larger point. But in this poll, interestingly enough—now, again, this was '93—there was not a huge gender gap; there was not even a huge regional gap, as you might expect with the South being way bigger than anyplace else. There were only two big gaps. People who identified themselves as evangelical Christians were 72–22 against my position. People who said yes to the question, "Have you personally known a gay person?" were 66–33 for my position.

So this is a matter of personal experience, and the country will come to this. They will come to the right place on this. Most gay people kept their sexual preference secret for a long time. A lot of venerable institutions in society that worry about their respectability and impact—and the Boy Scouts is such a venerable institution—what they're really dealing with is people coming out much more than affirmative prejudice.

It's like, "Hey, let's go back to the way it used to be where people didn't say and I didn't have to deal with this." That's what I believe, anyway. Because I remember—I grew up in a southern town. One of my teachers was gay. There was a gay doctor in my hometown that some people knew and didn't talk about.

So we're dealing with a huge kind of—and this goes to the core of how people think about themselves and how you work through

all this. We'll get there. We'll get there. But it's a matter of personal contact.

Richard Nixon

Mr. Wenner. In your first year in office, you regularly talked with Richard Nixon. What did you two talk about, and what were your impressions?

The President. He came up here. Do you remember that?

Mr. Wenner. Vaguely.

The President. He came to the White House. I had Nixon back at the White House. I've got a letter that I treasure that Nixon wrote me about Russia a month to the day before he died. And it was—how old was he then, 80, 81?

Mr. Wenner. Yes.

The President. It was really a lucid, eloquent letter. Have you ever seen that letter, Jake?

Press Secretary Siewert. No.

The President. You know, it was sort of his take on where Russia was and—the early part of my Presidency.

Press Secretary Siewert. He went to Russia right before he died.

The President. That's correct. He went there. He came back. He wrote me a letter about where he thought things were, and a month later he was gone.

Well, I had him back here. I just thought that I ought to do it. He lived kind of in the—he had lived what I thought was a fundamentally constructive life in his years out of the White House. He had written all these books. He tried to—and he tried to be a constructive force in world affairs. And I thought that he had paid quite a high price for what he did, and I just thought it would be a good thing for the country to invite him back.

Mr. Wenner. So when he came up, what was it like when he came here? Was that the first time you had met him, in a way that—spend any time?

The President. Actually it's funny, because I had had two other chances in my life to meet him. We were somewhere in 1969—we were at a dinner. I was working here in the summer—1970—and there was a dinner where he was, and I didn't go shake hands with him, because I was young and mad about the Vietnam war.

And then in the 1980's sometime, we were in the same hotel in Hong Kong. We were staying in the Peninsula Hotel in Hong Kong. I was there on a trade mission, and I was supposed to meet him, and somehow or another it got messed up. I can't remember what happened.

Mr. Wenner. But when he came here, what was that like? What was he like? He was kind of a stiff guy, right?

The President. Yes. He met my daughter, who was then going to Sidwell, and his mother was a Quaker, and I think his children went there, or at least had some association with Quaker schools. So he had this long talk with Chelsea about—who was then 13—about Sidwell and Quaker schools. But it was rather touching, because he seemed still, after all this time, somewhat ill at ease in personal conversations with people he didn't know. But it was obvious to me that he had thought about what he would say when he met my daughter.

Mr. Wenner. How was he like to you? I mean, did he treat you like the young man, or was he nervous?

The President. He sort of identified—it's interesting, he told me he identified with me because he thought the press had been too hard on me in '92 and that I had refused to die, and he liked that. He said a lot of life was just hanging on. So we had a good talk about that. [*Laughter*]

But I found it interesting—I always thought that he could have been—he did some good things, and I always thought he could have been a great President if he had been more, somehow, trusting of the American people, you know. I thought that somewhere way back there, his—something happened in terms of his ability to just feel at home, at ease with the ebb and flow of human life and popular opinion.

And I think also, some of his weaknesses were reinforced by the way he rose to national prominence, because he got elected to Congress by convincing people Jerry Voorhees was soft on communism, and he got elected to the Senate by convincing people that Helen Gahagan Douglas was soft on communism. Then he busted Alger Hiss and got to be Vice President when he was, I don't know, 38 years old—37. He was just a kid.

Because he was only—Kennedy was 43 and Nixon was 46, I think. Nixon was my age. Nixon would have been, had he won in '60, would have been as young as I was when he got elected.

So I think all of a sudden, boom, one term in the Congress, a couple years as a Senator, boom, you're Vice President, 8 years as Vice President, and how did you do this? You did this by sort of whipping popular opinion up into this frenzy by demonizing your opponent as being a little pink.

And I think that kind of reinforced some of his weaknesses. Whereas, if he had had to run like I did, in a little State, where you had to go to every country crossroads, people expect you to run the Governor's office like a country store, and you were used to brutal campaigns and used to trusting people to sort of see through them, if you fought them out hard enough, I think it might have rounded him in a different way. I think it might have prepared him a little.

Mr. Wenner. By all accounts, he was a nicer guy before the Jerry Voorhees campaign—and that there is something in that. And it wasn't even an idea he liked.

The President. Well, look, when he ran for President, he got 35 percent of the black vote. If he had a good record on civil rights—and for a Republican, he had a good record in the House and the Senate. And you know, there is no—when he got to be President, he signed the EPA and OSHA and a lot of other stuff. The guy had some—and he had a very fertile policy mind. He could get out of his ideological box. Remember, it was Nixon that imposed wage and price controls in 1971.

Mr. Wenner. And effectively.

The President. He understood that. He understood that only a Republican could go to China.

Nation-Building Presidents

Mr. Wenner. Which Presidents do you feel the most affinity for, in terms of the way—the problems they faced and the way they've handled them? We spoke a little bit about the similarity with Teddy Roosevelt. Are there any others that you feel a particular kinship to?

The President. Well, I think Roosevelt and Wilson—except I didn't have a war, thank God. But Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson had the same—during that whole period, they were dealing with the kinds of challenges that I have dealt with, both at home and around the world. And so I identified with them a lot.

There are a lot of others that I like, but I think Harry Truman, in a funny way—even though most of the ideas, like the U.N. and the international institutions, a lot of them were hatched and germinated when Roosevelt was still alive—Truman also had to create a new era, had to organize a world where our commitment to the world was not an option after the Second World War. But we had to create a set of international institutions where we could be leaders, but in which we were also interdependent. And that's what not only the U.N. but also NATO, the Marshall plan, and the Bretton Woods institutions that have been—that we've tried so hard to modify in my time.

And Truman—I liked Truman a lot. I'm from Arkansas, and we border Missouri. I was raised on Harry Truman.

Mr. Wenner. The McCulloch book made him look just great.

The President. Yes, it did. David McCulloch did a great job on that book. But I think he was pretty great. If you read Merle Miller's "Plain Speaking"—it's a much earlier book—it also made him look pretty good, and he was an old man when he did a lot of that talking. But he was pretty great.

Mr. Wenner. ——across the street from his house, in the Hay Adams Hotel, walk across the street and come to work.

The President. Yes.

Mr. Wenner. I mean, those are the—the modern Presidents. And you just gave a speech about sort of identifying a progressive tradition of which you feel that you are a part of and trying to sort of consciously come to terms with the idea of——

The President. Have you read—Wilson and FDR, and it ends in Johnson—I can't remember if he put Truman or Kennedy in it or not—but this whole sort of tradition of progressivism, of using Government as an instrument of social justice and economic progress. And so they were—Princeton,

where obviously—where Woodrow Wilson was president, did a seminar, or a 2-day symposium, excuse me, on the Progressive Era, on the Presidencies of Roosevelt and Wilson. So they asked me to come and speak about that and about the relevance of that for the work I had done. So I talked about that. But I also said that they were part of a larger tradition that I also felt that this time was a part of, which was defining the Union, defining what America was.

In the beginning of this country, there was a big debate. When we started the—after we ratified the Constitution, there was a huge debate early on between George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, and John Marshall on the one hand, and Thomas Jefferson and all his allies on the other, about whether we would have a strong nation and what did that mean. And you know, John Marshall subsequently became Chief Justice, and wrote all the great nation-building decisions of the first 20 years of the 19th century.

But even before that—and Alexander Hamilton you remember, wanted to build a great, strong national financial system. George Washington supported him. That's what the Federalists were. They wanted a Federal Government that was strong. The Republicans wanted more than the Articles of Confederation, but not all that much more. Now, as I said, when Thomas Jefferson got elected President, he was glad the other side won, because he used that to buy Louisiana and send Lewis and Clark out, which are two of the most important things in the first half of the 19th century that were done.

And Louisiana cost only $15 million, but that was one year's Federal budget at that time. Can you imagine what the Congress would say if I said, "Hey, I've got a deal for you, and it just costs $1.9 trillion. Let's go do this"? So that was the first battle.

The second battle was the battle to define the Union in terms of who was part of it. That's what Abraham Lincoln, you know, lived and died for. Gary Wills has argued brilliantly that he, in effect, rewrote the Constitution, the common meaning of the Constitution, for the Gettysburg Address, and brought it closer to the natural meaning of the words—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. So that was the second time.

Then the third time we had to redefine the Union was under Woodrow Wilson—Teddy Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, whom we had—one, we moved into an industrial era, and we had this huge wave of immigrants coming into our cities, into our factories. And we had to define, number one, what the role of the Nation was in incorporating all these people and defining the conditions of civilized life—child labor, minimum work week, all that stuff. And number two, what the role of the Government was in mediating between the industrial society and the civil society, which was the antitrust laws, in an economic sense, and in a larger sense, all that land Teddy Roosevelt set aside, when people first began to worry about pollution and using natural resources and all that. Teddy Roosevelt partly was able to be our first great conservation President, because people could see that growth in pollution could take away some of our natural resources.

And then, of course, Wilson built on that with a social agenda and then defining our responsibilities in the world in terms of World War I and his argument for the League of Nations, which ultimately prevailed, even though he lost it. So that was the second great time.

And then the third great time was Roosevelt in the Depression and in World War II, and afterward, Roosevelt and Truman had this—excuse me, the fourth time. You had the beginning, Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson. Then you had the fourth great period, was this period, because what they were doing is, they had first to essentially bring the Government into the heart of the management of the economy. That's what—the Federal Reserve and all that had been created, but we didn't really manage the economy until the Depression. Then there was this whole idea that the responsibility of the Government to help build and sustain a middle class society, everything from Social Security to the GI bill.

Then, after the war, what they had to do was create the conditions of permanent involvement of America in the world, because Teddy Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson got

us involved in the world in a leadership way, and then we just walked away from it and paid the consequences. So the cold war was on us after the war. So basically Roosevelt and Harry Truman built the structures within which America could lead and operate in an interdependent world.

And I would argue that this period is the fifth great period of nation-defining. Because we have to define what the role of Government is in an information global society, both in terms of empowering people to make the most of their own lives, dealing with a far greater array of racial and religious and social diversity than we've ever had before, and dealing with a world that is very different than the world of the cold war, or the world before that that we used to move in and out of.

So we had to have the permanence of involvement that we had in the cold war, with a greater degree of interdependence than we had in the cold war, because it's not a bipolar world. So we have a different set of challenges. And my election spawned a reaction in the Gingrich revolution, or the Gingrich counterrevolution, where if you go back and look at all their arguments for weakening the Federal Government, for toughening stands against immigrants, for turning away from the civil rights claims of gays, for refusing to strictly enforce the civil rights laws, and strengthen laws protecting women, the whole social and economic agenda they had—and Government is bad; the private sector is good—basically, they were trying to rewrite the Progressive Era that we built up over this time, and we, I think, essentially defeated them in three stages.

One was when they shut the Government down, and we beat their budget back. Then we went on to get a bipartisan welfare reform and Balanced Budget Act and the biggest expansion in child health—under the Gingrich Congress, the biggest expansion in child health since Medicaid. Two was impeachment. And three was when, after Gingrich was gone, I vetoed their big tax cut last year, and the public stuck with me.

Now, I don't know if you saw it, but earlier this week Al Hunt had a piece on Rick Santorum saying, where have all the conservatives gone, in pointing out that all these guys with these rightwing records were out there running away from what they did, running as the new moderates. And in a way, that's a form of flattery.

But the point is, every forward progress in this country has always sparked a reaction. And they won some of their reactions. I didn't prevail on health care. I didn't prevail on gays in the military. I haven't won every fight I've been in. But the big things that would have taken us down and taken the country in a different direction—the budget and Government shutdown, impeachment, and the big tax cut—those three things were the seminal battles, and we prevailed.

And if you look at it, if you look at the arguments that we're having, you can go all the way back to the beginning, and it's the same sort of thing that you saw in the fight that Washington and Marshall and Hamilton had with Jefferson and his crowd; that Lincoln had with the people that were against him, and you know, divided the country; that Teddy Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson had with the people against them; that FDR and Truman had with the people against them.

Interestingly enough, little piece of anecdotal evidence, there was a fabulous article in a paper the other day about all the people, Republicans all over America giving money to this Rick Lazio, running against Hillary. And there's a story about him going to—did I tell you this? In the New York Times, in the story about it, about how everybody that hates me or hates her or hates us both, this is their big deal, so they want to give money to Lazio.

So he's at a fundraiser in Alabama—Alabama. And there's a guy that says, "I just can't stand him." He says, "She's a carpetbagger"—and he didn't mean to New York; he meant to Arkansas—"and he is a scalawag." Now, the scalawags were the Southerners who supported the Union in the Civil War. And after the Civil War, all the Southerners who fought for the Confederacy were disenfranchised. So the only people that could vote were the scalawags, the carpetbaggers, and the blacks.

So that guy was actually exhibit A of my argument that I'm making. He was absolutely right. If I'd been there then, that's exactly what I would have been.

And one of the reasons they dislike me so intensely, that crowd, is they think I betrayed—they worked very hard, under the cover of Reagan, being quite nice, to basically have the old, conservative, white southern male culture dominate the political life of America. And they see me as an apostate, which I welcome. I mean, we have this—so when I take on the NRA or do something for gay rights, to them it's worse if I do it. It's like a Catholic being pro-choice. That's sort of that deal.

So when he said I was a scalawag, the guy knew exactly what he was saying, and he did—for anybody that read it, did a great service, because he was absolutely accurate. I have no quarrel with what he said. That's basically the great fault line we've been fighting through.

Mr. Wenner. Like Roosevelt, you're a traitor to your class?

The President. Yes.

Mr. Wenner. Like FDR?

The President. Yes. A traitor to my caste. [*Laughter*] But it's very interesting, when you see sometime—when an adversary of yours says something that you 100 percent agree with, the guy is absolutely right. That's why he's against me, and that's what I've tried to be in my whole life. I mean, I had a grandfather with a fourth grade education, fifth grade education, who was for integration of the schools. I mean, that's who we are.

And we were still having the Lincoln fight in the South, when I was a boy in school.

Mr. Wenner. They're trying to drag you out of here.

The President. I know. We'll finish.

Mr. Wenner. We've got two and a half pages done. [*Laughter*]

The President. It's good, though. Just set up another time. I owe it to him. We'll do one more. I just love Rolling Stone. They've been so good to me.

Mr. Wenner. I'd just like the long view and your philosophy about where we're going, what you've seen, and what you think about America. I want to ask you questions about, you know, what have you learned about the American people. You've had a unique exposure to them that nobody else has ever had.

The President. I'll tell you this. When I leave office, on January 20th, I will leave even more idealistic than I was the day I took the oath of office, 8 years earlier.

Mr. Wenner. Why?

The President. Because the American people almost—they are fundamentally good, and they almost always get it right if they have enough time and enough information. Now, they've got to have enough information. They've got to have enough time. They have to have a way to access it.

But the biggest problem we have in public discourse today is, there's plenty of information out there, but you don't know what's true and what's not, and it's hard to access it. It's all kind of flying at you at once. It's hard to have time to digest it. But if people have the information, they have time to digest it, they nearly always get it right. And if that weren't the case, we wouldn't be around here after 226 years.

I'm glad to see you.

NOTE: The interview was taped at 3:10 p.m. in the Solarium at the White House, and the transcript was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 7. In his remarks, the President referred to Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel; United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan; Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority; Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom; historian and author Gary Wills; and journalist Al Hunt. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Interview With Jann Wenner of Rolling Stone Magazine

November 2, 2000

Mr. Wenner. Thank you for your time; I appreciate it. It takes time to do something like this.

The President. Good.

2000 Presidential Election

Mr. Wenner. Why do you think the race is so tight, given the economy, the issues, the incumbency? How could it get to be this close?

The President. Well, I think for one thing, things have been good for a long time, and I think a lot of people may take it for granted and may not have—they may not be as clear

as they should be, which I hope we can use the last week to do, on what specific policies contributed to it and what could undermine it. I think that's one issue.

I also think that, you know, there's not as much general awareness as there might be about the differences between the two parties on health care, education, the environment, and crime, where I believe that the things we've done over the last 8 years had a measurable impact on all those things going in the right direction.

And a lot of—most Presidential races are fairly close, you know, because a lot of Presidential voting is cultural.

Mr. Wenner. The way you were raised.

The President. Well, the way you were raised and sort of the neighborhood you live in, your socioeconomic and ethnic background. I mean, a lot of it's cultural. So I think there are a lot of reasons it's close.

Also, keep in mind, in the history of our Republic, only two Vice Presidents have ever been directly elected President. One of them—when Martin Van Buren succeeded Andrew Jackson, we were effectively a one-party country then. And the other, when George Bush defeated Michael Dukakis, the country was not in as good a shape as it is now, but it was in pretty good shape, and Bush basically destroyed Dukakis. It was a hugely negative campaign with a lot of charges that were never effectively rebutted.

So this has been a much more positive race. There have been differences on the issues, but neither one of them has called each other's patriotism into question or whether they're normal Americans. Basically, the rap that was put on Dukakis was like reverse plastic surgery. So I think that that explains it largely.

Demands of the Presidency

Mr. Wenner. At the end of the interview, I'm going to ask you to make a bet with me.

What physical change in you says that you've served 8 years and it's a job that really takes a toll?

The President. Well, I think I'm in better shape, better health than I was 8 years ago, in a lot of ways. My hair is gray. I think that's about it. I've got a few wrinkles I didn't have 8 years ago.

But I've held up pretty well. I've had a good time. I've enjoyed it. I couldn't help my hair going gray. It would probably have gone gray if I hadn't become President.

Oklahoma City and Columbine

Mr. Wenner. One of the most important jobs that you, as a President, have is to talk to the country in the wake of national tragedies, frame the issues for the American people. I'm going to ask you about two of the things that happened during your two terms: the Oklahoma City bombing and the Columbine shootings.

Where were you when you first heard about the Oklahoma City bombing, and what was your first reaction, personally? And then how did you think you should frame that to the American people, to help them understand what's really a national trauma? And where were you when you heard it?

The President. I was in the White House. I believe I was in the White House, because I remember making a statement at the beginning, right in the Rose Garden, saying what you would expect me to say, expressing the Nation's sympathy for the loss but also urging the American people not to jump to conclusions about who had done it.

Remember in the beginning, there were a lot of people saying it was obviously some sort of act of foreign terrorism. There was one man that was brought back on an airplane. He was flying out of the country through to London, and he was brought back, suspected of maybe being involved, and he wasn't. And of course, subsequently, it was a domestic terrorist act.

But then when I went to Oklahoma, at the memorial service, what I tried to do was to elevate what the people who had been working in that building were doing. They were all public servants, and it was at a time when it was quite fashionable to bash the Government. And I told myself, even, that I would never refer to people who worked for the Government—even in agencies I thought weren't performing well—as bureaucrats again, because this whole—we have gotten, for more than a dozen years, a sort of demeaning rhetoric about the nature of Government and the nature of public service. And I tried to point out that these people

were our friends and our neighbors and our relatives, and they were an important part of America's family and that their service ought to be honored in that way.

And also, obviously, I took a strong stand against terrorism. And I was able—later I went to Michigan State and gave a commencement speech and tried to amplify on that. But I really believe that was the turning of the tide in the venom of anti-Government feeling.

Mr. Wenner. Did you see—was it a conscience thought to you that this could be the turning of the tide, and if you focused it correctly, if you said, "You know, you can't love your country if you hate your Government," that this would crystallize that feeling?

The President. I think I felt that after I had some time to think about it. In the beginning I was just horrified about all those people dying, all those little kids killed and hurt.

Mr. Wenner. What I'm trying to get at is, once beyond that obvious first reaction——

The President. Yes. I mean, it occurred to me that, you know, the American people are fundamentally decent, and they've got a lot of sense. And I thought that this might break a fever that had been gripping us for too long. And I think it did.

Mr. Wenner. And you thought, if I can take advantage of this opportunity—I mean, to have this tragedy—in every tragedy comes an opportunity, so is this an opportunity where I can make people rethink that idea.

The President. I think in a way, at least at some—maybe not even at a conscious level, the American people were rethinking it. And I think maybe that's why what I said at the memorial service struck a responsive chord in the country.

Mr. Wenner. What I'm trying to get at is, was that a deliberate thought on your part? That I have an opportunity as President to——

The President. Well, I thought that—yes, I was conscious of what I was saying.

Mr. Wenner. Did you connect it in some way to a kind of metaphorical bomb-throwing of Newt Gingrich, of the real anti-Government stance that he was taking at the time?

The President. I was careful not to do that. I wanted it to change the American peoples' attitude toward public servants and their Government. But to do it, you had to focus on what happened.

One of the things that I didn't like about Newt—and he certainly wasn't responsible in any way for the Oklahoma City bombing—because one of the things I didn't like about him is, he was always blaming the 1960's or liberals for everything that went wrong. When that woman, Susan Smith, drove her kids into the lake in South Carolina, he blamed the 1960's, and it turned out that the poor woman had been sexually abused by her father, her stepfather, who was on the local board of the Christian Coalition or something.

And when that woman dropped her kid out of the window in Chicago, he blamed the welfare culture. He was always blaming. So I didn't want to get into where I was doing reverse blame. I just wanted to try to make it clear to the American people that we shouldn't have a presumption against Government in general or public servants in particular.

Mr. Wenner. What about Columbine? Where did you first hear the news about that? And again, what was your reaction to that?

The President. I believe I was in the White House when I heard that, but I'm not sure. But I know that I called the local officials and the school officials from the Oval Office. You know, that was only the most recent and the most grotesque of a whole series of highly visible school shootings that we've had—a number of them in the South, one of them in Jonesboro, Arkansas. That was in my home State, and I knew some of the people who were involved, who run the school and in the county and in the city.

There was one in Pearl, Mississippi, and there was——

Mr. Wenner. One in Oregon.

The President. The one in Springfield, Oregon. What I thought there was that—I thought a lot of things. I thought, number one, how did those kids get all those guns, and how could they have had that kind of arsenal without their parents knowing? And I thought, after I read a little about it, how did they get so lost without anybody finding them before they went over the edge?

We had a spate of—before all these killings associated with that kind of darkness on the net, network——

Mr. Wenner. What do you mean, darkness on the net?

The President. Well, those kids were apparently into some sort of a—weren't they into some sort of satanic-like thing?

Mr. Wenner. No, they had their websites and——

The President. Their websites, yes. There were, earlier, a number of kids who killed themselves who were into talking to each other about destruction, but they weren't killing other people. And I just kept—I worry that—I worried then; I worry now about the people in our society, particularly children, that just drift off, and no one knows, or people feel helpless to do anything about it.

You know, I couldn't help thinking, wondering whether those kids could have been saved if somebody got to them, and then whether all those other children would still be alive.

Gun Safety Legislation

Mr. Wenner. It seemed shocking to me and a lot of other people that after that there was no—we didn't get any new gun control legislation after an event like that.

The President. It's going to be interesting to see what the voters in Colorado do. They have a provision on the ballot now in Colorado to close the gun show loophole. And it's a heavily Republican State, and I think it's going to pass.

Mr. Wenner. Right.

The President. I think what happened is that—well, first of all, you can't say nothing came out of it, because there was an organization of young people in Colorado that then organized kids all over the country for commonsense gun legislation. They got about 10,000 kids involved. Now we have the Million Mom March, and they're very active.

But the truth is that when legislation time comes that a lot of the people in Congress are still frightened of the NRA, because even though there is broad public support for these measures, they are still not primary voting issues for a lot of the people who are for them. Whereas, the NRA can muster an enormous percentage of the vote—maybe 15 percent, maybe even 20 sometimes—for whom that's a primary voting issue.

So if you've got an issue where you're ahead 60–30 but in your 60 it's a primary voting issue for 10 percent of the people, and in their 30 it's a primary voting issue for 20 percent of the people, the truth is, you're a net loser by 10 percent. That's the way—that's what happens in Congress and State legislatures. They're genuinely afraid.

Mr. Wenner. They know they could lose their seats.

The President. You see the tirade that Charlton Heston has carried on against Al Gore and me, before—saying that I was glad some of these people were killed because it gave me an excuse to take people's guns away. We never proposed anything that would take anybody's guns away.

I saw a special—you may have seen it on television the other night on ABC. Peter Jennings actually went out and went to some of these gun shows. And he was talking to all these people who were absolutely convinced that we wanted to take their guns away. The NRA is great at raising money and building their organizational power by terrifying people with inflammatory rhetoric. I guess that's why, since LBJ passed the first law after Bobby Kennedy was killed, I was the first President to take him on.

Mr. Wenner. You got Brady and assault through, but why didn't you take the opportunity with this post-Columbine atmosphere? I mean, you called the White House Conference on Violence immediately——

The President. Well, I did. I tried——

Mr. Wenner. But it focused on, like, violence in the media——

The President. Yes, but we also did lots and lots and lots of events——

Mr. Wenner. ——and then you thought you could reason with the NRA.

The President. No, I didn't think I could reason with the NRA. I thought Congress would be so shocked and the public was so galvanized that we had a window of opportunity.

Mr. Wenner. Right. And what happened to that, is my question.

The President. The Republican leadership just delayed until the fever went down. That's what happened. They knew that they

couldn't afford to have their Members voting wrong on closing the gun show loophole or banning the importation of large-capacity ammunition clips, which allows people to get around the assault weapons ban.

Mr. Wenner. Were you powerless to do something about that?

The President. No, we had tons of events. And we got a vote—if you'll remember, we finally got a vote in the Senate, where you can bring things up, where we got a majority vote for it. Al Gore broke the tie—another reason he ought to be President, he broke the tie. But we couldn't get a bill out of a conference committee, that had it in there. If we could ever have gotten a clean vote——

Mr. Wenner. You would have won that vote.

The President. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. Wenner. And beat that——

The President. Absolutely. We could win the vote today if you could get a vote. But the leadership of the Republican Party, as long as they're in the majority in both Houses, they can control things, especially in the House. You can write the rules so that you can just keep stuff from coming up.

Mr. Wenner. So despite your power, despite that event——

The President. Yes. And we had lots and lots and lots of events at the White House, not just one. We had a ton of events. We brought people in. We talked about it. We pushed and pushed. We finally got the vote in the Senate. We got 50 votes. Then Al broke the tie. We got 51. And there's no question that we could pass it.

But I'll remind you that one of reasons that Democrats are in the minority today in the House is because of the Brady law and the assault weapons ban. And interestingly enough, we didn't—there is—not a single hunter has missed an hour; not a single sports shooter has missed an event—an hour hunting—I should have finished the sentence—or a single sports shooter has missed an event. But they acted like the end of the world, but a half million felons, fugitives, and stalkers haven't gotten handguns because of the Brady law.

The ironic thing is, there's no reason here—when we tried to pass the Brady law they said, "Well, this won't do any good because all these criminals get their guns either one-on-one or at gun shows or urban flea markets."

Mr. Wenner. Let me change the subject. This is absolutely amazing——

The President. I feel passionately about this, and I'm glad I took them on. I'm just sorry I couldn't win more. There are a lot of good people out there in America who work hard; their only recreation is hunting and fishing; they don't follow politics all that closely; they get these NRA mailings. They're good people, but they think they can believe these folks. And they know that if they can stir them up, they can raise more money and increase their membership. And they do it by basically terrifying Congress.

Race Relations

Mr. Wenner. How would you characterize race relations today, as compared to when you took office?

The President. I think they're considerably better.

Mr. Wenner. In what ways?

The President. Well, I think, first of all, the country is changing. It's growing ever more diverse and, therefore, more and more people are having more contacts across racial, ethnic, and religious lines. And I think that, ultimately, the more people relate to each other, the more they come to not just tolerate—I don't like the word "tolerance" in this context because it implies that one group is superior, putting up with an inferior group and tolerating them.

I think the more they come to genuinely appreciate each other's heritage, find it interesting, and find a fundamental common humanity—I think a lot of it is just systematic human contact. And beyond the human contact, I think that the race initiative we started led to hundreds of efforts all over the country to have honest conversations. You know, sometimes people work around each other for years and they don't know the first thing about one another. Forget about race. I mean, there are people who probably work in the White House who see each other every day that don't know the first thing about one another.

So I think that the one thing we did was to spark all these conversations and also to

highlight systematic efforts that were working in local communities and try to get them replicated around the country in communities, in workplaces, in schools. I think that there was a genuine effort to deal with that.

I think the third thing is that we may have had some impact on it, I and my administration, because we were so much more diverse than any other administration in history. And I think people felt, who had never felt that way before, that the White House was their house, too; the Government was their Government, too. So I think the climate in the country was positive for that.

Mr. Wenner. And you sense that change in climate from those factors in——

The President. Absolutely. Look at the difference——

Mr. Wenner. Because this is one of your main priorities.

The President. Yes. And look at the difference in the rhetoric in the Presidential campaign this year. All the rhetoric is about racial inclusion. Now you know, we could argue about the policies. I think that the Republican policies are still divisive, but the rhetoric is about inclusion. And even they—a number of their members have taken a different tack on immigration.

Advice for Youth

Mr. Wenner. Do you have any special message to young people, any sort of valedictorian thoughts to the kids in school right now, as you leave office?

The President. Yes, I do. First of all, I think that they should realize that they're very fortunate to be living in this country at this time, fortunate because of our economic prosperity, fortunate because of our enormous diversity, and fortunate because of the permeation of technology in our society, all of which enables us to relate to the rest of the world and to one another in different and better ways.

Secondly, I think they should understand that our future success is not guaranteed and depends upon their interest in public affairs, as well as their private lives and their participation. One of the things that's really concerned me about this election is all these articles that say that young people think there is not much in it for them. I think maybe that's because there has been a lot of debate about Social Security and Medicare in the debate. They think that's an old folks' issue.

But it's actually not just an old folks' issue, because when all of us baby boomers retire—and I'm the oldest of the baby boomers; the baby boomers are people that are between the ages now of 54 and 36. So when we retire, unless everybody starts having babies at a much more rapid rate, or we have hugely greater immigration, there will only be two people working for every one person drawing Social Security. Now, more of us are going to have to work into our later years. And more of us have a choice now because—one of the good things that Congress did unanimously was to lift the earnings limit on Social Security.

But anyway, even the Social Security issue is a youth issue. Why? Because the baby boomers, most of them, I know, are obsessed with our retirement not imposing an undue burden on our children and our grandchildren. But there are all these other issues.

We have to build a clean energy future to avoid global warming. Two stunning studies have come out in the last month, and because of the Presidential campaign, they've not been much noticed. One analysis of a polar icecap says that the 1990's were the warmest decade in a thousand years. The other projecting study estimates that if we don't change our greenhouse gas emissions, the climate could warm between 2.4 and 10 degrees over the next century; 2.4 is too much. Ten degrees would literally flood a lot of Louisiana and Florida. This is a very serious thing.

Then you've got this incredible scientific and technological revolution that will lead to, among other things—if you just take the human genome alone, a lot of the young people in America today, when they have their children, they'll get a little gene card to take home with them from the hospital, and their children will be born with a life expectancy of 90 years, because they'll be able to avoid so many of the illnesses and problems that they have a biological propensity to.

So this is a fascinating time to be alive, but it's not free of challenges. So I would say to the young people, you ought to be

grateful you're alive at this time. You'll probably live in the most prosperous, interesting time in human history, but there are a lot of big challenges out there, and you have to be public citizens as well as private people.

Drugs and the Legal System

Mr. Wenner. Do you think that people should go to jail for possessing or using or even selling small amounts of marijuana?

The President. I think, first of all——

Mr. Wenner. This is after—we're not publishing until after the election.

The President. I think that most small amounts of marijuana have been decriminalized in most places and should be. I think that what we really need—one of the things that I ran out of time before I could do is a reexamination of our entire policy on imprisonment.

Some people deliberately hurt other people. And if they get out of prison—if they get in prison and they get out, they'll hurt them again. And they ought to be in jail because they can't be trusted to be on the streets. Some people do things that are so serious, they have to be put in jail to discourage other people from doing similar things. But a lot of people are in prison today because they, themselves, have drug problems or alcohol problems. And too many of them are getting out—particularly out of the State systems—without treatment, without education, without skills, without serious effort at job placement.

Mr. Wenner. You're talking about any offender?

The President. Yes. But there are tons of people in prison who are nonviolent offenders, who have drug-related charges that are directly related to their own drug problems.

Mr. Wenner. Don't you think those people—should we be putting nonviolent drug offenders in jail at all, or should we put them in treatment programs that are more fitting and not——

The President. I think it depends on what they did. You know, I have some experience with this. Let me just say——

Mr. Wenner. Well, I remember your experience is based on your brother's——

The President. Well, let me just say about my brother—whom I love and am immensely proud of, because he kicked a big cocaine habit—I mean, his habit got up to 4 grams a day. He had a serious, serious habit. He was lucky to live through that. But if he hadn't had the constitution of an ox, he might not have.

I think if he hadn't gone to prison, actually been put away forcibly somewhere, I think his problem was so serious, it is doubtful that he would have come to grips with it. I mean, he was still denying that he was addicted right up until the time that he was sentenced. So I'm not so sure that incarceration is all bad, even for drug offenders, depending on the facts. I think there are some——

Mr. Wenner. I meant——

The President. Let me finish. I think the sentences in many cases are too long for nonviolent offenders. I think the sentences are too long, and the facilities are not structured to maximize success when the people get out. Keep in mind, 90 percent of the people that are in the penitentiary are going to get out. So society's real interest is seeing that we maximize the chance that when they get out, that they can go back to being productive citizens, that they'll get jobs, they'll pay taxes, they'll be good fathers and mothers, that they'll do good things.

I think this whole thing needs to be reexamined. Even in the Federal system, these sentencing guidelines——

Mr. Wenner. You've got mandatory minimums. Would you do away with those?

The President. Well, most judges think we should. I certainly think they should be reexamined—and the disparities are unconscionable between crack and powdered cocaine. I tried to change the disparities, and the Republican Congress was willing to narrow, but not eliminate, them on the theory that people who use crack are more violent than people who use cocaine. Well, what they really meant was that people who use crack are more likely to be poor and, coincidentally, black or brown and, therefore, not have money. Whereas, people who use cocaine were more likely to be rich, pay for it, and therefore be peaceable.

But my own view is, if you do something violent, it's appropriate to have an incarceration. But I think we need a serious re-examination in the view toward what would make

us a more peaceful, more productive society. I think some of this, our imprisonment policies, are counterproductive. And now, you know, you have in a lot of places where, before the economy picked up, prison-building was a main source of economic activity, and prison employment was one of the big areas of job growth.

Mr. Wenner. Do you think people should lose access to college loans because they've been convicted of smoking pot—which is now law?

The President. No. I think that, first of all——

Mr. Wenner. I mean, those are people that seem to need a loan the most.

The President. First of all, I don't believe, by and large, in permanent lifetime penalties. There is a bill in Congress today that has bipartisan support that I was hoping would pass before I left office, but I feel confident it will in the next year or 2—which would restore voting rights to people after their full sentences have been discharged, and they wouldn't have to apply for a Federal pardon to get it.

I changed the law in Arkansas. When I was attorney general I changed the voting rights law in 1977, to restore voting rights to people when they had discharged their sentence. And my State is one of the relatively few States in the country where you do not have to get a pardon from the Governor to register to vote again—or from the Federal Government, for that matter.

Look, it depends on what your theory is. But I don't believe in making people wear a chain for life. If they get a sentence from a jury, if they serve it under the law, if they discharge their sentence, the rest of us have an interest in a safe society, in a successful society, and seeing that these folks go back to productive lives. You know, keeping them with a scarlet letter on their forehead for the rest of their lives and a chain around their neck is not very productive.

Mr. Wenner. Just to wrap this up, do you think that we need a major rethink of what these drug sentencing laws are?

The President. Not just drugs. I think we need to look at who's in prison, what are the facts——

Mr. Wenner. Well, they're filled with drug prisoners, these jails.

The President. ——most of them are related to drug or alcohol abuse, but there are some non-violent offenders unrelated to drug or alcohol abuse, which is not to say that I don't think white-collar criminals should ever go to jail. But I think we need to examine—the natural tendency of the American people, because most of us are law-abiding, is to think when somebody does something bad, we ought to put them in jail and throw the key away.

And what I think is, we need a discriminating view. There are some people who should be put in jail and throw the key away, because they can't help hurting other people. And I believe that one of the reasons for the declining crime rate is that we have a higher percentage of the people in jail who commit a lot of the crimes; a very small percentage of the people are multiple, habitual criminals. And if you could get a significant percentage of them in jail, the crime rate goes way down.

Now, on the other hand, there are a whole lot of other people in jail who will never commit another crime, particularly if they have—if they get free of drugs or free of their alcohol abuse and if they get education and training and if somebody will give them a job and give them another chance.

And what I think we need is a serious reexamination of what we've done, because we've done a lot of good in identifying people who are habitual criminals and keeping them in prison longer, and that's one of the reasons that the crime rate has gone down, along with community policing and improving the economy. But we also have just captured a whole lot of people who are in jail, I think, longer than they need to be in prison and then get out without adequate drug treatment, job training, or job placement.

But the society is moving on this. I notice now back in Washington, there is a really good program where—maybe two, that I know—where they try to keep people who go to prison in touch with their children, and they use the Internet so they can E-mail back and forth. They try to, in other words, not cut people off so completely that they lose

all hope and all incentive of returning to normal life, and they try not to damage these kids so badly, to reduce the chances that the kids will follow in their parents' footsteps.

Mr. Wenner. Let me change the subject.

The President. I think we need a whole new look at that. The sentencing guidelines, the disparities, are only a part of it. We have to look at how long should certain people go to prison from the point of view of what's good for society. We need to completely rethink it, because criminal laws and sentencing tend to be passed sort of seriatim in response to social problems at the moment.

Mr. Wenner. You, in general, restored judicial discretion and replace the kind of panic legislation that was passed about crack or——

The President. The reasons for the sentencing guidelines in the first place was to try to reduce the arbitrary harshness. It wasn't because they wanted to make sure everybody went to jail for a while; it was because the citizen guidelines tended to be abusive on the other end of the spectrum.

I think we may need some sentencing guidelines, but I think the impact, the practical impact of the ones we have has led to some people going to prison for longer than they should and longer than they would have under the old system. So there should be some more flexibility than there is.

Military Action in the Balkans

Mr. Wenner. I'm going to change the subject. The Balkans was your only major military engagement. What was it like to run a war night after night? I mean, was it your mentality in feeling that as all of that was going on as you go to sleep every night?

The President. Well, I went to sleep every night praying that it would end that night and that Milosevic would give in, praying that no other——

Mr. Wenner. You were literally praying?

The President. Yes. Praying that nobody would die, no American would die, and hoping that no innocent civilians would die but knowing that they would.

You know, it's easy for people to talk about war when it's appropriate to use military force, but you have to know that once human beings start using big, powerful weapons, there will be unintended consequences. We wound up bombing the Chinese Embassy. Innocent people died. We hit a schoolbus. And we have the most skilled Air Force and the most sophisticated weapons in all human history.

In the Gulf war, which is normally thought of as a 100-hour war and a model of sort of technical proficiency, we had 4½ months to settle in and prepare there, and still a lot of the American casualties were from friendly fire. The same thing happened even in the small engagement in Grenada, and President Reagan. These things happen. There are—once you start killing people, there will be unintended consequences.

Mr. Wenner. How do you get yourself personally comfortable—I mean, how do you get yourself, as a person and as a politician, ready to make that decision with a level of comfort you're now going to go ahead and do this?

The President. You have to be convinced that the consequences of inaction would be more damaging to more people and to your country. And in the case of Kosovo, I didn't think it was a close case. They had already killed several thousand Kosovars, and they were running a million of them out of their homes, 800,000. It was a clean case of ethnic cleansing.

And I thought the United States and our European Allies had to stand up against it. We couldn't let it happen in the heart of Europe. If we did that, we would lose the ability to stop it anywhere else.

Mr. Wenner. And wouldn't it be on your conscience in some way, for having failed to stop it?

The President. Absolutely. Look, it took us—one of the things that just tore at me—and in the end it didn't require much military engagement, although it required some—was how long it took me to build a consensus. It took me 2 years to build a consensus among our Allies for military action in Bosnia. And you know, what happened there was, after the slaughter at Srbenica we finally got—you know, everybody said, "Okay, let's go"—we did a few air strikes, and all of a sudden we were at Dayton and the peace talks. And for all the raggedness of it, the

Bosnian peace has held, and it's better now because we turned back the tide of ethnic cleansing.

But over 200,000 people died there. And I just knew, you know, there is no point in letting it happen again in Kosovo.

Rwanda

Mr. Wenner. How do you feel, then, about Rwanda? I mean, clearly it's a difference. You didn't have the allies; you didn't have intelligence, all kinds of things. Is there anything that we could have done to prevent it? And whether there was or not, it happened while you were President. Do you feel any responsibility in that, personally?

The President. I feel terrible about it. One of the reasons that I went to Tanzania to be with Mandela and try to talk to the Burundians into the peace agreement—because before my time, over 200,000 people were killed in Burundi. Same deal—the Hutus and the Tutsis, same tribes, fighting the same battles.

In Rwanda—the thing that was shocking about Rwanda was that it happened so fast, and it happened with almost no guns. The idea that 700,000 people could be killed in 100 days, mostly with machetes, is hard to believe. It was an alien territory; we weren't familiar. After that, we began working very earnestly in Africa to train troops to be able to go in and prevent such things. We worked very hard with something called the Africa Crisis Response Initiative.

And when I was in Senegal, I actually went out of Dakar to another city to watch a training exercise—at least a parade exercise—and talk to the troops from Senegal that our American soldiers were working with. We are now working with the Ghanian forces and Nigerian forces to give them the training and the capacity to prevent the resumption of the slaughter of Sierra Leone.

So I think that—I hope the United States will be much, much more involved in Africa from now on, and everywhere. In economic development, we passed the Africa trade bill this year; in fighting AIDS, TB, malaria in Africa; in debt relief, we passed a big debt relief legislation this year; and in helping them to develop the mechanisms to do this.

The African countries have leaders who are willing to go in and take their responsibility in these areas if we'll give them the logistical and other support necessary to do it, if they're trained to do it. That's what happened in East Timor, where we didn't have to put troops on the ground, but we sent 500 people over there and provided vital airlift and logistical and other support, so that the Australians and New Zealanders and the other troops that came in could bring an end to the slaughter there.

So I think that there is—there is sort of a sliding scale here. In Europe it had to be done by NATO, and the scale of it and the power of the Serbian Government was such that if we hadn't been directly involved with our NATO Allies, we never could have turned it back and Milosevic never would have fallen. If we hadn't stopped him in Bosnia and Kosovo and kept the sanctions on, the people would never have had the chance to vote him out.

So I feel good about that. I wish we had been—Rwanda, if we had done all the things we've done since Rwanda and Africa—training the troops, supporting them, working with them—what I think would have happened is, the African troops would have moved in; they would have stopped it; and we could have given them the logistical support they needed to stop it.

Now, there are other problems that may develop——

Mr. Wenner. Another reason to vote for Gore.

The President. Another huge reason to vote for Gore, because, you know, Governor Bush has said that he doesn't think that's the business of the American military. We're only supposed to fight and win wars and let everybody else do this. He kept talking about Kosovo, I noticed, in a way as if we were the only forces in Kosovo. We were only 15 percent of the soldiers in Kosovo.

Presidential Politics

Mr. Wenner. Let me change the subject, back to Washington. Why do you think you were such a lightning rod for partisanship and bitterness and so much hatred during your term now?

The President. I think there were a lot of reasons. I think mostly it's just because I won. The Republicans really didn't—they believe the only reason they lost in '76 to Jimmy Carter was because of Watergate. They believe that, from the time Mr. Nixon won in '68, they had found a fool-proof formula to hold the White House forever, until some third party came on. That's what they believe.

Mr. Wenner. Did you ever hear anybody articulate that, the Republicans——

The President. Well, in so many words. I had a very candid relationship with a lot of those guys. They would tell me what was going on. I think they really believed that America saw Republicans as the guarantor of the country's security and values and prudence in financial matters, and that they could always turn Democrats into cardboard cutouts of what they really were; they could sort of caricature them as almost un-American; and that basically the Congress might be Democratic most of the time because the Congress would give things to the American people. But the Republicans embodied the values, the strength, the heritage of the country, and they could always sort of do, as I said about Dukakis, reverse plastic surgery any Democrat.

So I came along, and I had ideas on crime and welfare and economic management and foreign policy that were difficult for them to characterize in that way. And we won. And they were really mad. I think I was the first President in a long time that never got a day's honeymoon. I mean, they started on me the next day. I think that was one thing.

I think, secondly, I was the first baby boomer President, not a perfect person, never planned to be—I mean, never claimed to be—and had opposed the Vietnam war. So I think that made them doubly angry because they thought I was a cultural alien, and I made it anyway.

Mr. Wenner. Do you think that the cultural——

The President. ——Southern Baptist, because the dominant culture of the Republican Party—President Reagan put a nicer image on it. But the dominant culture were basically white southern Protestant men who led the surge of the new Republican Party, first under President Nixon and the silent majority and, you know, blue-collar people, and then it came to an apotheosis under President Reagan.

So I think that, you know, they didn't like losing the White House, and they didn't like me, and they didn't like what they thought I represented. And that all happened at the time you had this huge growth in conservative talk shows and these—you know, sort of associated think tanks and groups and networks that grew up in Washington from the time of Nixon through the time of Bush.

And I think they had sort of a permanent alternative Government set up by that time. And they went to war the first day of my Presidency.

Mr. Wenner. Because you were the most threatening politically, and they despised what you represented culturally, age-wise and——

The President. ——think they honestly disagreed with me on a lot of the issues as well, but a lot of it was, they were mad they weren't in, which is one of the reasons they're working so hard now. And one of the big challenges that we face in the closing days of this election is to motivate the people that agree with us to the level that they're motivated. Just because they've been out a long time, they want back in really badly.

Early Democratic Policy Differences

Mr. Wenner. Were you surprised about the difficulties you had in your own party with Sam Nunn on the gays thing and Moynihan on health care and Kerrey on the economic plan?

The President. Not particularly, because—I'll come back to the gays in the military.

Mr. Wenner. Don't, because we've run through that. But just insofar as Nunn?

The President. No. And the answer to that is, no, because a lot of the Democrats who were culturally conservative and pro-military thought that gays in the military coming up so early was inconsistent with the whole new Democratic approach we were taking. Plus which, they thought I was wrong. But as I explained to you, I think when we talked last, I didn't bring it up first. Bob Dole did.

Now, on the other issues, the fundamental problems there was that there were no easy answers. I mean, Bob Kerrey comes from Nebraska. He and Jim Exon were Democrats, but Nebraska is one of the most Republican States in the country, and I think, you know, he thought we should have maybe cut spending a little more or raised taxes a little less, or cut taxes a little less on lower income working people so we wouldn't have to raise it as much, you know. And I think—and we'd been through that tough Presidential campaign.

Mr. Wenner. These guys were like, you know, the party elders.

The President. Well, Moynihan believed——

Mr. Wenner. Generally, they should like say, "Well, he's our new President." That's——

The President. But I didn't take offense to that. Moynihan believed, first of all, with some justification, that he knew more about most areas of social policy than anybody else did. I think he thought we were making a political mistake not to do welfare reform first, which turned out to be right. We did make a political mistake not to do welfare reform first.

And secondly, I think he felt that the system in Washington could not absorb in a 2-year period the economic plan which he strongly supported. He was terrific. The NAFTA trade agreement, which he strongly supported, which was controversial within our party, and then this major health care thing. He really didn't believe and he's told me that, you know, he said, you know, "We just don't have time to do these." He said, "The system cannot absorb this much change in this short a time."

And you know, that was a mistake I made. Hillary gets a bum rap for that. That was basically my fault, because I knew that basically there's only two ways to get to universal coverage. You either have to have a taxpayer subsidy, which is what we've done now with the Children's Health Insurance Program, because now we've got the number of uninsured people going down in America for the first time in a dozen years, primarily because in the Balanced Budget Act, we insisted—the Democrats did—on getting the Children's Health Insurance Program, which is the biggest expansion of Government-financed health care since Medicaid. You either have to do it that way or you have to have an employer mandate where the employers have to provide the health insurance, and then you exempt smaller businesses and subsidize that somewhat.

Mr. Wenner. You——

The President. I didn't take offense at it. You know, they thought I was being bullheaded, and I think, in retrospect, they were probably right.

Newt Gingrich

Mr. Wenner. What was your relationship with Newt like?

The President. I had an unusual relationship with him. First of all——

Mr. Wenner. Was it——

The President. It depended on which Newt showed up. But I thought the good Newt, I found engaging, intelligent, and that we were surprisingly in agreement in the way we viewed the world.

Mr. Wenner. ——similar——

The President. Partly. But you know, Newt supported me in virtually all of my foreign policy initiatives. And after he got his Congress, he realized that a hundred of them had never had a passport.

I remember him calling me once, wanting me to get them to go on foreign missions. He said, "If you ask them, then they can't be attacked back home for boondoggle trips." So we actually had a very cordial relationship.

He was also very candid with me about his political objectives. And he, in turn, from time to time, would get in trouble with the rightwing of his own caucus because they said I could talk him into too much. We had a pretty good relationship.

You know, on the other hand, as I told you, when he did things like blaming every bad thing that happened in America on Democrats in the 1960's and all that, I thought it was highly destructive.

Mr. Wenner. How did he make you feel, personally?

The President. At some point, probably around 1996, I got to the point where I no longer had personal feelings about those

things. But you know, things like the Whitewater investigation and the Travel Office investigation—he was smart. He knew there was nothing in that stuff. It was all politics to him. It was about power.

But he really did believe that the object of politics was to destroy your opponent. And you know, he ran Jim Wright out of the Congress on account of that. That's what he thought he was doing. And he had an enormous amount of success in the beginning, and he won the Congress basically by having that take-no-prisoners, be-against-everything approach.

Mr. Wenner. Didn't he tell you once on the phone that he was planning to lead a revolution against you?

The President. Well, he thought he was leading a revolution, and I was in the way. And I think he really believed, after '94——

Mr. Wenner. What did you think when he says this to you? "I'm out there to destroy—I'm going to take you on. You're through."

The President. I thought he was a worthy adversary, and I thought I would defeat him, because I thought the American people would stick with me. But I thought he was a very worthy adversary.

I think he thought that he could create, for the rest of my Presidency, a sort of an almost a parliamentary system where he would be the prime minister and make the policy, and I'd be in charge of foreign policy, and he'd help me.

Mr. Wenner. I mean, historically, the Newt versus Bill, I was just trying to think back, there hasn't been as powerful—I mean, powerful and as antagonistic a Speaker to the President, not in modern times. You had an actual enemy. You had somebody actually out there daily fighting you, not a—not a Lyndon, not a McCormack. Everybody went with Reagan and gave him what he wanted.

The President. That's what they decided to do. And you know, now I have a Speaker in Hastert I can really work with. We've got a lot done. But he still has—the dominant power in the caucus is Tom DeLay and Dick Armey. And if they had their druthers, you know, they'd still follow that approach. But the balance of authority is so—power is so close in the House that more often than not, we work things out.

But in the Senate, you've got the same thing with Lott. You know, Lott I have a very cordial personal relationship with. I have a lot in common with Lott in terms of our background and childhood and, you know, that whole thing. His daddy was a laboring person. He could have well been a Democrat.

Mr. Wenner. How did you develop your strategy in sort of dealing with Newt and outflanking him? Just wait him out? Give him enough rope?

The President. Well, that's part of it. You know, I felt after they won that when the people actually saw the fine print on their contract, they would think that there was a contract on America instead of a contract with America. And then I felt that I had to oppose them when I thought they were wrong. But I couldn't let them push me back into the old confrontation where they could say, "Clinton's an old Democrat. He's defending everything, even the indefensible, so you may think we're going too far, but America has to change," because this is a country in constant change. So that was—for example, instead of just fighting them on the budget, I offered my own balanced budget.

Mr. Wenner. I mean, everybody—I think Democrats really wanted to attack him back as quickly as possible, and you took a much more conciliatory——

The President. That's because I felt they had to have a chance to run their—and then when we got to the Government shutdown, I wasn't just against what they were doing; I had an alternative. See, I believe—and I think it's more important, I think it's easier for Republicans to be against everything than Democrats because people view us as the party of affirmative Government. And since I believed in balancing the budget, I just didn't want to do it the way they wanted to.

Mr. Wenner. What's your bottom line on Newt, historically? I mean, what's your—if you were an historian, what would you say about Gingrich?

The President. That he was immensely successful in, first of all, consolidating the power of the Republican Party and its right

wing and then in winning the Congress, winning the historic struggle for Congress in '94 by opposing me right down the line. And in '94, the people—the economy was getting better, but people didn't feel it yet. The budget we passed did not impose great tax burdens on ordinary Americans, but they didn't know it yet. And the crime bill we passed was going to help bring the crime rate down without interfering with people's gun rights, but they didn't know it yet.

So you had the best of all times to run through a gaping hole. And then I had made the mistake of trying to do both, trying to do the economic plan and NAFTA, which dispirited some of our base supporters. And then I tried to do health care under circumstances that were literally impossible. You could not get a universal coverage plan passed through Congress.

So I made a lot of errors, and he ran through them, and he therefore changed the Congress. Then I think people will say that we had one of these historic battles that periodically happens in America about the role of the National Government and, indeed, what the meaning of the Nation is.

And I think he thought he could actually carry out the revolution that President Reagan talked about, you know, drastically shrinking the Federal Government, drastically limiting its ability to act in the social sphere and moving it to the right.

And to me, we had a series of battles that were really the latest incarnation of this age-old battle of what does it mean to be an American, what is the idea of America, what is the purpose of a nation? And there was a Government shutdown. There was an impeachment. There was my veto of the Newt tax bill after Newt was gone. All these were ongoing battles.

The battle over—the same thing is now happening, shaping up over the courts. The most important issue in this election may well be what happens to the courts. Because there is now already—we are one vote away from having enough votes that would repeal *Roe* v.*Wade.*

But there is this other issue in the courts which I think is quite profound, which is, there are five votes right now to restrict the ability of Congress to require the States to participate in protecting the American people in a lot of fundamental ways. So I think this is an ongoing battle.

But it's the same battle that we had between George Washington and John Adams and Alexander Hamilton and John Marshall on the one side and Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Payne, and a lot of other people on the other in the beginning; the same battle Abraham Lincoln had around the time of the Civil War. Could the States secede? Did the Federal Government have the power to enslave them? The same battle we had at the dawn of the industrial revolution when Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson asserted the authority of the Nation to proscribe basic conditions in the workplace and protection. And it was the same battle that Franklin Roosevelt fought. That was the fourth time it was fought. Now we're in the fifth battle over how to define America. And in the first three skirmishes, we won. But I see that as a big issue in this election, a huge issue.

Impeachment

Mr. Wenner. Let's talk about impeachment a little. You're going to—in the history books, it's going to say, of course, that you were the second President ever to be impeached. How does that make you feel? Do you feel that that will cloud your real accomplishments?

The President. Well, that's for the historians to determine. The history books will also record, I think, that both impeachments were wrong, and that's when they failed. And I'm just grateful that, unlike Andrew Johnson, I was less embittered by it and I had more support from the public and in the Congress, so I was able to resume my duties and actually get a lot done for the American people in the aftermath.

Mr. Wenner. Was there ever a point where you wanted to give up or it just became too hard?

The President. Never.

Mr. Wenner. Did you ever get so angry during it that you think it clouded your judgment?

The President. I got angry, but I always was alone or with friends who would deflate

me, so I don't think it ever clouded my judgment on any official thing I took.

You know, I realized that when it was all over, I would have the responsibility to work with the Republicans, as well as the Democrats. One of the things I had to learn—as I said, it took me almost my whole first term to learn it—is that at some point Presidents are not permitted to have personal feelings. When you manifest your anger in public, it should be on behalf of the American people and the values that they believe and the things they do.

You just can't—a lot of this stuff you can't take personally—and especially when I realized that for the people that were directing it, it was just politics. You know, it was about power and politics. So I was largely able to purge myself of it. And I had very strong personal feelings about it, but I tried never to talk about it. I tried to get up every day and just do my job and let others defend me publicly and go on with the work of the country, because——

Mr. Wenner. ——in private?

The President. Yes, because Presidents will always be under siege in some way or another. And if you don't want the job and the attendant heat, you shouldn't ask for it.

Mr. Wenner. Does it make you uncomfortable to talk about this episode now?

The President. I just think the less I say about it right now, the better. I think the more time passes, the more people will see what happens, and the more it will come out. There have been some pretty good books written about it.

Mr. Wenner. What do you think of Ken Starr now?

The President. I think he did what he was hired to do.

Mr. Wenner. You told me you never really met him and had no ill feelings.

The President. I met him. You know, I met him once when he interviewed me. He was hired to keep the impeachment thing—I mean, to keep the inquiry going past the '96 election and to do whatever damage he could. That's why he was put in, and he did what they asked him to do.

Mr. Wenner. What's your take on Henry Hyde, who was supposedly "Mr. Reasonable," and then he seemed to defy the will of the people after the '98 elections, where he kind of got repudiated?

The President. Well, he did what he was hired to do, too. I mean, the rightwing was in control of the Congress, and they thought they had paid in '98, and they thought they would never have to pay again. They thought it was a free shot to put a hit on me, and so they did. I don't think it's complicated.

Mr. Wenner. Once the elections were done, I remember seeing you a week before, and clearly Democrats were going to take the House in a way they had never taken it before in an off election. And it was a referendum on this issue, and then they went ahead—him and the Republican leadership went ahead despite that. What does that tell you about them?

The President. That they wanted to—they stayed with their rightwing, and they thought they would pay no price in 2000 because they thought, whatever happened, it would all be over by now. And they thought they could put a black mark on me in history, and that was really important to them. They were really angry. They got beat. They were just angry, and they thought they had paid once, and they wouldn't have to pay this time because the American people would move on to other things as they always do. And so they did it.

Mr. Wenner. It's not an issue now in this election, really.

The President. It is in three or four House seats, but not many.

Mr. Wenner. It's an issue to me.

The President. But it shouldn't be. I've tried—the only way it should be an issue in the election is that it indicates how important it is, if they should maintain their majority, they have somebody in the White House that can restrain them. Because it's just an example of other things they were doing to the environmental laws of the country, to the education laws, to the health care system. That's the only way it should be an issue. It's over. The American people shouldn't be expected to dwell on it. They shouldn't have to deal with it.

Mr. Wenner. Who do you think really came through for you and got up and defended you?

The President. Oh, tons of people. The House judiciary committee Democrats were really good. There were 800 people, including a lot of Republicans who didn't even like me, who filed testimony talking about how inappropriate it was. Then there was that bipartisan panel of career prosecutors who said that no one would bring any criminal charges on this. So a lot of people who—came forward who had no particular reason to do it but who cared about their country and were offended by what was going on.

Mr. Wenner. Do you think in some way this is sort of a referendum on sort of the nature of morality or the character of America in some way?

The President. Not really. No, I think people strongly disagree with what I did. I did, too. I think the—I don't think the—I think that they just were able to discriminate between a bad personal mistake and the justification for a Constitutional crisis. I think—I don't think that it—I think it said more about their ability to discriminate between two different kinds of problems than any changed moral standards.

Mr. Wenner. In the sixties we always talked—still they talk about karma, you know, your karma? Did you ever look at it in terms of what's in my karma that I got this shit-hammer dropped on me?

The President. No. Like I said—no, I don't. If I hadn't made a personal mistake, they wouldn't have the pretext to do what they did, even though what they did was wrong. So no, I don't.

Mr. Wenner. Do you think it benefited us, that process, that we learned from all that, from the impeachment process?

The President. Well, the one thing it did was it pointed out all the other excesses. You know that there was a bogus Whitewater investigation. It was totally bogus and wasted money and——

Mr. Wenner. What was that?

The President. The Whitewater investigation. That civil lawsuit against me was bogus. Even the judge who was famous for disliking me personally threw it out as having no merit. So I think that what it did was, at least for the time being, it took a lot of the venom out of our public life. You know, even as hard as George Bush and Al Gore are hitting each other now in this election, they are by and large hitting at each other over the issues. I mean, Bush has got some ad up now questioning Gore's integrity, which is amazing that Bush would question Gore's integrity, but anyway. But he knows that there's a certain number of voters who vote for Republicans because they're convinced that they're morally superior to Democrats, not withstanding the fact that we're awash in evidence now that they're not. And so he's doing that, but there has been very little of that, even from him. They're basically—the level of venom is lower than it was. And maybe I absorbed enough for several years.

And if so, then that alone might make it worth doing. Because I think it's just crazy for America with all these fabulous opportunities and some pretty stiff challenges out there to waste our elections and our public officials' time with things that we know are bogus or trivial and cost the taxpayers a fortune, for no other purpose than for one side to pursue political advantage over another. There will always be some of that, but my instinct is that in the next 4 years, we'll have a lot less of it.

Relations With the Media

Mr. Wenner. The press—as President, you have a relationship with the press that is unique to anybody in the world. You, as an individual, there's certainly more scrutiny or criticism or attention, more everything. What's your take on the press in America?

The President. Well, I think that, first of all, it's very difficult to generalize. I think that on the balance, it's a great advantage for the President to have a bully pulpit that can reach everyone in America and everyone in the world instantaneously. And any criticisms that a President has about negative press or incessant carping or whatever—you've got to temper that with the fact that they make it possible for you to do your job in a communications age.

And they work—especially the working press, I have an enormous amount of respect for them. I mean these people that are on this airplane, because I've worked hard and I keep long hours, it's a hard job for them, because they have to—they go around in the vans, not in Air Force One or the helicopters.

They have a lot of hard work to do, and I think by and large, most of them do it as well as they can and as honestly as they can. I have an enormous amount of respect for them.

Now, there's another part of the press that are kind of part of almost a celebrity political press that are—that go all the way from the columnists to the people that are on all these talk shows all the time. And they have—in order for them to be successful, their comments have to have edge. They tend to be more negative and more dogmatic in their attempts to be—and sometimes there is more heat than light in a lot of what's said in a lot of those forums—formats. But that's part of the new age we're living in.

And also they're sort of on the cutting edge between the serious press, the tabloid press, and pure political advocacy and entertainment. You've got all these segments now that are kind of blurred together, compounded by a 24-hour news cycle, and the fact that there are umpty-dump channels people can watch, some of which are news channels that know they have to go after narrowly segmented markets, and they're targeting certain audiences.

So it's a very different press environment, and if you took it all seriously, it would run you nuts. But you can't—once you realize kind of what the environment is, you just learn to deal with it. I think the important thing is to—for Presidents, especially—to try to hear the criticism, because it's not always wrong. Sometimes it's right. I find it easier, really, when it comes from thoughtful columnists who are really trying to make a serious contribution to the national debate. Even in some other forums it's important.

Mr. Wenner. Which columnists or reporters do you think have been particularly good or particularly smart in their coverage of you in the last 8 years?

The President. Well, I think just in terms of columnists, I think Tom Friedman is the best foreign policy writer we have today, by a long stretch. I think he understands the world we're living in and the one toward which we're moving. Therefore, whether he's criticizing me or analyzing an issue or whatever he's doing, he's trying to do it from a completely honest point of view of trying to say, here's where the world is; here's where we're going.

I think Ron Brownstein is one of the best political columnists in America today, one of the two or three best. He's truly extraordinary. And you know, he understands this whole New Democrat movement that I have been a part of. He understood the ideas that underlay the '92 campaign and the whole Democratic Leadership Council effort. Everything we're trying to do. And he made it his business to study that. I think he's very good.

I think E.J. Dionne is good. I regret that his other responsibilities at the Post don't give him time to write more columns, because I think he's very good.

Mr. Wenner. [*Inaudible*]—towards the Times for their role in Whitewater?

The President. No, I think that—it was sort of like this Wen Ho Lee deal in a way. I mean, the same guy got a story and it was kind of overwritten and dire things were predicted. But I think whatever I feel about that, it has to be tempered by the fact that the Times has a serious conscience when it comes to the national issues. I don't think the—I think they had a—they really have tried consistently to think—on the public issues, I think they really have done an excellent job of analysis and are trying to come out in the right place in the right way. So whatever I feel about that is tempered by that.

Mr. Wenner. Do you think institutionally it's working right, the press as a whole, the major newspapers, the networks, and so forth?

The President. I think they're doing the best they can in a very new and different environment. I have a lot of sympathy with them.

Mr. Wenner. So you don't have resentment towards them? Like, a lot of Presidents just hated—once done, they just hated them.

The President. No. Absolutely not. You know, how can Presidents hate the press? I mean, they give you—you can gripe all you want about all the negative coverage you get on the evening news or on these talk shows or being blasted in the newspaper or having to get on something where they're dead wrong—like on Whitewater, whatever it is—

dead wrong, but still, every day they're right in all kinds of other things about all the things that affect the American people and their lives. And anytime you want a microphone to have your say, you've got it. So I think to be obsessively negative is a mistake.

The White House

Mr. Wenner. What creature comforts are you going to miss the most about leaving the White House, not living there?

The President. The movie theater, the swimming pool, Camp David. Everybody says I'll miss Air Force One the most once I have to return to commercial travel. But what I will miss the most is not the creature comforts; it's the honor of living in the White House, which I have loved. I've loved living there, because I love my country; I love the history of my country. I know—I was a pretty good American historian before I got there, and I know a lot more than I did then, and I've read a lot about Presidents that most people don't know much about, including me before I got there.

And even more than that, I'll miss the work. It's the job I'll miss the most. I love the work. I actually have loved doing this job.

Mr. Wenner. Do you just get off every single day when you get up, just—I am so lucky?

The President. Even the worst day. Even in the worst times—the whole impeachment thing—I just thank God every day I can go to work. I love the job. I've always loved it.

Mr. Wenner. Looking at the other side of the coin, what—is there anything that seems attractive to you about not living there anymore?

The President. Well, I look forward to kind of having—being a citizen again. It will be the first time in 20 years—you know, I've been—I was Governor for 12 years, and 10 years, the last 10 years in a row—so it will be the first time in 18 years that I've really had a private home that was my primary residence, and where I'll get up every day, feeling a responsibility to be of public service, but knowing that I'm basically in control of my life again. And it will be an interesting challenge for me. Eighteen years is a long time to be a chief executive, living in public housing, with every day scripted out—you know, hours and hours a day, particularly if you work like I do.

It's a challenge, and I'm going to be interested to see whether I can meet it and what it means, you know, to go into this next chapter of my life. I'm actually excited about it.

Advice for the Next President

Mr. Wenner. What's the one thing about being—what's the one thing that would surprise either Bush or Gore about being President that they just can't know now? What was the greatest surprise to you? What advice would you give the next President?

The President. I think they will be surprised how many different things happen at once. Now, Al won't be as surprised by that, because he's been there 8 years. It's another good argument for voting for him, because he's experienced and he makes good decisions. He'll be a very good President if he wins. He'll be quite good. He makes good decisions, and he's had experience. And the environment, I think, will be less hostile for either one of them than it was for me, and they will have more of an opportunity to craft cooperative solutions, because almost under any conceivable scenario, the Congress will be even more closely divided than it is now.

You know, the Democrats are going to pick up some seats in the Senate. They might even be in control. But if they are, they will just have a one-seat majority here, too, and I think the Democrats will win the House. But if they do, they won't have any bigger majority than the Republicans do now, maybe a little more, but not much. So you will have a very closely divided Government which will require them to all work together.

So I think they may have a less hostile environment than I did, and I hope they do, but I think they'll still be surprised at how many different things they'll have crash in on them at once.

Mr. Wenner. What would you tell them to do? You say, look, here's what you've got to do as the next President. Here's what I would like you to do.

The President. Well, first of all, I think after the election, they ought to get more rest than I did. You know, I didn't really take a vacation. I think they ought to clear their heads. I would advise them to work as hard

as they can to get a good Cabinet and a good staff, and then really emphasize teamwork, and when you come to the tough decisions, do what you think is right.

A lot of these decisions, you know, that were unpopular that I made—Bosnia, Haiti, debt relief in Mexico, taking on the NRA, doing the debt thing—reducing the deficit, I mean, right now, it's like smooth sailing. But it's just not in the nature of human existence to be free of difficulty. And I think when you come down to those tough decisions, you just have to do what you think is right, tell the American people why you did it, and hope they'll go along with you.

2000 Presidential Election

Mr. Wenner. So this comes out after the election. So do you want to—give me a prediction.

The President. I've always believed Gore will win, and I still do. And I think if he doesn't, the only reason that I think that he might not win is if they vote—a higher percentage of the people that want Bush to be President vote than the percentage of people that want Gore to be President. But I believe if we get an even turnout, I think in the closing days of this election, people will begin to think about whether they really want to risk this prosperity by adopting an economic plan that has a huge tax cut, a huge Social Security privatization program, and a bunch of spending that will put us back into deficit.

I think that people have to think about whether they want to risk having nobody to restrain a Republican Congress if they should stay in the majority, and I think they will think about what will happen to the courts.

And so I think that those things will be enough to put Al Gore over, and I think he'll be elected.

Mr. Wenner. What do you think the margin is going to be—the popular vote?

The President. I have no idea. I think it will be—it will definitely be close in the popular vote. Whether it's close in the electoral vote depends on what happens—there's a dozen States it could go either way. So either one of—there could be a sizable electoral victory; it could be——

Mr. Wenner. Predict Florida for me. Predict Missouri, Pennsylvania, Michigan.

The President. I think Gore will win Florida, Pennsylvania, and Michigan. I've always thought Gore would win Florida. We've worked like crazy there for 8 years, and we've done a lot for Florida and a lot with Florida, and Joe Lieberman has helped a lot in Florida. So I think Gore will win Florida. I think he will win Pennsylvania. I think he will win Michigan, and I think he will win Missouri if Mrs. Carnahan is the choice of the Missouri people for Senator.

Mr. Wenner. And Washington State?

The President. I think we'll win in Washington.

Mr. Wenner. I don't want to take any of your money on that. Did you see the cover on Al that—the Rolling Stone that's gotten so much talk?

The President. Yes.

Mr. Wenner. It took hours to do that interview. I just used—eat up hours of his time. I appreciate your time very much.

The President. Thanks.

NOTE: The interview was taped at 2:45 p.m. aboard Air Force One en route to Los Angeles, CA, and the transcript was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 7. In his remarks, the President referred to actor Charlton Heston, president, National Rifle Association; ABC News anchor Peter Jennings; former President Slobodan Milosevic of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro); former President Nelson Mandela of South Africa; Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush; former Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr; Thomas L. Friedman, columnists, New York Times; Ron Brownstein, columnist, Los Angeles Times; E.J. Dionne, columnist, Washington Post; former Los Alamos National Laboratory scientist Wen Ho Lee; and Jean Carnahan, widow of the late Gov. Mel Carnahan of Missouri. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Remarks Announcing the Establishment of the Federal Aviation Administration's Air Traffic Organization

December 7, 2000

Well, Keith, thank you for telling everybody why I'm trying so hard to get something done about this. [*Laughter*] Thank you very

much for the work you do and for being here with us today as exhibit A.

I want to thank Secretary Slater and our Administrator Jane Garvey for all they have done in these last several years. And I want to thank John Cullinane and Sharon Patrick for being here. And our NTSB Chairman, Jim Hall; thank you very much, Jim, for your work.

As Secretary Slater said, when the Vice President and I took office in 1993, among other things that were troubled in this economy, we found a very troubled airline industry. And in my first—Rodney mentioned the trip I made to Everett, Washington, to meet with the leaders of the airline industry at the Boeing plant near Seattle. That was the first trip I took outside Washington as President. I did it because I knew that we had to turn the airline industry around if we wanted to turn the American economy around.

Out of that meeting was born the Baliles Commission, headed by the former Governor of Virginia, Governor Gerry Baliles, and a set of recommendations that helped to power the airline industry back to health. Thanks to those recommendations and to a booming economy, the airline industry is strong again and, I think, has benefited from the work that has been done in this administration by the Vice President and Secretary Slater and Administrator Garvey.

We have basically pursued a three-pronged approach: First, we want to preserve and enhance domestic competition so that our people continue to reap the benefits of deregulation. Second, we want to open more foreign markets so that our airlines can compete better internationally. And third, we want to improve the efficiency of our infrastructure, particularly air traffic control, to keep pace with the phenomenal growth in air travel. Now, that's what we're here to talk about today, because, frankly, we haven't been able to do it.

Our infrastructure is just as important to us today as the railroads were in the 1800's or the Interstate Highway System was in the second half of the 20th century. Just as those advancements made us competitive in the 19th and 20th century economies, a modernized air traffic control system will help determine our ability to compete in the 21st century.

The fact is, the FAA's 20-year effort to modernize its air traffic control technology simply has not been able to keep pace with either the emergence of new technology or the growth and demand for air travel. And while we've made significant progress, as the horrendous—and I don't know how else to say it—just the horrendous flight delay statistics demonstrate, we have not done nearly enough.

This is no reflection, I don't hesitate to say, on the leadership of the FAA or the dedication of its employees. They are very, very good. They operate the largest, busiest, and safest air travel system in the world. It orchestrates 93,000 flights every day, more than one every second. They also oversee the safety of the entire system, which has a remarkable record, as all of you who are involved in it know.

Despite the extraordinary efforts of these people, however, the rapid growth in air travel is simply racing ahead of the limits of the FAA's aging infrastructure. Flight delays have increased by more than 58 percent in the last 5 years, cancellations by 68 percent. In addition to widespread passenger frustration and anger, which I hear about wherever I go, these delays are costing airlines and passengers more than $5 billion every year.

Part of the problem is due to outdated technology. We're working with Congress to speed up the upgrade of facilities and equipment at airports and air traffic control centers. But a more fundamental problem is also how the FAA operates. It must be better structured to manage the high-tech, high-demand operations of a 21st century air traffic control system.

David Osborne, who popularized the phrase "Reinventing Government" when he wrote a book by that title, sums up the problem in his new book, the "Reinventor's Field Book." In it, he says—and I quote—"air traffic control is a massive, complex, technology intensive service business, operating within a conventional U.S. Government bureaucracy. It's like putting a Ferrari engine into a dump truck body and still expecting it to win races."

We need to put the Ferrari engine of FAA excellence into a new, more streamlined, more efficient body. To accelerate our efforts to reduce passenger delays and improve air traffic control efficiency, I am taking, therefore, the following actions. First, I am directing the FAA to create a performance-based organization, the Air Traffic Services Organization, to manage the operation of air traffic control. This semiautonomous organization, located within the FAA, will have the incentives and tools necessary to operate more effectively and efficiently.

Second, Secretary Slater is designating five outstanding business and management leaders for appointment to the Air Traffic Services Subcommittee. The group will function as a board of directors to oversee the management of the FAA's air traffic control organization to make sure it operates more efficiently. They are: former United States Senator and Chairperson of the subcommittee on aviation, Nancy Kassebaum Baker; John Cullinane, who's here with us today, president of the Cullinane Group and a pioneer in the computer software industry; Leon Lynch, the international vice president for human affairs at the United Steel Workers; Sharon Patrick, president and chief operating officer of Martha Stewart Living Omnimedia, Inc., is here with us; and John Snow, a former Department of Transportation Administrator and current chairman, president, and chief executive officer of CSX corporation. It is a distinguished group, and I think they'll do a fine job.

I am also directing the Department of Transportation and the FAA to review the impediments to the use of airport congestion pricing and other market mechanisms to reduce airport delays. Let me say, I asked about this years ago, and it turns out there are a couple of Federal laws which make it hard to do.

But if you think about how much business travel there is and how much travel travel there is and how much flexibility we might build in the system if we just had some market mechanisms to more uniformly use the airplane and airport infrastructure that we have out there, I think that we really missed a big opportunity not to try to take more advantage of this. And I think we could rather quickly level out and maximize the use of our facilities and our planes in ways that would dramatically reduce delays and cancellations.

But there are some, apparently, some actual statutory impediments to doing it. So we're going to do what we can to identify them and leave them in good shape for the next administration, and given the level of anxiety about this in the country, I think that we could get some pretty quick action. I hope it will happen next year.

I hope that all these actions will accelerate much-needed reform of the air traffic control system, but they are not enough. Congress still has to reform the way air traffic control service is financed and move from a system financed by passenger taxes to one in which commercial users pay the costs of the services they use.

The airline industry is at a crossroads. We can continue on the current course and continue to experience crowded airports, flight delays, and even higher passenger frustration. But if we act decisively now to improve our infrastructure, we can ensure that air travel in the 21st century is the safest, most cost effective, most efficient in the world.

I can hardly think of anything else the Government does now that the consumers feel more directly. And I certainly hope that what we're doing today will help. I believe it will. And I will try to wait patiently in those lines next year for Congress to do its part. [*Laughter*]

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:28 a.m. in Presidential Hall in the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Keith Bellows, editor and vice president, National Geographic Traveler Magazine.

Executive Order 13180—Air Traffic Performance-Based Organization

December 7, 2000

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in order to further improve the provision of air traffic services, an inherently governmental function, in ways that increase efficiency, take

better advantage of new technologies, accelerate modernization efforts, and respond more effectively to the needs of the traveling public, while enhancing the safety, security, and efficiency of the Nation's air transportation system, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Establishment of the Air Traffic Organization.* (a) The Secretary of Transportation (Secretary) shall, consistent with his legal authorities, move to establish within the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) a performance-based organization to be known as the "Air Traffic Organization" (ATO).

(b) The ATO shall be composed of those elements of the FAA's Air Traffic Services and Research and Acquisition organizations that have direct connection and give support to the provision of day-to-day operational air traffic services, as determined by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration (Administrator). The Administrator may delegate responsibility for any operational activity of the air traffic control system to the head of the ATO. The Administrator's responsibility for general safety, security, and policymaking functions for the National Airspace System is unaffected by this order.

(c) The Chief Operating Officer (COO) of the Air Traffic Control System, established by the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (Air-21) (Public Law 106-181), shall head the ATO and shall report directly to the Administrator and be subject to the authority of the Administrator. The COO, in consultation with the Air Traffic Control Subcommittee of the Aviation Management Advisory Committee, shall enter into an annual performance agreement with the Administrator that sets forth measurable organization and individual goals in key operational areas and describes specific targets and how such goals will be achieved. The COO may receive an annual bonus not to exceed 30 percent of the annual rate of basic pay, based upon the Administrator's evaluation of the COO's performance in relation to the targets and goals described above.

(d) The COO shall develop a 5-year strategic plan for the air traffic control system, including a clear statement of the mission and objectives for the system's safety, efficiency, and productivity. This strategic plan must ensure that ATO actions are consistent with long-term FAA strategies for the aviation system as a whole.

(e) The COO shall also enter into a framework agreement with the Administrator that will establish the relationship of the ATO with the other organizations of the FAA.

Sec. 2. *Purpose.* The FAA's primary mission is to ensure the safety, security, and efficiency of the National Airspace System. The purpose of this order is to enhance that mission and further improve the delivery of air traffic services to the American public by reorganizing the FAA's air traffic services and related offices into a performance-based, results-oriented, organization. The ATO will be better able to make use of the unique procurement and personnel authorities that the FAA currently has and to better use the additional management reforms enacted by the Congress this year under Air-21. Specifically, the ATO shall:

(a) optimize use of existing management flexibilities and authorities to improve the efficiency of air traffic services and increase the capacity of the system;

(b) develop methods to accelerate air traffic control modernization and to improve aviation safety related to air traffic control;

(c) develop agreements with the Administrator of the FAA and users of the products, services, and capabilities it will provide;

(d) operate in accordance with safety performance standards developed by the FAA and rapidly respond to FAA safety and security oversight findings;

(e) consult with its customers, the traveling public, including direct users such as airlines, cargo carriers, manufacturers, airports, general aviation, and commercial space transportation providers, and focus on producing results that satisfy the FAA's external customer needs;

(f) consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local public agencies, including the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to determine the best practices for meeting the diverse needs throughout the National Airspace System;

(g) establish strong incentives to managers for achieving results; and

(h) formulate and recommend to the Administrator any management, fiscal, or legislative changes necessary for the organization to achieve its performance goals.

Sec. 3. *Aviation Management Advisory Committee.* The Air Traffic Control Subcommittee of the Aviation Management Advisory Committee shall provide, consistent with its responsibilities under Air-21, general oversight to ATO regarding the administration, management, conduct, direction, and supervision of the air traffic control system.

Sec. 4. *Evaluation and Report.* Not later than 5 years after the date of this order, the Aviation Management Advisory Committee shall provide to the Secretary and the Administrator a report on the operation and effectiveness of the ATO, together with any recommendations for management, fiscal, or legislative changes to enable the organization to achieve its goals.

Sec. 5. *Definitions.* The term "air traffic control system" has the same meaning as the term defined by section 40102(a)(42) of title 49, United States Code.

Sec. 6. *Judicial Review.* This order does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any person.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
December 7, 2000.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:15 p.m., December 8, 2000]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on December 11.

Statement on the Ethiopia-Eritrea Final Peace Agreement

December 7, 2000

Ethiopia and Eritrea have accepted the invitation of Algerian President Abdelaziz Bouteflika to sign a final peace agreement in Algiers on December 12, building on a Cessation of Hostilities Agreement brokered by the United States and the Organization of African Unity last June.

Last week I was able to inform both Prime Minister Meles and President Isaias that each leader had confirmed to me his acceptance of the text of a final peace agreement. All who have worked for this peace, and all who were moved by the costs of the war, congratulate the Ethiopian and Eritrean leadership and people for achieving this breakthrough.

This agreement ends the biggest conventional war in the world in recent years, in what may be the world's poorest region. It should permit these two countries to realize their potential in peace, instead of squandering it in war. It should free both countries to concentrate on meeting their people's aspirations for democracy and development, as their leaders have pledged to do. The United States stands ready to work with both countries to consolidate the peace and accelerate their return to the urgent task of economic development.

More than 2 years of effort by the United States and the Organization of African Unity went into reaching this final agreement. I want to thank my Special Envoy, former National Security Adviser Anthony Lake, Gayle Smith of the National Security Council, and Assistant Secretary Susan Rice for their untiring commitment and selfless dedication to the task. I also wish to extend my personal gratitude and congratulations to President Bouteflika of Algeria and his entire mediation team.

Statement on the Decision To Stay the Execution of Juan Raul Garza

December 7, 2000

Today I have decided to stay the execution of Juan Raul Garza, an inmate on Federal death row, for 6 months, until June, 2001, to allow the Justice Department time to gather and properly analyze more information about racial and geographic disparities in the Federal death penalty system.

I believe that the death penalty is appropriate for the most heinous crimes. As President, I have signed Federal legislation that authorizes it under certain circumstances. It is clearly, however, an issue of the most serious weight. The penalty of death, as Justice Potter Stewart and Justice Sandra Day O'Connor have reminded us, is "qualitatively

different" from other punishments we impose. Whether one supports the death penalty or opposes it, there should be no question that the gravity and finality of the penalty demand that we be certain that when it is imposed, it is imposed fairly.

As I have said before, supporters of capital punishment bear a special responsibility to ensure the fairness of this irreversible punishment. Further, Article II of the Constitution vests in the President the sole authority to grant pardons and reprieves for Federal crimes. Therefore, I have approached this matter with great deliberation.

This fall the Department of Justice released the results of a statistical survey of the Federal death penalty. It found that minority defendants and certain geographic districts are disproportionately represented in Federal death penalty prosecutions. As the Deputy Attorney General said at the time the survey was released, no one confronted with those statistics can help but be troubled by those disparities. We do not, however, fully understand what lies behind those statistics. The Attorney General has said that more information and a broader analysis are needed to better interpret the data we now have and to determine whether the disparities that are evident reflect any bias in our system. She has undertaken an effort to gather and analyze the relevant information so than an appropriate decision can be made on the question of bias.

After a close and careful review of this issue and after conferring with the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General, I am not satisfied that, given the uncertainty that exists, it is appropriate to go forward with an execution in a case that may implicate the very issues at the center of that uncertainty.

In issuing this stay, I have not decided that the death penalty should not be imposed in this case, in which heinous crimes were proved. Nor have I decided to halt all executions in the Federal system. I have simply concluded that the examination of possible racial and regional bias should be completed before the United States goes forward with an execution in a case that may implicate the very questions raised by the Justice Department's continuing study. In this area, there is no room for error.

I have asked that the Attorney General report to the President by the end of April, 2001, on the Justice Department's analysis of the racial and geographic disparities in Federal death penalty prosecutions.

Statement on Action To Implement the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Act of 2000

December 7, 2000

Today I am pleased to sign an Executive order that will help implement the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Act of 2000, which authorized compensation for thousands of Department of Energy workers who sacrificed their health in building the Nation's nuclear defenses. These individuals, many of whom were neither protected from nor informed of the hazards to which they were exposed, developed occupational illnesses as a result of their exposure to radiation and other hazards unique to nuclear weapons production and testing.

This order builds on the administration's previously articulated principles and the framework established in the act to ensure the compassionate, fair, and timely compensation of these workers and their families. Specifically, the order defines the respective responsibilities of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Energy, and Justice; establishes an Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health; and creates an interagency group to develop a legislative proposal and address program implementation issues.

While the Nation can never fully repay these workers or their families, they deserve fair compensation for their sacrifices. I am pleased to take the next critical step in ensuring that these courageous individuals receive the compensation and recognition they have long deserved.

Executive Order 13179—Providing Compensation to America's Nuclear Weapons Workers

December 7, 2000

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including Public Law 106–398, the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–398, the "Act"), and to allocate the responsibilities imposed by that legislation and to provide for further legislative efforts, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Policy.* Since World War II, hundreds of thousands of men and women have served their Nation in building its nuclear defense. In the course of their work, they overcame previously unimagined scientific and technical challenges. Thousands of these courageous Americans, however, paid a high price for their service, developing disabling or fatal illnesses as a result of exposure to beryllium, ionizing radiation, and other hazards unique to nuclear weapons production and testing. Too often, these workers were neither adequately protected from, nor informed of, the occupational hazards to which they were exposed.

Existing workers' compensation programs have failed to provide for the needs of these workers and their families. Federal workers' compensation programs have generally not included these workers. Further, because of long latency periods, the uniqueness of the hazards to which they were exposed, and inadequate exposure data, many of these individuals have been unable to obtain State workers' compensation benefits. This problem has been exacerbated by the past policy of the Department of Energy (DOE) and its predecessors of encouraging and assisting DOE contractors in opposing the claims of workers who sought those benefits. This policy has recently been reversed.

While the Nation can never fully repay these workers or their families, they deserve recognition and compensation for their sacrifices. Since the Administration's historic announcement in July of 1999 that it intended to compensate DOE nuclear weapons workers who suffered occupational illnesses as a result of exposure to the unique hazards in building the Nation's nuclear defense, it has been the policy of this Administration to support fair and timely compensation for these workers and their survivors. The Federal Government should provide necessary information and otherwise help employees of the DOE or its contractors determine if their illnesses are associated with conditions of their nuclear weapons-related work; it should provide workers and their survivors with all pertinent and available information necessary for evaluating and processing claims; and it should ensure that this program minimizes the administrative burden on workers and their survivors, and respects their dignity and privacy. This order sets out agency responsibilities to accomplish these goals, building on the Administration's articulated principles and the framework set forth in the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000. The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Energy shall be responsible for developing and implementing actions under the Act to compensate these workers and their families in a manner that is compassionate, fair, and timely. Other Federal agencies, as appropriate, shall assist in this effort.

Sec. 2. *Designation of Responsibilities for Administering the Energy Employees' Occupational Illness Compensation Program ("Program").*

(a) *Secretary of Labor.* The Secretary of Labor shall have primary responsibility for administering the Program. Specifically, the Secretary shall:

(i) Administer and decide all questions arising under the Act not assigned to other agencies by the Act or by this order, including determining the eligibility of individuals with covered occupational illnesses and their survivors and adjudicating claims for compensation and benefits;

(ii) No later than May 31, 2001, promulgate regulations for the administration of the Program, except for functions assigned to other agencies pursuant to the Act or this order;

(iii) No later than July 31, 2001, ensure the availability, in paper and electronic format, of forms necessary for

making claims under the Program; and

(iv) Develop informational materials, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to help potential claimants understand the Program and the application process, and provide these materials to individuals upon request and to the Secretary of Energy and the Attorney General for dissemination to potentially eligible individuals.

(b) *Secretary of Health and Human Services.* The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall:

(i) No later than May 31, 2001, promulgate regulations establishing:

(A) guidelines, pursuant to section 3623(c) of the Act, to assess the likelihood that an individual with cancer sustained the cancer in the performance of duty at a Department of Energy facility or an atomic weapons employer facility, as defined by the Act; and

(B) methods, pursuant to section 3623(d) of the Act, for arriving at and providing reasonable estimates of the radiation doses received by individuals applying for assistance under this program for whom there are inadequate records of radiation exposure;

(ii) In accordance with procedures developed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, consider and issue determinations on petitions by classes of employees to be treated as members of the Special Exposure Cohort;

(iii) With the assistance of the Secretary of Energy, apply the methods promulgated under subsection (b)(i)(B) to estimate the radiation doses received by individuals applying for assistance;

(iv) Upon request from the Secretary of Energy, appoint members for a physician panel or panels to consider individual workers' compensation claims as part of the Worker Assistance Program under the process established pursuant to subsection (c)(v); and

(v) Provide the Advisory Board established under section 4 of this order with administrative services, funds, facilities, staff, and other necessary support services and perform the administrative functions of the President under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), with respect to the Advisory Board.

(c) *Secretary of Energy.* The Secretary of Energy shall:

(i) Provide the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health access, in accordance with law, to all relevant information pertaining to worker exposures, including access to restricted data, and any other technical assistance needed to carry out their responsibilities under subsection (b)(ii) and section 4(b), respectively.

(ii) Upon request from the Secretary of Health and Human Services or the Secretary of Labor, and as permitted by law, require a DOE contractor, subcontractor, or designated beryllium vendor, pursuant to section 3631(c) of the Act, to provide information relevant to a claim under this Program;

(iii) Identify and notify potentially eligible individuals of the availability of compensation under the Program;

(iv) Designate, pursuant to sections 3621(4)(B) and 3622 of the Act, atomic weapons employers and additions to the list of designated beryllium vendors;

(v) Pursuant to Subtitle D of the Act, negotiate agreements with the chief executive officer of each State in which there is a DOE facility, and other States as appropriate, to provide assistance to a DOE contractor employee on filing a State workers' compensation system claim, and establish a Worker Assistance Program to help individuals whose illness is related to employment in the DOE's nuclear weapons complex, or the individual's survivor if the individual is deceased,

in applying for State workers' compensation benefits. This assistance shall include:

(1) Submittal of reasonable claims to a physician panel, appointed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services and administered by the Secretary of Energy, under procedures established by the Secretary of Energy, for determination of whether the individual's illness or death arose out of and in the course of employment by the DOE or its contractors and exposure to a toxic substance at a DOE facility; and

(2) For cases determined by the physician panel and the Secretary of Energy under section 3661(d) and (e) of the Act to have arisen out of and in the course of employment by the DOE or its contractors and exposure to a toxic substance at a DOE facility, provide assistance to the individual in filing for workers' compensation benefits. The Secretary shall not contest these claims and, to the extent permitted by law, shall direct a DOE contractor who employed the applicant not to contest the claim;

(vi) Report on the Worker Assistance Program by making publicly available on at least an annual basis claims- related data, including the number of claims filed, the number of illnesses found to be related to work at a DOE facility, job location and description, and number of successful State workers' compensation claims awarded; and

(vii) No later than January 15, 2001, publish in the *Federal Register* a list of atomic weapons employer facilities within the meaning of section 3621(5) of the Act, Department of Energy employer facilities within the meaning of section 3621(12) of the Act, and a list of facilities owned and operated by a beryllium vendor, within the meaning of section 3621(6) of the Act.

(d) *Attorney General.* The Attorney General shall:

(i) Develop procedures to notify, to the extent possible, each claimant (or the survivor of that claimant if deceased) whose claim for compensation under section 5 of the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act has been or is approved by the Department of Justice, of the availability of supplemental compensation and benefits under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program;

(ii) Identify and notify eligible covered uranium employees or their survivors of the availability of supplemental compensation under the Program; and

(iii) Upon request by the Secretary of Labor, provide information needed to adjudicate the claim of a covered uranium employee under this Program.

Sec. 3. *Establishment of Interagency Working Group.*

(a) There is hereby established an Interagency Working Group to be composed of representatives from the Office of Management and Budget, the National Economic Council, and the Departments of Labor, Energy, Health and Human Services, and Justice.

(b) The Working Group shall:

(i) By January 1, 2001, develop a legislative proposal to ensure the Program's fairness and efficiency, including provisions to assure adequate administrative resources and swift dispute resolution; and

(ii) Address any impediments to timely and coordinated Program implementation.

Sec. 4. *Establishment of Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health.*

(a) Pursuant to Public Law 106–398, there is hereby established an Advisory Board on Radiation and Health (Advisory Board). The Advisory Board shall consist of no more than 20 members to be appointed by the President. Members shall include affected workers and their representatives, and representatives from scientific and medical communities. The President shall designate a Chair for the Board among its members.

(b) The Advisory Board shall:

(i) Advise the Secretary of Health and Human Services on the development of guidelines under section 2(b)(i) of this order;

(ii) Advise the Secretary of Health and Human Services on the scientific validity and quality of dose reconstruction efforts performed for this Program; and

(iii) Upon request by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, advise the Secretary on whether there is a class of employees at any Department of Energy facility who were exposed to radiation but for whom it is not feasible to estimate their radiation dose, and on whether there is a reasonable likelihood that such radiation dose may have endangered the health of members of the class.

Sec. 5. *Reporting Requirements.* The Secretaries of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Energy shall, as part of their annual budget submissions, report to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on their activities under this Program, including total expenditures related to benefits and program administration. They shall also report to the OMB, no later than March 1, 2001, on the manner in which they will carry out their respective responsibilities under the Act and this order. This report shall include, among other things, a description of the administrative structure established within their agencies to implement the Act and this order. In addition, the Secretary of Labor shall annually report on the total number and types of claims for which compensation was considered and other data pertinent to evaluating the Federal Government's performance fulfilling the requirements of the Act and this order.

Sec. 6. *Administration and Judicial Review.* (a) This Executive Order shall be carried out subject to the availability of appropriations, and to the extent permitted by law.

(b) This Executive Order does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers or employees, or any other person.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
December 7, 2000.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., December 8, 2000]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on December 11.

Remarks at the University of Nebraska at Kearney, Nebraska

December 8, 2000

Thank you very much. Didn't Casey do a good job? [*Applause*] She was great. I'd like to thank Chancellor Johnston for her kind remarks and the honorary degree. And thank you, President Smith, and members of the board of trustees, to both the students and the other members.

Thank you, Governor, for your welcome. And I thank the other State officials who are here. I am especially grateful that my longtime friend and former colleague as Governor, your retiring Senator, Bob Kerrey, flew down here with me today. Thank you, Bob, for your service, along with our former Nebraska Congressman, Peter Hoagland. Thank you for coming with me. I congratulate Ben Nelson on his election to the United States Senate. Governor Morrison, thank you for being here today.

And I want to say a special word of thanks to my great friend, your former Senator, Jim Exon, who persuaded me to come here and to come to Kearney—he said—should be here.

When I came in here and I looked at this crowd, one of my staff members joked that we had found a building in Nebraska that would hold every single Democrat—[*laughter*]—and a few charitable Republicans, to boot. [*Laughter*]

Let me say, I'm glad that I finally made it to Nebraska. There were a lot of signs outside that said, you saved the best till last. [*Laughter*] And I saw the patriotism and the spirit of the people, all the children holding the American flags. It was very, very moving, coming in. All the schools were let out, and there were hundreds and hundreds of people along the way. And it made us a little bit late, and for that, I'm sorry. But I did actually stop, and we got out and shook hands with one group of schoolchildren there just to thank them for being in the cold. So I thank them for that.

I was also reminded at the airport that we are literally in the heartland of America. A gentleman at the airport gave me a sweatshirt that had a little map of Nebraska with Kearney, and it had a line and it said, "1,300 miles to New York and 1,300 miles to San Francisco."

Most Americans have probably forgotten this, but back in the 1870's, there was actually talk of relocating our Nation's Capital away from Washington, DC, to a more central location. And a local publisher in this community, named Moses Henry Sydenham, launched a national campaign to nominate Kearney for the Nation's Capital. He promised to rename it "New Washington" and to use the real estate profits to pay off the national debt. [*Laughter*]

Critics of his proposal asked him what in the world he would do with all those big, fancy buildings in old Washington. He said it was simple. He would turn them into asylums. [*Laughter*] Well, history took a different course, except for that part about turning those buildings into asylums. [*Laughter*] I have occupied one for the last 8 years.

And we are finally paying off the national debt, which is good. [*Applause*] Thank you. But since half of Washington is in Kearney today, maybe we should think again about moving the Capital. I rather like it here. [*Laughter*]

I want to say again, I thank the people of this community for a wonderful welcome, and all of you in the university community especially. I also want to say again how impressed I was by what Casey had to say. Because I came here today not just to keep my promise to visit Nebraska but to keep working on something at the very end of my term I have been trying for 8 years to do, which is to persuade ordinary, hard-working American citizens in the heartland of America that you should be concerned about what goes on beyond our Nation's borders and what our role in the rest of the world is, because the world is growing smaller and smaller and more interdependent. Every Nebraska farmer knows that. And indeed, when Senator Kerrey and I visited the units of the Nebraska Air National Guard out there, we asked them where the guardsmen were. We found out that you have some Nebraska guardsman now still in Kosovo. So we are personally affected by it.

But I don't think I have still—people say I'm a pretty good talker, but I still don't think I've persuaded the American people by big majorities that you really ought to care a lot about foreign policy, about our relationship to the rest of the world, about what we're doing. And the reason is, in an interdependent world, we are all directly affected by what goes on beyond our borders—sure, in economics, but in other ways, as well—and by what we decide to do or not do about it.

This is an immensely patriotic community. That's one thing Bob Kerrey kept saying over and over again, "Look at all those people holding the flag. These people love their country." But what we have to do is be wise patriots. This country is still around after 224 years because our Founders not only loved our country; they were smart. They were smart enough to figure out how to give us a system that, as we have seen in the last few weeks, can survive just about anything. [*Laughter*]

And I want to ask you again today, just give me a few minutes to make the case in the heartland about why there is no longer a clear, bright line dividing America's domestic concerns and America's foreign policy concerns and why every American who wants to be a good citizen, who wants to vote in every election, should know more about the rest of the world and have a clearer idea about what we're supposed to be doing out there and how it affects how you live in Kearney. Because I think it is profoundly important.

Let's start with a few basics. Never before have we enjoyed at the same time so much prosperity and social progress with the absence of domestic crisis or overwhelming foreign threats. We're in the midst of the longest economic expansion in our history, with the lowest unemployment rate in 30 years, the lowest welfare rolls in 32 years, the lowest crime rates in 27 years, 3 years of surpluses in a row and 3 years of paying down the national debt for the first time in 50 years, the highest homeownership and college-going rate in history. Today we learned that the

November unemployment rate was 4 percent, staying at that 30-year low.

Now, this is good news for America. But there is good news beyond our borders for our values and our interests. In the last few years, for the first time in all human history, more than half the people on the face of the Earth live under governments that they voted for, that they chose.

And more and more, even in nations that have not yet completely embraced democracy, more and more people, especially young people, see our creative, entrepreneurial society with more and more personal freedom as the model for the success they want. Last month I went to Vietnam, where America fought in a very difficult war for a long time, where Senator Kerrey earned the Medal of Honor and nearly 60,000 Americans died, and 3 million Vietnamese died on both sides of the conflict.

So I was interested to see what sort of a reception that I would get and the United States would get, because the Government there remains in the hands of a Communist leadership. And frankly, some of them didn't know what to make about America showing up. But everywhere I went, from Hanoi to Ho Chi Minh City, formerly Saigon, tens of thousands of people appeared out of nowhere. Not for me, for America; for the idea of America. Sixty percent of the people who live in Vietnam are under 30. Because of the tragedy of the war, only 5 percent are over 60.

But the ones under 30 like what they know about America. They want to be our partners in the future, and they want to have the chance to build the kind of future they think young people in this country have. That is a priceless gift.

So the first thing I want to say, especially to the young people here, is that we should all be grateful that we are so fortunate to be alive at this moment of prosperity, military and political power, social progress, and prestige for America.

But the really important question is, what do we intend to make of this moment? Will we be grateful but basically complacent, being the political equivalent of couch potatoes? Will we assume that in this era of the Internet, freedom, peace, and prosperity will just spread? That all we have to do is kind of sit back, hook the world up to AOL, and wait for people to beat their swords into shares on the Nasdaq? [*Laughter*] Or will we understand that no change is inevitable. Change is inevitable, but the particular change is not. And we have to actually make some decisions if we're going to seize the opportunities and meet the challenges before us.

To put it in another way, the train of globalization cannot be reversed, but it has more than one possible destination. If we want America to stay on the right track, if we want other people to be on that track and have the chance to enjoy peace and prosperity, we have no choice but to try to lead the train.

For example, you all applauded when I said more than half the people in the world live under governments of their own choosing for the first time in history. We'd like to keep that process going. But we know that democracy in some places is fragile, and it could be reversed.

We want more nations to see ethnic and religious diversity as a source of strength. You know what the chancellor said when the choir was singing? I said, "Boy, they're good." She said, "They got a lot more rhythm since I came here"—we're laughing. [*Laughter*]

Casey talked about her Hispanic heritage. I was shaking hands with these kids out on the street, and about the third young boy I shook hands with was of Asian descent. This is a more interesting country than it has ever been. Everywhere I go—I mean, you can't be President anymore unless you understand the concerns of at least 50 different groups.

It's an interesting thing. For us, this is a big plus, even though we still have our problems with hate crimes and racial or religious or other instances. But basically, our diversity has come to be something that makes life more interesting in America, because we realize that what unites us is more important than what divides us, that our common humanity anchors us in a way that allows us to feel secure about our differences, so we can celebrate them. And this is important.

I don't like to use the word "tolerance" in this context, because tolerance implies that

there's a dominant culture putting up with a subordinate one. I don't really think that's where we're going as America. I think we're going to the point where we say, "Here are our common values, and if you sign on to those, we respect you; we treat you as an equal; and we celebrate and find interesting the differences."

Now, that's what we would like for every place. And we know that if everybody deals that way, that America's going to do very well in the global society of the 21st century, because there's somebody here from everywhere else. And that's good. You know, we're going to do very, very well, as the world becomes more interdependent. So that's the outcome we want.

But all we have to do is read the paper everyday to know that old hatreds die hard. And their persistence, from Bosnia and Kosovo to the Middle East to Northern Ireland to the African tribal wars to places like East Timor, have in our time led to hundreds of thousands of deaths and countries being impoverished, for 10 years or more, because people couldn't give up their old hatreds to build a new future together.

So how this comes out is not at all inevitable. We want global trade to keep our economy growing. Nebraska farmers like it when people open their markets and the most efficient farmers in the world can sell their food to people who need to buy it. But it is possible that financial crisis abroad could wreck that system, as farmers here found out when the Asian financial crisis hit a couple years ago, or that alienation from global capitalism by people who aren't a part of it will drive whole countries away. We want global trade to lift hundreds of millions of people out of poverty, from India to China to Africa. We know if it happens, it will create a big market for everything American, from corn to cars to computers. And it will give all of us new ideas and new innovation, and we'll all help each other in constructive competition.

But the gap between rich and poor nations could continue to widen and bring more misery, more environmental destruction, more health problems, more and more young people in poor countries just checking out of wanting to be part of a global system, because they think there is nothing in it for them.

We want advances in technology to keep making our lives better. I went last year to that annual show in Chicago of all the latest high-tech gadgets. And I held in my hand, in my palm, a little plastic computer—with a complete keyboard that I held in my hand, that also was connected to the Internet. And I was getting CNN on those tiny little—I don't see well enough in my old age to even use the thing. It's so small, and my hands were too big to effectively use the keyboard, it was so small. Very exciting.

But the same technological breakthroughs that put that computer in the palm of my hand could end up making it possible to create smaller and smaller chemical or biological or nuclear weapons in the hands of terrorists. And all the things we're learning about computers will be learned by people who, because they belong to organized crime units or narcotraffickers or terrorists, would like to pierce our secure networks and get information or spread viruses that wreck our most vital systems.

So I'm a wild-eyed optimist. But I've lived long enough to know that things can happen that are not necessarily what you want, and that every opportunity brings with it new responsibilities because the organized forces of destruction can take advantage of them, all these opportunities, too.

A long time ago, one of your citizens, William Jennings Bryan, said, "Our destiny is a matter of choice. It is not a thing to be waited for. It is a thing to be achieved." We have to continue to achieve America's destiny. And the point I want to make is that it cannot be achieved in the 21st century without American citizens who care about, know about, and understand what is going on beyond our borders and what we're supposed to do about it.

Now, for the last 8 years, I've had the honor of working with people in Congress, principled people of both parties, like both your Senators, Bob Kerrey and Chuck Hagel, to try to make a choice for American leadership in the post-cold war, global information age. I think it's been good for America and for people around the world. And as I leave office, I think America should continue to build a foreign policy for the global age based

on five broad principles, which I would like to briefly state and explain.

First, everything we want to achieve in the world, just about, depends upon maintaining strong alliances with people who share our interests and our values and adapting those alliances to meet today's and tomorrow's challenges. For example, our most important alliance with Europe is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO. It was organized to defend Europe against the Soviet Union in the cold war. When I became President, the cold war was over, and the alliance was in doubt. What's it for, anyway? Who's going to be in it? What's it supposed to do?

But the values that we shared with Europe and the interest we shared were very much threatened when I became President by a vicious, genocidal war in Bosnia. Our European Allies were aiding the victims heroically, but unintentionally shielding the victimizers by not stopping them. And for the first time since World War II, America was refusing to help to defeat a serious threat to peace in Europe. But all that's changed. America decided to lead. Our European Allies decided to work with us. We revitalized the NATO Alliance. We gave it new missions, new members from behind the old Iron Curtain, a new partnership with Russia.

We finally ended the war in Bosnia. We negotiated a peace that grows stronger, steadily. When ethnic cleansing erupted in Kosovo, we acted decisively to stop that and send almost a million people back home.

Today, the Serbian leader who began the Balkan wars, Slobodan Milosevic, has been deposed by his own people. And instead of fighting something bad, we're trying to finish something worthy, a Europe that is united, democratic, and peaceful, completely for the first time in all human history. That takes a big burden off America in the future and give us a big, big set of economic and political partners to deal with the world's challenges.

Now, here's the decision for today. Do we believe that we did the right thing or not? If we do, we have to stay the course, keep expanding NATO, keep working with the Russians, keep burdensharing to do what needs to be done. I don't think most people know this, but in Kosovo today, we provide less than 20 percent of the troops and the funds. But we would not be there as an alliance if the United States had not agreed to do its part. America cannot lead if we walk away from our friends and our neighbors.

The same thing is true in Asia. We fought three wars in Asia in the 20th century. Huge numbers of Americans died there, from World War II through Korea, through Vietnam. What should we do now that the cold war is over, but the future is uncertain? What we have done is to decide to keep our troops in the Pacific, to renew our alliance with Japan. We sent ships to keep tensions from escalating between China and Taiwan. We stood by South Korea and diminished the nuclear threat from North Korea, and we supported the South Korean President's decision to seek to end 50 years of tension on the Korean Peninsula, for which he justifiably won the Nobel Peace Prize.

Should we withdraw from Asia? I don't think so. I think we ought to stay there, modernize our alliances, and keep the peace so we don't have to fight any more wars in the 21st century.

The third thing I want to say about the alliances is that the 21st century world is going to be about more than great power politics, which means we can't just think about East Asia and Europe. We need a systematic, committed, long-term relationship with our neighbors in Latin America and the Caribbean, with South Asia—next to China, the most populous place on Earth—and with Africa, where 800 million people live.

One of the most—[*applause*]—yes, you can clap for that. That's all right. So I think that's important. We've been estranged from India for 50 years. Do you know how many people live in India? Nine hundred and eighty million. In 30 years India will be more populous than China.

In Silicon Valley today, there are 700 high-tech companies headed by Indians—700, in one place. This is totally off the radar screen of American policy during the cold war. So I would encourage all of you who, like Casey, are involved in some sort of international studies, not to just think about America's traditional concerns but to think about what we're going to do with Latin America and the Caribbean, with sub-Saharan Africa and

with south Asia, because a lot of our future will be there.

So beyond alliances, the second principle is that we have to build, if we can, constructive relationships with our former adversaries Russia and China. One of the big questions that will define the world for the next 10 years is, how will Russia and China define their greatness in the 21st century? Will they define it as their ability to dominate their neighbors or to control their own people? Or will they define it in a more modern sense, in their ability to develop their people's capacity to cooperate with their neighbors, to compete and win in a global economy and a global society?

What decision they make will have a huge impact on how every young person in this audience lives. It will define what kind of defense budget we have to have, how many folks we have to enroll in the armed services, where we have to send them, what we have to do. It's huge. Now, we cannot make that decision for Russia or for China. They'll make that decision for themselves. But we can control what we do, and what we do will have some impact on what they decide.

So we should say to them what we've been trying to say for 8 years: If you will accept the rules and the responsibilities of membership in the world community, we want to make sure you get the full benefits and be a full partner, not a junior partner. We also have to say, we have to feel free to speak firmly and honestly when we think what you do is wrong by international standards.

When we've worked together with Russia in a positive way, we've made real progress. Russia took its troops out of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia and put them in joint missions with NATO, something nobody ever thought would happen. We're serving together in Bosnia and Kosovo. Russia helped us find a just end to the war in Kosovo. They worked with us to eliminate 5,000 nuclear warheads from the old Soviet Union and safeguard those that are still there.

Now, do we agree with everything in Russia? No. We think there has been too much corruption at times. We don't agree with wars in Chechnya we think were cruel and self-defeating. We don't agree with backsliding on the free press that we see. But we need a little perspective here. When I went to Moscow for the first time as President, in 1993, people were still lining up for bread, recovering from inflation that got to 2,500 percent. Many people were predicting that an impoverished Russia would go back to communism or turn to fascism.

Since then, Russia has had five—five—free elections. And every time, people have voted to deepen democracy, not to weaken it. The economy is growing. Now, are the positive trends inevitable? No, but they are more than possible. And it's in our interests to encourage them.

The same thing is true in China. We have tried to encourage change by bringing China into international systems, where there are rules and responsibilities, from nonproliferation to trade. That's what I think will happen with China coming into the World Trade Organization. It is a statement by them, by agreeing to the conditions of membership, that they can't succeed over the long run without opening to the world. It is a declaration of interdependence.

It increases the chance that they'll make a good decision, rather than a negative one, about what they're going to do in the 21st century world. And if China goes on and follows through with this, they'll have to dismantle a lot of their old command-and-control economy, which gave the Communist Party so much power. They'll open their doors to more foreign investment and more foreign information and the Internet revolution. Will it inevitably bring freedom? No, but it will increase the chances of China taking the right course.

So I believe if we stay with this course, one of the most profoundly positive changes the generation of young people in this audience will see could be the change that ultimately comes to China. And I told you the Vietnam story. I felt the same thing in Shanghai. I felt the same thing walking in little villages and talking to people who were electing their mayors for the first time in China, where there are, at least now, a million local villages electing their local officials. So, alliances, constructive relations with Russia and China.

The third thing we have to recognize is that local conflicts can become worldwide

headaches if they're allowed to fester. Therefore, whenever possible, we should stop them before they get out of hand. That's why we've worked for peace in the Balkans, between Greece and Turkey on Cyprus, between India and Pakistan, Ethiopia and Eritrea. That's why I'm going back to Northern Ireland next week, the land of my ancestors. And it's why we've worked so hard to make America a force for peace in the Middle East, the home of the world's three great monotheistic religions, where God is reminding us every day that we are not in control.

But we have made a lot of progress. We've seen a peace treaty between Israel and Jordan. We saw a sweeping agreement between the Israelis and the Palestinians and progress toward implementing it over the last 8 years. But what's happened is, they're down to the hedgerows now and the hard decisions, and they've gotten to those fundamental identity questions, where they have to decide what I was talking about earlier. Is it possible for them to look at each other and see their common humanity and find a solution in which neither side can say, "I have vanquished the other," or have there been so many years of history welling up inside them that neither side can let go? That is the issue, and we will continue to work on it.

But the main point I want to make to you is, you should want your President and your Government involved in these things, and you should support your Congress if they invest some of your money in the cause of peace and development in these hotspots in the world.

And let me say again: This is not inconsistent with saying that people ought to take the lead in their own backyard. I think most Americans feel if the Europeans can take the lead in Europe, they ought to do it. The same thing with the Asians in Asia and the Africans in Africa.

What I want you to understand is that we have unique capabilities and unique confidence-building capacity in so many parts of the world that if we're just involved a little bit, we can make a huge difference. Our role was critical in the Balkans, but it was also critical in East Timor. Do you remember when all those people were getting killed in East Timor? You saw it on television every night. And people that couldn't find it on a map, all of a sudden were living with it every single night.

We provided about 500 troops to provide support for the international operations the Australians led there. But it made all the difference. We're training peacekeepers in Sierra Leone. They don't want us to go there and fight, but they want us to train the peacekeepers.

We've been involved in trying to settle a war between Ethiopia and Eritrea that has claimed over 60,000 lives, that most people don't know much about, but could cause us a world of trouble. And besides, it's just tragic.

We had 10 people—10, total—in the jungle when we settled the conflict between East Ecuador and Peru and got them to agree—but they couldn't agree to let it go unless we, America, agreed to send 10 people into a remote place on the border of these two countries, because they knew we could be trusted to do what they had agreed ought to be done. Now, you ought to be proud of that for your country.

But the only point I want to make is, we should do things with other people, and they ought to do their part in their own backyard. But we're in a unique position in history now. There is no other military superpower or economic superpower. And we can do some things, because we've maintained a strong military, nobody else can do.

And I'll be gone in a few weeks, and America will have a new President and a new Congress, but you ought to support them when they want to do these things, because it's very, very important to the stability and future of the world.

One other thing I want to say. We ought to pay our U.N. dues and pay our fair share of peacekeeping operations. Now, nobody in the world benefits from stability more than we do. Nobody. Nobody makes more money out of it. Just think about pure, naked self-interest. Nobody. And when we pay for this peacekeeping—I'll say more about it in a minute—but we get more than our money's worth out of it. And when we walk away from our responsibilities, people resent us. They resent our prosperity; they resent our power; and, in the end, when a whole lot of people

resent you, sooner or later they find some way to manifest it. When we work with each other and do things that we don't just have to do in the moment, we build a common future.

The fourth point I would like to make to you is that this growing openness of borders and technology is changing our national security priorities. People, information, ideas, and goods move around more freely and faster than ever before. That makes us more vulnerable first to the organized forces of destruction, narcotraffickers, terrorists, organized criminals—they are going to work more and more together, with growing access to more and more sophisticated technology.

Part of the challenge is just to get rid of as many weapons of mass destruction as possible. That's why we got the states of the former Soviet Union outside Russia to give up their nuclear arsenals, and we negotiated a worldwide treaty to ban chemical weapons. That's why we forced Iraq to sell its oil for money that can go to food and medicine, but not to rebuilding its weapons. And I think the other countries of the world that are willing to let them spend that money rebuilding their weapons systems are wrong. And I hope that we can strengthen the resolve of the world not to let Saddam Hussein rebuild the chemical weapons network and other weapons systems that are bad.

It's why we negotiated a freeze on plutonium production with North Korea. Now, dealing with terrorists is harder, as we have seen in the tragedy of the U.S.S. *Cole*. Why? Because terrorists, unlike countries, cannot be contained as easily, and it's harder to deter them through threats of retaliation. They operate across borders, so we have got to strengthen our cooperation across borders. We have succeeded in preventing a lot of terrorist attacks. There were many planned during the millennium celebration that we prevented.

We have arrested a lot of terrorists, including those who bombed the World Trade Center and those who were involved in several other killings in this country. And make no mistake about it: We will do the same for those who killed our brave Navy personnel on the U.S.S. *Cole*.

But the most important thing is to prevent bad things from happening. And one of the biggest threats to the future is going to be cyberterrorism—people fooling with your computer networks, trying to shut down your phones, erase bank records, mess up airline schedules, do things to interrupt the fabric of life.

Now, we have the first national strategy to protect America's computer systems and critical infrastructure against that kind of sabotage. It includes, interestingly enough, a scholarship-for-service program to help students who are studying information security and technology, pay for their education if they will give us a couple of years' service in the Government. It's really hard to get talented people in the Government, because we can't pay them enough. You've got 27-year-old young people worth $200 or $300 million if they start the right kind of dot-com company. It's pretty hard to say, "Come be a GS–13," you know? [*Laughter*]

But if we can educate enough people, we can at least get them in their early years, and that's important. We funded this program for the very first time this year, thanks to bipartisan support. And let me say, I'd also like to congratulate the University of Nebraska—some of you perhaps know this, but Nebraska has set up a new information assurance center which is dedicated to the same exact goal. We need more universities to follow your lead. This is going to be a big deal in the future, a big deal.

There are other new things you need to think about in national security terms. Climate change could become a national security issue. The last decade was the warmest in a thousand years. If the next 50 years are as warm as the last decade, you will see the beginning of flooding of the sugarcane fields in Louisiana and the Florida Everglades; you will see the patterns of agricultural production in America begin to shift. It's still cold enough in Nebraska; you'll probably be all right for another 50 years. [*Laughter*] I mean, we laugh about this—this is a serious thing.

Already, in Africa, we see malaria at higher and higher levels than ever before, where it used to be too cool for the mosquitos. This is a serious problem. And the only way to

fix it is to figure out a way for people to get rich without putting more greenhouse gasses into the atmosphere. In other words, we have to change the rules that governed the industrial revolution. And you can play a big role in that, too.

Why? Because scientists today are researching more efficient ways of making ethanol and other biomass fuels. I always supported that, but the real problem with ethanol, you should know, is, is that the conversion ratio is pretty low. It takes about 7 gallons of gasoline to make about 8 gallons of ethanol. But scientific research now is very close to the equivalent of what happened when we turned crude oil into refined gasoline, when we cracked the petroleum molecule.

In other words, they're very close to figuring out how to change the conversion ratio from 7 gallons of gasoline to 8 gallons of ethanol to one gallon of gasoline per 8 gallons of ethanol. When that happens, everybody is all of a sudden getting 500 miles to the gallon, and the whole future of the world is different. And you don't have to use corn, either. You can use rice hulls; you can use grasses on range land. You can do anything. You can do this. This is going to be a big deal.

If I were—no offense, Mr. President—if I were the president of the University of Nebraska, whatever I was spending on that, I'd double it. [*Laughter*] Because if we can do this one thing, if we can do—or you could ask the Department of Agriculture to give you some more money, because we've got some more—[*laughter*]—because the Congress gave us a lot more money this year.

We're all laughing about this, but you think about it. One-third of this problem is transportation. It's an issue. Some people made fun of us a few months ago when we said we considered AIDS a national security issue. You know why? In some southern African countries, it is estimated that half of all the 15-year-olds will die of AIDS. There are four African countries which, within a couple of—a few years, there will be more people over 60 than people under 30.

It is estimated that AIDS will keep South Africa's GDP income 17 percent lower than it otherwise would have been 10 years from now. That obviously makes it harder for them to preserve their democracy, doesn't it, and to give jobs to their children. So that's why we're involved in this international AIDS effort, for a vaccine for more affordable medicines, for better care. It's an important foreign policy issue. Our effort to relieve the debt of the world's poorest countries is a very important foreign policy issue.

Our efforts to help people rebuild their public health systems—they all collapsed, and a lot of the countries of the former Soviet Union, they now have the highest AIDS growth rates in the world because they don't have any public health systems anymore. And all these things will affect whether these countries are breeding grounds for terrorists, whether the narcotraffickers in the places where drugs can be grown will get a foothold, whether we can build a different future. So I hope you will think about that.

The last thing I want to say is that the final principle ought to be, we should be for more open trade, but we have to build a global economy with a more human face. We win in the trade wars, or the trade—not wars, the trade competition. And I know that Nebraska is more—I have not persuaded my fellow Americans of that either, entirely, but in Nebraska, because of the agricultural presence here, has been generally more pro-free trade.

But these 300 trade agreements, from NASA to the World Trade Organization and many others that we negotiated, 300 of them, have given us the longest economic expansion in history. Over 25 percent of our growth is tied to trade now.

Here's the problem: The benefits have not been felt in much of the rest of the world. Eight hundred million people still go hungry every day. More than a billion people have no access to clean water. More than a billion people live on less than a dollar a day. Every year 6 million undernourished boys and girls under the age of 5 die. So if the next President and the next Congress want to spend some of your money to relieve the burden of the world's poorest countries and debt, if they'll put the money into education and health care and development, if they want to spend some money fighting AIDS, if they want to expand a program that we have done

a lot with—the microcredit program, which loans money to entrepreneurs in poor countries—we made 2 million of those loans last year—if they want to double, triple, or quadruple it, I hope you will support that.

If they want to close the digital divide so that people in, let's say, a mountain village in Bolivia can be hooked up to the Internet to sell their rugs that they knit to Bloomingdale's in New York, I hope you will support that. You know why? Bolivia is the poorest country in the Andes, but they've done the best job of getting rid of the narcotraffickers. And so far, they don't have a lot to show for it, because they're still the poorest country. And it would cost us a pittance of what it cost to deal with the drug problem once these drugs show up in America to help those good, honest poor people who are so proud and honorable that they do not want to tolerate the narcotraffickers to make a decent living from their efforts.

Anyway, that's what I want to say. We've got to keep building these alliances; we've got to try to have constructive relationships with Russia and China. We've got to realize there are other places in the world that we haven't fooled with enough. We have to understand the new security challenges of the 21st century. We have to keep building a global economy, because it's the engine of the global society, but we have to do more to put a human face on it.

Fifty years ago Harry Truman said something that's more true today than it was when he said it. Listen to this: "We are in the position now of making the world safe for democracy if we don't crawl in the shell and act selfish and foolish." We still haven't fully—you probably all say you agree with that, but there are practical consequences.

For example, Congress agreed this fall to fund our obligations to the U.N. But because Congress hasn't finished the overall Federal budget, the agreement is at risk, and Congress has got to send me the money pretty soon, or if it doesn't, literally, the very future of the United Nations will be in jeopardy. How would you feel if you picked up the paper and the Secretary-General of the United Nations said, "I'm sorry, we're going to have to close down for a few weeks because the United States won't pay its dues"?

What will that do to us? They share the burden with us of keeping the peace, fighting hunger, protecting the environment, advancing human rights. Listen to this. When you hear people say America spends to much, just listen to this: Right now, at a time when we are the world's only superpower with the strongest economy in the world, less than one in every 800 United Nations' peacekeepers is an American—less than one in 800.

Less than 2 percent of our men and women in uniform are involved in ongoing military operations abroad of any kind. Our annual global budget—for everything from diminishing the nuclear threat to preventing conflict to advancing democracy to fighting AIDS—is no more than what Americans spend each year on dietary supplements—in my case with mixed results. [*Laughter*] I want you to laugh about it, because I want you to remember that this is a big deal.

We must not squander the best moment in our history on smallmindedness. We don't have to be fearful. We've got the strongest military in the world, and in history, and we're going to keep it that way. We don't have to be cheap. Our economy is the envy of the world. We don't have to swim against the currents of the world. The momentum of history is on our side, on the side of freedom and openness and competition. And we don't have the excuse of ignorance, because we've got a 24-hour global news cycle. So we know what's going on out there.

We can no longer separate America's fate from the world any more than you could celebrate Nebraska's fate from America's, or Kearney's fate from Nebraska's. So that's what I came here to say. I hope that in the years ahead the heartland of America will say, America chooses to be a part of the world, with a clear head and a strong heart; to share the risks and the opportunities of the world; to work with others until ultimately there is a global community of free nations, working with us, for peace and security, where everybody counts and everybody has got a chance.

If we will do that, America's best days, and the world's finest hours, lie ahead.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:58 a.m. at the Cushing Health and Sports Center. In his remarks, he referred to Casey Mendez; who introduced the President; Gladys Styles Johnston, chancellor, and L. Dennis Smith, president, University of Nebraska at Kearney; Gov. Mike Johanns and former Gov. Frank Morrison of Nebraska; President Kim Dae-jung of South Korea; and President Saddam Hussein of Iraq.

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.

December 3

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton attended the 23d Kennedy Center Honors Gala at the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

December 4

In the afternoon, the President met with congressional leaders in the Oval Office to discuss budget legislation.

The President declared a major disaster in New York and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by near-record snow on November 19–21.

December 5

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton attended a dinner honoring the Senate of the 107th Congress in the Great Hall of the U.S. Supreme Court.

December 6

The President declared a major disaster in Montana and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by severe winter storms beginning October 31 and continuing through November 20.

December 7

In an afternoon ceremony in the Oval Office, the President received diplomatic credentials from Ambassadors Michael King of Barbados, Mohammed Bin Ali Thani Al-Khusaiby of Oman, Claudia Fritsche of Liechtenstein, Lisa Shoman of Belize, Al Asri Saeed Ahmed Al Dhahari of the United Arab Emirates, and Alfonso Ortega Urbina of Nicaragua. Later, he met with congressional leaders in the Oval Office to discuss budget legislation.

December 8

In the morning, the President traveled to Kearney, NE, and later, he visited Grand Platte Archway Monument. In the afternoon, he traveled to Omaha, NE, and later, he returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced his intention to appoint James C. Free as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation.

The President announced his intention to nominate Islam A. Siddiqui to be Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The President announced his intention to appoint James R. Thompson, Jr., as a member of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission.

The President announced his intention to appoint Smith Bagley, William F. McSweeny, and Thomas E. Wheeler as members of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

NOTE: No nominations were submitted to the Senate during the period covered by this issue.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

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

Released December 2

Transcript of a telephone press briefing by Secretary of Education Richard Riley and Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy Barbara Chow

Released December 4

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Jake Siewert

Released December 5

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Jake Siewert

Released December 6

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Jake Siewert

Released December 7

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Jake Siewert

Transcript of a press briefing by National Security Adviser Samuel Berger on the President's upcoming visit to Ireland and England

Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's December 1 letter to President-elect Aristide of Haiti

Released December 8

Fact sheet: A Foreign Policy for the Global Age

Fact sheet: Scholarship for Service

Acts Approved by the President

Approved December 5

H.J. Res. 126 / Public Law 106–537
Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes

Approved December 6

H.R. 2941 / Public Law 106–538
To establish the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area in the State of Arizona

Approved December 7

H.J. Res. 127 / Public Law 106–539
Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes